# The Influence of Organizational Justice on Turnover Intention of Employees in Food and Beverage Industry in Nigeria

**B.A. Chukwu**

*Department of Business Administration Igbinedion University Okada, Nigeria*
*Email: Benedictchukwu103@yahoo.com Tel: +234-816 026 4544*

## Abstract

This research explored the influence of organizational justice on employee turnover intention. Labour turnover has negative impact on food and beverage industry in Nigeria in form of direct and indirect cost. Labour turnover is a source of economic drain to the food and beverage industry in Nigeria. Retention of employee is not easy and is a complex issue. Management of food and beverage industry can reduce turnover by considering different preventive measures such as entrenchment of Justice in organization especially where it concerns distribution of reward and treatment of staff. Employees will opt out of the organization if denied Justice in organization. This study adopted a Survey research design through administration of questionnaire to sampled firms. The data for the research was analyzed using descriptive statistics and Chi-square. The empirical result from the Chi-square analysis showed that fairness in procedure and process of getting reward, fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward, fairness in personal treatment of employees received from authority figures and entrenchment of Justice in organization has significant influence on employee turnover intention at 5percent level of significance. Based on the findings of this research, it is recommended that there should be fairness in procedure and process of getting and distributing reward in organization. And that Justice should be entrenched in organizational Culture.

**Highlights of this paper**

- This research examined the influence of organizational justice on employee turnover intention. The empirical result from the Chi-square analysis showed that fairness in procedure and process of getting reward, fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward, fairness in personal treatment of employees received from authority figures and entrenchment of Justice in organization has significant influence on employee turnover intention at 5percent level of significance.

## 1. Introduction

Organizational Justice is the perceptions of fairness in the organization (Cropanzano *et al.*, 2001). Three types of organizational Justice are recognized and there are distributive Justice (fairness of outcomes), procedural Justice (fairness in process) and interactional Justice (fairness of personal treatment one receives from authority figures) (Robins and Judge, 2009). Research have shown that unjust processes generate negative consequences in the organization like job dissatisfaction, turnover intention, low commitment and low organizational citizenship behavior (Cropanzano *et al.*, 2001).

Employees have evaluated the fairness of human resource practices in the organization, and discovered that commitment towards organization will decrease if no distributive justice is perceived (Price, 2001). Justice in the distribution of reward of the organization will reduce turnover intention. Equity theory of motivation plays vital role in this respect by showing how employees react to maintenance aspect of Motivation especially if there is no justice in the reward of the organization. Research tends to support equity theory particularly as it implies to people who are underpaid (James and Banes, 2005).

Satisfying the economic need is not the only problem, but includes how to distribute equitably the economic need of the organization. Employees are very conscious of equity pay. The moral seem to be that even lower primates are genetically programmed to demand fair treatment when it comes to pay. Higher up the primate line, the equity theory of motivation postulates that people are strongly motivated to maintain a balance between what they perceived as their input or contributions and their reward (James and Banes, 2005). But when what they perceived as their input or contributions are not commiserated with their reward turnover intention sets in.

Organizational Justice is an area of Psychological inquiry that focuses on perception of fairness in the organization (Byme and Cropanzano, 2001). Psychological inquiry is an important predictor for employees' workplace attitudes, behaviours, and employee's well being in general (Häusser *et al.*, 2010). It is therefore pertinent to understand to what extent organizational Justice interact with the factors in the organization or work environment in shaping individuals attitudes and behaviours such as turnover intention (Thomas and Nagalungapa, 2012).

### 1.1. Statement of Research Problem

Staff turnover is costly to all level of organizations regardless of its nature and usually the productivity and quality of the products or services are always negatively affected (Gustafson, 2002; Roshidi, 2014). Staff turnover has been a serious issue affecting organizations worldwide especially in the field of human resources management (Roshidi, 2014). High staff turnover brings destruction to the organization in the form of direct and indirect costs and profitability (Roshidi, 2014). The direct costs refers to replacement costs, recruitment process costs for advertising, selection, interviewing, hiring, doing their orientation program to the hiring costs for the newly hired employees (Gustafson, 2002). The indirect costs relate to the loss of production, reduced performance levels, unnecessary overtime and loss moral (U.S Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2008).

Staff turnover is verified as one of the problems that affects organizations long term objectives, goals and monetary. Loss of an employee as a result of staff turnover can cause additional work stress and lower moral and motivation of employees that stay (Solomon *et al.*, 2012). Staff turnover can disrupt organization strategic planning to achieve objectives when a critical employee is lost (Capelli, 2008; Oluwafemi, 2010). It can also reduce customers service, loyalty and cause Psychological effect on employees (Oluwafemi, 2010).

### 1.2. Significance of the Study

This study would be of great benefit to the following stakeholders:

### Managers

The study would help managers of Food and Beverage Industry in finding possible measures/strategies to reduce employee turnover intention. It would be of great interest and valuable to practicing managers especially Human Resource Managers and help them to reduce turnover and create savings in hiring and training replacements.

### Employee

The study would be of great benefit to employees to strongly appraise those motivational factors that would enhance the employee to know how they can find better opportunities to reduce turnover intention in a given productive companies.

### Academia

This study would be of great benefit to researcher in Business Administration and Management related field as it would provide empirical evidence for further studies on the area of employee turnover intention.

