



Perceived Influence of Organizational Justice on Psychological Detachment among employees in Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Damilola A. Osekita

ABSTRACT

Article's History

Received: 2nd April, 2023
Revised: 2nd June, 2023
Accepted: 25th June, 2023

Authors' Affiliation

Department of Psychology and Behavioural Studies, Faculty of the Social Sciences, Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti; Nigeria.

Correspondance:

ayodele.osekita@eksu.edu.ng or
osekitad@yahoo.com.
+2347068439720

This study was carried out to investigate the mediating role of work centrality on the perceived influence of organizational justice on psychological detachment. A total number of five hundred and twenty (520) workers from 3 different sectors participated in the study. They are: Ministry of Finance, Ekiti-State Secretariat, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti-State Teaching Hospital, Ado-Ekiti and Nigerian Police Force Headquarter, Ado-Ekiti. Two Psychological instruments were used; they include Recovery Experience Scale, Organizational Justice Scale developed by Colquitt (2001). Five hypotheses were developed and tested using regression and independent t-test. The result reveals that there is a significant influence of organizational justice on psychological detachment, $[F(4, 514) = 13.636, P < .05]$. It also revealed that there is a significant influence of procedural justice on psychological detachment, $[t(518) = 1.397, P < .05]$. As well as interactional justice on psychological detachment $[t(518) = -.930, P < .05]$ but, there is no significant influence of distributive justice on psychological detachment. $[t(518) = 3.146, P > .05]$. The result also revealed a significant gender difference on organizational justice $[t(518) = 2.140, p < .01]$ but there is no significant gender difference on psychological detachment $[t(518) = 2.161, P < .05]$. The result was discussed in line with relevant literature and recommendations were subsequently made based on the findings. It was concluded that organizational justice significantly influence psychological detachment and also, each of the dimensions of organizational justice also significantly influence psychological detachment except for distributive justice which did not significantly influence psychological detachment. The way gender perceives organizational justice but psychological detachment is perceived in the same way.

Keywords: *organizational justice, police, psychological detachment, work centrality*

Introduction

Human Resources are considered as most powerful resources of an organization to make it prosperous, that is, human power is the most essential in an organization. All other resources like monetary resources, natural resources etc. are said to be dependent on talented and capable human resources for their optimal utilization. Every employee wants good working environment, in terms of fair procedures used to determine rewards, distribution of rewards, interaction with supervisors to make them more satisfied and committed to their work and organisation. When employees are treated fairly overall in an organisation, they feel the need for reciprocal response to the organisation in form of positive behaviours.

Al-Zu'bi, (2010) said an employee who have a sense of equality and feel that they are rewarded fairly for their genuine contributions to the organisation are satisfied with the organisation and tend to reciprocate the effort of the organisation by putting in their very best for the organisation. The reward may include multiple benefits other than financial gains. Employees with high job satisfaction tend to exert higher levels of performance, productivity, commitment and retention rates. Naturally, human beings love pleasure and always want to get involved in what will bring them pleasure. This is also applicable on job situations because when an individual's work is pleasurable, probably the individual will dedicate more of his time to that work but when it is otherwise, it may bring about dampening the interest of the individual in that kind of work because the work situation is not pleasurable. Losing interest in what someone is doing will not allow that individual to give in his/her best to the work and the organisation.

Psychological Detachment

In the traditional working arrangements of the past, most individuals not working at home had the opportunity to detach themselves from work during off-job time. They physically leave their working place and go home or to other places where they spend their evening hours or weekends. However, nowadays, being physically away from the working place does not necessarily imply leaving one's work behind in psychological terms. In modern work contexts, individuals have to focus on getting their work done, regardless of the location at which they complete their tasks. For example, while at home, individuals may have to accomplish additional job-related tasks such as reading reports or preparing material for the next working day. In addition, when not deliberately accomplishing job-related tasks, individuals may continue to think about their jobs, ruminate about job-related problems, or reflect about future opportunities. When staying psychologically attached to their jobs during evening hours, individuals are said not to detach from their work. Etzion, Eden, &Lapidot (1998) introduced the term sense of detachment describing it as "the individual's sense of being away from the work situation". Detachment implies not being occupied by work-related duties. For example, when detached from work, an individual will not receive job-related phone calls at home and will refrain from job-related activities. In addition, detachment involves disengaging oneself psychologically from work. When someone detach psychologically from work, one stops thinking of or ruminating about job-related problems or opportunities. Psychological detachment implies a distraction from job-related thoughts. For psychological detachment to occur, it is not sufficient for one to change location by leaving the working place; one must also stop thinking about work related issues.

According to Sonnentag& Bayer (2005) Psychological detachment from work refers to a state of mind during non-work time characterized by the absence of job-related activities and thoughts. It implies distancing oneself from the job not only in a physical, but also in a mental sense. Psychological detachment occurs when the individual is not occupied with work-related thoughts, tasks or emotions, but instead, disengages physically and psychologically from work. During the past decades, researchers (Sonnentag& Bayer 2005, De Lange, De Witte, &