### 1.3. Objectives of the Study

The objective of the study is to examine the influence of organizational justice on employee turnover intention. The specific objectives of the study are to:

i. ascertain whether employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward.

ii. determine whether employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward.

iii. examine whether employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures.

iv. examine whether employees will intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in organization.

### 1.4. Statement of Relevant Research Questions

i. Will employees intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward?

ii. Will employees intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward?

iii. Will employees intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures?

iv. Will employees intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in the organization?

*1.5. Statement of Hypotheses*

*Hypothesis 1*

H1: Employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward.

HO$_2$: Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in procedures and process of getting reward.

*Hypothesis 2*

H1: Employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward.

HO$_2$: Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward.

*Hypothesis 3*

H1: Employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures.

HO$_3$: Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures.

*Hypothesis 4*

H1: Employees will intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in organization.

HO$_4$: Employees will not intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in organization.

*1.6. Scope of the Study*

The study examined the influence of organizational Justice on employee turnover intention in Food and Beverage Industry in Nigeria. The Scope of this study would delimit to the staff of Nigeria Brewery Plc in Nigeria. The study adopted a survey research design through the administration of structured questionnaires raised on a five point likert scale to the sampled respondents for the study.

*1.7. Limitations of the Study*

The following limitations was faced in carrying out this research.

1. Limited sample Size: The sample size of the study was constrained due to the inability of the respondents to voluntarily participate in the survey. In addition, the non inclusion of all the Breweries in Nigeria would also reduced the Sample Size of the Study.

2. Low Response: The usage of research instrument was usually constraint with poor response and this ultimately affects the sample size. Also, the reluctant of respondents to answer the questionnaire in the process of data collection, due to fear of victimization by those in authority was another limitation of the study.

# 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

*2.1. Conceptual Review*

*2.1.1. Turnover Intention*

Turnover intention refers to one step before leaving which is planning to leave while actual turnover is the employee departure from the organization (Chen *et al.,* 2011). Hom and Grifeth (1991) defined turnover intention as the relative strength of an individuals intention towards voluntary permanent withdrawal from the organization. This type of intention are typically measured along a subjective probability dimension which associates a person to a certain activities within a specific time interval, that is within the next six months or one year (Adeboye and Adegoroye, 2012).

Turnover intention concept is drawn from the belief attitudes behavioral intention model developed by Fishbein in 1967, which stated that one's intention to perform a specific behaviour is the immediate determinant of the behaviour, meaning that turnover intention is one's behavioural intention to separate from Job. Most studies on turnover has shown that the relationship between attitudes about job and behavioural intentions were Significant (Allen *et al.*, 2003).

Turnover intention is an immediate predictor of turnover (Price, 2001). It is the strongest precursor of turnover (Allen *et al.*, 2003). It is a cognition which provides organization an opportunity to salvage employee management relationship and stop the loss of employee (Fang and Verma, 2002).

### 2.2. Organizational Justice

Cropanzona et al, defined organizational Justice as the perception of fairness in organization. Three types of organizational Justice are considered fair in work place and these includes distributive Justice, procedural Justice and interactional justice (Robins and Judge, 2009). Procedural Justice refers to the perception of employees regarding procedure and process of garnering rewards (Price and Mueller, 1986). Distributive Justice refers to employees perception of fairness of outcomes such as rewards which includes promotion and incentives (Robins and Judge, 2009). Interactional Justice refers to employees perception of fairness of treatment one receives from authority figures (Robins and Judge, 2009). Organizational Justice interacts with other factors in organization in shaping individuals attitudes and behaviours such a turnover intention (Thomas and Nagalungapa, 2012).

## 3. THEORETICAL REVIEW

### 3.1. Organizational Justice and Turnover Intention

Non discriminatory reward system, timely promotion, regular salary review, adequate training, open and fair appraisal system will improve overall quality of work life of employee and improve employee turnover intention and performance (Oluwafemi, 2013). Sunday *et al.* (2015) Stated that how far employees are treated relate to their intention to leave, particular to those who experience the under estimation of fairness.

Robins and Judge (2009) Stated that Justice notion about what is considered fair in work place are distributed into three facets which include distributive Justice, procedural Justice and interactional Justice. Colquit (2001) Stated that many researchers today choose to examine one or more of the Justice. This study choose two facets of Justice namely distributive and procedural to examine their influence on turnover intention. Organizational Justice is negatively related to turnover intention (Sunday *et al.*, 2015).

Ambrose *et al.* (2013) stated that the focus on direct relationship between organizational Justice and employees outcomes is receding instead, different processes through which organizational justice perceptions are related to work outcomes are of more interest. Byme and Cropanzano (2001) stated that organizational justice is an area of psychological inquiry that focuses on perception of fairness in the organization. Work environment differ for individuals within the same organization. The Psychological work environment is an important predictor for employees' and workplace attitudes, behaviours, and their well being in general (Häusser *et al.*, 2010).

It is therefore important to understand to what extent organizational Justice interacts with the factors in the organization or work environment in shaping individuals attitudes and behaviors such as turnover intention (Thomas and Nagalungapa, 2012). This can be achieved by examining whether the fairness perception of an organization have the same effect on individual well-being regardless of how the work environment is perceived (Sunday *et al.*, 2015). Sunday *et al.* (2015) also stated that how far employees are treated relates to their intention to leave, particular to those who experience the under estimation of fairness.

133

Justice in the distribution of reward of the organization will reduce turnover intention (Hassan, 2010; Prathamesh, 2012). Equity theory of motivation plays an important role in determining how employees react to maintenance aspect of motivation (James and Banes, 2005). Research tends to support equity theory especially as it implies to people who are underpaid (James and Banes, 2005). Satisfying the economic need is not the only important problem, but includes how to distribute equitably the economic needs of the organization (Hassan, 2010). Employees are conscious of equity pay.

Unjust processes generate negative consequences in the organization like job dissatisfaction, turnover intention, low commitment and low organizational citizenship behaviour (Cropanzano *et al.*, 2001). When employees evaluate the fairness of human resource practices in the organization, commitment towards organization will decrease if no distributive Justice is perceived (Prathamesh, 2012). There is a significant relationship between employee turnover intention and perceived distributive, procedural and interactional Justice.

Food and Beverage workers will resign, when there is no Justice, more especially in the distribution of reward of the organization. In order to avoid dissatisfaction and turnover, management should be able to identify the best way of distributing reward. Management must equitably distribute economic reward by paying competitive wages and salary, enhanced allowances and fringe benefits.

### 3.2. Empirical Review

Oluwafemi (2013) Carried out a study on predictors of turnover intention among employees in Nigeria oil Industry in Nigeria. The objective of the study was to examine the relationship between contextual (distributive, procedural and interactional Justice) and dispositional variables (Conscientious agreeable and emotional stability) on turnover intention among employees in Nigeria Oil Industry. The findings of the study showed that there is a significant negative relationship between contextual variables and turnover intentions, and between dispositional variables and turnover intention. Using age and tenure as control, contextual variable accounted for higher variance in turnover intention than dispositional variables, justifying the assumption of weak effects of dispositional traits in strong situations. The study recommended fair employment practices, elimination of discriminatory policies, procedures and practices to improve retention and performance.

Saraih *et al.* (2016) conducted a study on the factors that influence turnover intentions among academicians in the Malaysia Higher Educational Institution in Malaysia. The objective of the study was to investigate the relationship between organizational Justice, Organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour and turnover intention. The study used survey research design. The data was gathered through survey instrument from 175 subjects in one of the Malaysia High Education Institution. The research finding showed that organizational commitment was the only factor that was negatively associated with academicians turnover intention.

Nienaber and Masibigiri (2012) carried out a research on factors affecting turnover intention in South Africa. The objective of the study was to identify the factors influencing voluntary turnover intent of employees in South Africa. The research findings showed that the factors affecting employee turnover intention were Organizational Justice, lack of recognition, poor career path, unsupportive organizational context, unchallenging work, absence of training and better job offer. There were also evidence of normative commitment among the employees as they were not effectively committed. Employees were missing the feeling of engagement. The study recommended that employers should feel affectively committed, emotionally attached to their organizations to do their best, being dedicated, effective and productive and working towards achieving their organizations goals and objectives.

Ahmad and Riaz (2011) Carried out a research on the factor affecting turnover intention in Pakistan. The objective of the study was to investigate the voluntary turnover of Doctors in public Sector Medical College and hospital in Pakistan. The research findings showed that lack of distributive Justice, better job opportunities, management problems, less salary, nature of work were the major source of turnover of Doctors and job Satisfaction.

Prathamesh (2012) conducted a study on the influence of interactional Justice on turnover intention in India. The objective of the study was to examine the relationship between distributive Justice and the intention to turnover. The findings of the study showed that there is a negative and significant relationship between distributive Justice and turnover intention and that a significant relation also exist between approach Justice and intention to leave, while a negative and significant relationship exists between interactional justice and intention to leave. His research also showed that the influences of interactional justice combining the effects of both interpersonal and informational Justices, is found to be more on an employee intention to turnover compared to other forms of Justice. The study recommended use of all forms of Justice to enhance retention.

## 4. THEORETICAL FRAME WORK OF THE STUDY

### 4.1. Theory of Turnover Intention

#### 4.1.1. Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory asserts that various exchange relationships exists between member of an organization. (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Social Exchange theory is an exchange process between parties that is mutually contingent and mutually rewarding (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). This theory was used by numerous studies to explain the relationship between a diversity of organizational aspects and employee behaviour (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). A sense of attachment and commitment toward the organization is built by high level of social exchange (Gould-Williams and Davies, 2005). Employees that have high positive perception of exchange relation are less likely to leave the organization (Gould-Williams, 2007). The social exchange theory is of the opinion that organizations and managers can provide organizational support to achieve desirable attitude and behaviours from employees (Gould-Williams and Davies, 2005; Gould-Williams, 2007).

Employees stay at their work when they are satisfied with their salary, career growth, training and development and performance appraisal in their organization (Abubakar *et al.*, 2014). Eisenberger *et al.* (2002) argued that the greater employees satisfaction with organization support, the more likely they will feel a responsibility to reward their organization.

## 5. METHODOLOGY

Survey research method was used in this study. It entails collection of data or information from specific population or sample through questionnaire instrument. Survey research method was used because the goal was to sample the opinions of the people on issues concerning the research. The population of this study comprised staff of Nigerian Breweries Plc and was 3195. A sample of 355 was selected from this study using Yamane (1964) formula. A stratified random sampling technique was used to distribute sample to Nigeria Breweries using stratum allocation technique of Kumar (1976). This sampling technique is considered most appropriate because it gives everybody in the population equal chance of being selected.

Questionnaire was the measuring Instrument. The questionnaire was made up of five point likert scale ranging from I (Strongly disagree with the statement) to 5 strongly agree with the statement). The questionnaire was self development of items. Demographic data was part of the questionnaire. The validity and reliability of the

questionnaire was measured using Cronbach's Alpha. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.826 which is within the acceptable limit in social science. This means that the data collected were valid and reliable for analysis.

A total of 355 questionnaire were distributed to staff of Nigerian Breweries Plc and 311 responses were collected which has 87.01% response rate. Tables and percentages were used to present and analyze the data while Chi-square was used to test the hypotheses.

## 6. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENT

### 6.1.Pilot Test

A pilot test was carried on 50 respondents before questionnaire distribution in other to collect their comments, ensure simplicity and understanding of questionnaire, which helped in developing the questionnaire more efficiently. A favourable comment was obtained from the 50 respondents and the results of the pilot test ensure that the survey was understandable   by the 50 respondents.

A reliability analysis was conducted on employee perception of fairness on procedure and process, employee perception of fairness in distribution of outcomes, employee perception of fairness in personal treatment and Perception of Entrenchment of Justice. Table 1 showed the reliability analysis of the questionnaire, and the results showed that the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire range from 0.768–0.902. The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire is 0.826.  This is within the range acceptable in social sciences.  This means that the data collected were valid and reliable enough to be used for analysis.

**Table-1.** Result of Reliability Analysis.

| Variables | Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|
| **Perception of fairness in** | | |
| **Procedure and process** | 4 | 0.768 |
| **Perception of fairness in** | | |
| **Distribution of outcomes** | 4 | 0.895 |
| **Perception of fairness in** | | |
| **Personal treatment** | 4 | 0.781 |
| **Perception of** | | |
| **Entrenchment of Justice** | 4 | 0.785 |
| **Turnover intention** | 4 | 0.902 |

**Source:** Researchers Computation 2018.

## 7. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

### 7.1. Data Presentation and Analysis for Sample Background Variables

As total of three hundred and fifty-five (355) questionnaires were given out to respondents and three hundred and thirteen (311) were duly returned and useable, and subsequently analyzed. Therefore, the response rate was 87.01%. The demography of the respondents was presented in Table 2.

Table 2 shows the age distribution of the sampled respondents of whom, 65 (20.9%) of them were aged 30years below, 126 (40.5%) of them were aged 30 − 39 years, 81 (26.0%) of them were aged 40 − 49 years and 39 (12.6%) of them were aged 50 years and above. This shows that majority of the respondents were aged 30 − 39 years. On the issue of sex of the sampled respondents, 203 (67.3%) were males and108 (34.7%) were females. This implies that majority of the respondents were males. On the educational level of the respondents who returned valid copies of distributed questionnaires of whom 88 (28.3%) of them attended secondary school, 123 (39.5%) of them attended post secondary school and 100 (32.2%) of them attended polytechnic/university.

**Table-2.** Demography of Respondents.

| Responses | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **Age:** | | |
| **Below 30 years** | 65 | 20.9 |
| **30 − 39 years** | 126 | 40.5 |
| **40 − 49 years** | 81 | 26 |
| **50 years and above** | 39 | 12.6 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |
| **Sex:** | | |
| **Male** | 203 | 65.3 |
| **Female** | 108 | 34.7 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |
| **Educational Level:** | | |
| **Secondary** | 88 | 28.3 |
| **Post-secondary** | 123 | 39.5 |
| **Polytechnic/University** | 100 | 32.2 |
| **Total** | 311 | 100 |
| **Department** | | |
| **Accounting** | 35 | 11.3 |
| **Marketing** | 77 | 24.7 |
| **Administration** | 45 | 14.5 |
| **Production** | 100 | 32.1 |
| **Maintenance** | 54 | 17.4 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |
| **Marital Status** | | |
| **Single** | 106 | 34.1 |
| **Married** | 205 | 65.9 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |
| **Years of Service** | | |
| **Below 5 years** | 87 | 28 |
| **5 − 10 years** | 129 | 41.5 |
| **10 − 15 years** | 71 | 22.8 |
| **16 years and above** | 24 | 7.7 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |
| **Number of Times change Job** | | |
| **2times and below** | 191 | 61.4 |
| **3 − times** | 82 | 26.4 |
| **5 − times and above** | 38 | 12.2 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |

**Source:** Authors Compilation, 2018.

This means that majority of the sampled respondents attend post secondary school. Based on department, 35 (11.3%) of the respondents were in accounting department, 77 (24.7%) of the respondents were in marketing department, 45 (14.5%) of the respondents were in administration department, 100 (32.1%) of the respondents were in production department and 54 (17.4%) of the respondents were in maintenance department. This means that majority of the respondents were in production department. On the issue of marital Status of the sampled respondents, 106 (34.1%) of them were single and 205 (65.9%) of them married. This shows that majority of the respondents were married. On the year of service, 87 (28.0%) had work for the period of 5 years and below, 129 (41.5%) had work for the period of 5 − 10 years, 71 (22.3%) had work for the period of 10 − 15 years, 24 (7.7%) of the respondents had work for the period of 16years and above. This shows that majority for the respondents had work for the 5 - 10years. The number of times change job, 191 (61.4%) of the respondents had change job less than twice, 82 (26.4%) of the respondents had changed job for 3 − 4 times and 38 (12.2%) of the respondents had changed job for 5 times above. This means that the majority of the respondents had changed jobs for less than 2 times.

### 7.2. Test of Hypotheses

**Chi- square formula was used as a statistical instrument for testing the hypotheses.**

$$X^2 = \frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where:

of  =  observed frequency

ef  =  expected frequency

$X^2$  =  distribution is worked out by the value of its degree of freedom (df). Contingency table was also used to work out the expected frequencies.

Decision Rule: Reject the null ($H_0$) hypothesis and accept the research/alternate ($H_1$) hypothesis if the Calculated ($X^2$) value is greater than the table value.

Expected Frequency (Ef) = Roll Total x Column Total

Grand Total

### Hypothesis 1

$H_1$: Employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward.

$H_0$: Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in Table 3 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

**Table-3.** Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward.

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Agreed | 84 | 27 |
| Disagreed | 183 | 58.8 |
| Undecided | 44 | 14.2 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |

**Source:** Field survey, 2018.

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward. 84 respondents representing 27 percent agreed that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward. 183 respondents representing 58.8 percent disagreed while 44 respondents representing 14.2 percent were undecided in the issue.

**Table-4.** Contingency.

| Response | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agreed | 56 (56.8) | 31 (30.2) | 87 |
| Disagreed | 122 (116.8) | 57 (62.2) | 179 |
| Undecided | 25 (29.4) | 20 (15.6) | 45 |
| Total | 203 | 108 | 311 |

**Source:** Author's compilation (2018).

In Table 4, 56 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed while 56.8 is the expected frequency. 51 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed while 50.2 is the expected frequency.

112 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed while 116.8 is the expected frequency. 57 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 62.2 is the expected frequency.

25 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that were undecided while 29.4 is the expected frequency. 20 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that were undecided while 13.6 is the expected frequency Table 5.

Expected Frequency Calculation.

Expected frequency = $\underline{\text{Roll Total x Column Total}}$

Grand Total

Roll$_1$ Cell$_1$ 203 x 87 ÷ 311 = 56.8

Roll$_1$ Cell$_2$ 108 x 87 ÷ 311 = 30.2

Roll$_2$ Cell$_1$ 203 x 179 ÷ 311 = 116.8

Roll$_2$ Cell$_2$ 108 x 179 ÷ 311 = 62.2

Roll$_3$ Cell$_1$ 203 x 45 ÷ 311 = 29.4

Roll$_3$ Cell$_2$ 108 x 45 ÷ 311 = 15.6

**Table-5.** Chi-square.

| Of | Ef | (of − ef) | (of − ef)² | $\dfrac{(of − ef)^2}{ef}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| x6 | 56.8 | –0.8 | 0.64 | 0.0113 |
| 31 | 30.2 | 0.8 | 0.64 | 0.0212 |
| 122 | 116.8 | 5.2 | 27.04 | 0.2315 |
| 57 | 62.2 | –5.2 | 27.04 | 0.4347 |
| 25 | 29.4 | –4.4 | 19.36 | 0.6585 |
| 20 | 15.6 | 4.4 | 19.36 | 1.241 |
| 311 | | | | 2.5982 |

of = 0bserved frequency
ef = expected frequency
$X^2$= Chi-Square

$$X^2 = \frac{(of − ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where:
of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.
ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

$X^2$ value calculated = 2.598
To find degree of freedom
df = (R − 1) (C − 1)
= (3 − 1) (2 − 1)
= 3 x 1
df = 3
At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815.

Decision Rule: Reject H$_0$ If the $X^2$ Calculated value is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (2.598) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and alternate rejected.

This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward.

*Hypothesis 2*

$H_1$: Employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward.

$H_0$: Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in Table 6 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

**Table-6.** Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward.

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| Agreed | 83 | 26.7 |
| Disagreed | 181 | 58.2 |
| Undecided | 47 | 15.1 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |

**Source:** Field Survey 2018.

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward. 83 respondents representing 26.7 percent agreed that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward, 181 respondents representing 58.2 percent disagreed while 47 respondents representing 15.1 percent were undecided on the issue.

**Table-7.** Contingency.

| Response | Male | Female | Total |
|----------|------|--------|-------|
| Agreed | 58 (54.2) | 25 (28.8) | 83 |
| Disagreed | 119 (118.1) | 62 (62.8) | 181 |
| Undecided | 26 (30.7) | 21 (16.3) | 47 |
| Total | 203 | 108 | 311 |

**Source:** Author's compilation (2018).

In Table 7, 58 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed while 54.2 is the expected frequency. 25 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed while 28.8 is the expected frequency.

119 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed while 118.1 is the expected frequency. 62 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 62.8 is the expected frequency.

26 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that were undecided while 30.7 is the expected frequency. 21 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that were undecided while 16.3 is the expected frequency Table 8.

Expected Frequency Calculation

Expected frequency = Roll Total x Column Total

Grand Total

Roll$_1$ Cell$_1$ 203 x 83 ÷ 311 = 54.2

Roll$_1$ Cell$_2$ 108 x 83 ÷ 311 = 28.8

Roll$_2$ Cell$_1$ 203 x 181 ÷ 311 = 118.1

Roll$_2$ Cell$_2$ 108 x 181 ÷ 311 = 62.8

Roll$_3$ Cell$_1$ 203 x 47 ÷ 311 = 30.7

Roll$_3$ Cell$_2$ 108 x 47 ÷ 311 = 16.3

**Table-8.** Chi-square.

| Of | Ef | (of − ef) | (of − ef)² | $\frac{(of − ef)^2}{Ef}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **58** | 54.2 | 3.8 | 14.44 | 0.2664 |
| **25** | 28.8 | −3.3 | 10.89 | 0.3781 |
| **119** | 118.1 | 0.9 | 0.81 | 0.0007 |
| **62** | 62.8 | −0.8 | 0.64 | 0.0102 |
| **26** | 30.7 | −4.7 | 22.09 | 0.7195 |
| **21** | 16.3 | 4.7 | 22.09 | 1.3552 |
| **311** | | | | 2.7295 |

of = 0bserved frequency

ef = expected frequency

$X^2$ = Chi-Square

$$X^2 = \frac{(of − ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where:

of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

$X^2$ Value Calculated = 2.729

To find degree of freedom

Df = (R − 1) (C − 1)

  (3 − 1) (2 − 1)

   3 x 1

df = 3

At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815

Decision Rule: Reject H$_0$ if the $X^2$ calculated value is greater than the table value and Vice-Versa. Since the calculated value (2.729) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when there is farness in the distribution of outcomes such as rewards.

*Hypothesis 3*

H$_1$: Employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures.

H$_2$: Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in Table 9 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

**Table-9.** Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures.

| Responses | Frequency | Percentages |
|---|---|---|
| Agreed | 88 | 28.3 |
| Disagreed | 183 | 58.8 |
| Undecided | 40 | 12.9 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |

**Source:** Field survey 2018.

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures. 88 respondents representing 28.3 percent agreed that employees will intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures. 183 respondents representing 58.8 percent disagreed while 40 respondents representing 12.9 percent were undecided on the issue.

**Table-10.** Contingency.

| Responses | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agreed | 60 (58.1) | 29 (30.9) | 89 |
| Disagreed | 120 (119.4) | 63 (63.5) | 183 |
| Undecided | 23 (25.4) | 16 (13.5) | 39 |
| Total | 203 | 108 | 311 |

**Source:** Author's compilation (2018).

In Table 10, 60 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed while 58.1 is the expected frequency. 29 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed while 30.9 is the expected frequency.

120 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed while 119.4 is the expected frequency. 63 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 63.5 is the expected frequency.

23 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that were undecided while 25.4 is the expected frequency. 16 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that were undecided while 13.5 is the expected frequency Table 11.

Expected Frequency Calculation

Expected Frequency = Roll Total x Column Total

Grand Total

$Roll_1$  $Cell_1$  203 x 89 ÷ 311 = 58.1

$Roll_1$  $Cell_2$  108 x 89 ÷ 311 = 30.9

$Roll_2$  $Cell_1$  203 x 183 ÷ 311 = 119.4

$Roll_2$  $Cell_2$  108 x 183 ÷ 311 = 63.5

$Roll_3$  $Cell_1$  203 x 39 ÷ 311 = 25.4

$Roll_3$  $Cell_2$  108 x 39 ÷ 311 = 13.5

**Table-11**. Chi-square.

| Of | Ef | (of − ef) | (of − ef)² | (of − ef)² / ef |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 60 | 58.1 | 1.9 | 3.61 | 0.0621 |
| 29 | 30.9 | −1.9 | 3.61 | 0.1168 |
| 120 | 119.4 | 0.6 | 0.36 | 0.003 |
| 63 | 63.5 | -0.5 | 0.25 | 0.0039 |
| 23 | 25.4 | −2.4 | 5.76 | 0.2267 |
| 16 | 13.5 | 2.5 | 6.25 | 0.4629 |
| 311 | | | | 0.8754 |

of = 0bserved frequency
ef = expected frequency
$X^2$ = Chi-Square

$$X^2 = \frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where:
of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.
ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

$X^2$ Value Calculated = 0.8754
To find degree of freedom
Df = (R − 1) (C − 1)
    (3 − 1) (2 − 1)
    3 x 1
df = 3
Level of Significance = 5% = 0.05
At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815

Decision Rule: Reject $H_0$ if the $X^2$ calculated value is greater than the table value and vice-versa. Since the calculated value (0.8754) is less than the table (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment from the authority figures.

*Hypothesis 4*

$H_1$: Employees will intend to leave when justice is entrenched in the organization.

$H_0$: Employees will not intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in the organization.

Test Data: Data collected and presented in Table 12 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

**Table-12.** Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in the organization.

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Agreed | 74 | 23.8 |
| Disagreed | 195 | 62.7 |
| Undecided | 42 | 13.5 |
| Total | 311 | 100 |

**Source:** Field Survey 2018.

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in the organization. 74 respondents representing 23.8 percent agreed that

143

employees will intend to leave when Justice is entrenched in organization. 195 respondents representing 62.7 percent disagreed while 42 respondents representing 13.5 percent were undecided on the issue.

**Table-13.** Contingency

| Responses | Male | Female | Total |
|-----------|------|--------|-------|
| **Agreed** | 54 (48.9) | 21 (26.0) | 75 |
| **Disagreed** | 128 (127.9) | 68 (68.1) | 196 |
| **Undecided** | 21 (26.1) | 19 (13.9) | 40 |
| **Total** | 203 | 108 | 311 |

**Source:** Author's compilation (2018).

In Table 13, 54 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that agreed while 48.9 is the expected frequency. 21 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that agreed while 26.0 is the expected frequency.

128is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that disagreed while 127.9 is the expected frequency. 68 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed while 68.1 is the expected frequency.

21 is the observed frequency of the number of male respondents that were undecided while 26.1 is the expected frequency. 19 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that were undecided while 13.9 is the expected frequency Table 14.

Expected Frequency Calculation

Expected Frequency = Roll Total x Column Total

               Grand Total

$Roll_1$ $Cell_1$  203 x 75 ÷ 311 = 48.9

$Roll_1$ $Cell_2$  108 x 75 ÷ 311 = 26.0

$Roll_2$ $Cell_1$  203 x 196 ÷ 311 = 127.9

$Roll_2$ $Cell_2$  108 x 196 ÷ 311 = 68.1

$Roll_3$ $Cell_1$  203 x 40 ÷ 311 = 26.1

$Roll_3$ $Cell_2$  108 x 40 ÷ 311 = 13.9

**Table-14.** Chi-square.

| of | ef | (of − ef) | $(of − ef)^2$ | $\dfrac{(of − ef)^2}{ef}$ |
|----|----|-----------|---------------|---------------------------|
| **54** | 48.9 | 5.1 | 26.01 | 0.5319 |
| **21** | 26 | −0.5 | 25 | 0.9615 |
| **128** | 127.9 | 0.1 | 0.01 | 0.0001 |
| **68** | 68.1 | −0.1 | 0.01 | 0.0002 |
| **21** | 26.1 | −5.1 | 26.01 | 0.9965 |
| **19** | 13.9 | 5.1 | 26.01 | 1.8712 |
| **311** | | | | 4.3614 |

of = 0bserved frequency

ef = exprectedfrequency

$X^2$= Chi-Square

$$X^2 = \frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where:

of = Observed frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

ef = Expected frequency of the number of male and female respondents that agreed, disagreed and were undecided on the issue.

$X^2$ Value Calculated = 4.361

To find degree of freedom

Df = (R − 1) (C − 1)

(3 − 1) (2 − 1)

3 x 1

df = 3

Level of Significance = 5% = 0.05

At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815

Decision Rule: Reject $H_0$ if the $X^2$ Calculated value is greater than the table value and vice-versa. Since the calculated value (4.361) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when justice is entrenched in the organization.

## 8. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The result showed that the entire four null hypotheses were accepted while the alternate hypotheses were rejected. Four findings were revealed from the results which showed that.

i.     Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in procedure and process of getting reward.

ii.    Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in distribution of outcomes such as reward.

iii.   Employees will not intend to leave when there is fairness in personal treatment they receive from the authority figures.

iv.    Employees will not intend to leave when justice is entrenched in organization.

Chi − square statistical analysis showed that organizational justice has significant influence on employee turnover intention at 5% level of significance. Employee will not turnover when all issues concerning organizational justice is given proper attention and resolved.

## 9. CONCLUSION

The objective of this study is to examine the influence of organization justice on employee turnover intention in food and Beverage Industry in Nigeria. To execute this research goal, four objectives were raised from four research questions drawn, and four hypotheses were also formulated and tested. Based on the results from the test of the four hypotheses, it is concluded that organizational justice has significant influence on employee turnover.

And employees will turnover when all issues concerning organizational justice is not given proper attention and resolved.

## 10. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made based on the research findings:

(1)    There should be fairness in the procedure and process of getting reward in the organization.

(2)    There should be fairness in the distribution of the outcomes such as rewards which includes promotion and incentives.

(3)    There should be fairness in personal treatment employees receive from the authority figures in the organization.

(4)    Organizational justice should be entrenched in organizational culture, so that it will be strictly adhere to by every body in the organization.

## REFERENCES

Abubakar, R., A. Chanchan and K. Kura, 2014. Relationship between perceived organizational politics, organizations trust, human resource management practices and turnover intention among Nigerian nurses. Management Science Letters, 4(9): 2031 – 2048.Available at: https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2014.8.018.

Adeboye, T.A. and A.A. Adegoroye, 2012. Employee's perception of career progression and turnover intention among bank workers in Ife Central Local Government Area, Osun State. Research Journal in organizational Psychology & Educational Studies, 1: 253-360.

Ahmad, T. and A. Riaz, 2011. Factors affecting turn-over intentions of doctors in public sector medical colleges and hospitals. Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business, 1(10): 57-66.

Allen, D.G., L.M. Shore and R.W. Griffeth, 2003. The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. Journal of Management, 29(1): 99-118.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-2063(02)00222-2.

Ambrose, M.L., M. Schminke and D.M. Mayer, 2013. Trickle-down effects of supervisor perceptions of interactional justice: A moderated mediation approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 98(4): 678-689.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032080.

Byme, Z. and R. Cropanzano, 2001. The history of organizational justice; The founders speak. In R Cropanzona (Ed). Justice in the workplace: From Theory to practice. Mahwa NH: Lawrence Erlbanm.

Capelli, P., 2008. Talent on demand management, talent age of uncertainty. Boston Harvard Business Press.

Chen, G., R.E. Ployhart, H.C. Thomas, N. Anderson and P.D. Bliese, 2011. The power of momentum: A new model of dynamic relationships between job satisfaction change and turnover intentions. Academy of Management Journal, 54(1): 159-181.Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.59215089.

Colquit, J.A., 2001. On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3): 386 – 400.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386.

Cropanzano, R., Z.S. Byrne, D.R. Bobocel and D.E. Rupp, 2001. Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58(2): 164-209.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1791.

Cropanzano, R. and M.S. Mitchell, 2005. Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6): 874-900.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602.

Eisenberger, R., F. Stinglhamber, C. Vandenberghe, I.L. Sucharski and L. Rhoades, 2002. Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(3): 565-573.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.565.

Fang, T. and A. Verma, 2002. Union wage premium. Perspectives on Labour and Income, 3(9): 13-19.

Gould-Williams, J., 2007. HR practices, organizational climate and employee outcomes: Evaluating social exchange relationships in local government. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18(9): 1627-1647.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190701570700.

Gould-Williams, J. and F. Davies, 2005. Using social exchange theory to predict the effects of HRM practice on employee outcomes: An analysis of public sector workers. Public Management Review, 7(1): 1-24.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1471903042000339392.

Gustafson, C.M., 2002. Staff turnover: Retention. International Journal of Contemporary Hospital Management, 14: 106 − 110.

Hassan, S., 2010. Fairness treatment, job involvement and turnover intention of professional employees in government. The importance of organizational identification as mediator. Thesis Submitted to John Glem School of Public Ohio State University.

Häusser, J.A., A. Mojzisch, M. Niesel and S. Schulz-Hardt, 2010. Ten years on: A review of recent research on the job demand–control (-support) model and psychological well-being. Work & Stress, 24(1): 1-35.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/02678371003683747.

Hom, P.W. and W.R. Grifeth, 1991. Cultural constraints in management theory. Academy of Management Executive, 7: 81 − 94.

James, D. and B. Banes, 2005. An analysis of turnover among retail buyers. Journal of Business Research, 58(7): 874-882.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.10.009.

Kumar, S., 1976. A manual of sampling technique. London: Heinemann.

Nienaber, H. and V. Masibigiri, 2012. Exploring factors influencing voluntary turnover intent of generation X public servants: A South African case. Trade Journal, 12(1): 67-84.Available at: https://doi.org/10.4102/ac.v12i1.133.

Oluwafemi, O., 2013. Predictors of turnover intention among employees in Nigeria's oil industry. Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies, 4(2 (8)): 42-63.

Oluwafemi, O.J., 2010. Contextual dispositional factors, turnover intention and perceived job alternatives as predictors of organization citizen behaviour of employees of Nigerian's oil industry. University of Ibadan Unpublished Ph.D Thesis.

Prathamesh, M., 2012. Influence of interactional justice on the turnover behavioral decision in an organization. Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business, 5: 31-41.

Price, J.L., 2001. Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. International Journal of Manpower, 22(7): 600-624.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/eum0000000006233.

Price, L.L. and C.W. Mueller, 1986. Handbook of organizational measurement. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Robins, S. and T. Judge, 2009. Organizational behaviour. 13th Edn.: Person Education Inc Prentice − Hall Inc.

Roshidi, H., 2014. Factors influencing turnover intention among technical employees in information technology organization: A case of xyz (m) sdn. Bhd. International Journal of Arts and Commerce, 3(9): 120-137.

Saraih, U., Z. Aris, A. Zuraini, M.F. Sakdan and R. Ahmad, 2016. Factors affecting turnover intention among academician in the Malaysian Higher Educational Institution. Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, 6(1): 1-15.

Solomon, O., N.H. Hashim, Z.B. Mehdi and A.M. Ajagbe, 2012. Employee motivation and organizational performance in multinational companies: A study of Cadbury Nigeria Plc. IRACST-International Journal of Research in Management & Technology, 2(3): 303-312.

Sunday, E.I., M.M.O. Aniedi and G. Idante, 2015. Organizational justice and job performance of lecturers in Federal Universities in South-South Zone of Nigeria. American International Journal of Social Science, 4(1): 111-117.

Thomas, P.L. and S. Nagalungapa, 2012. Consequences of perceived organizational justice: An empirical study of white collar employees. Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce, 3: 54 – 63.

U.S Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2008. Job openings and labour turnover survey. Available from http/data b/s. gov/pdo/servalet/survey output servalet data tool – latest number series id = JT50000000 TSR.

Yamane, T., 1964. Statistics: An introductory analysis. New York: Haper and Row Publishers.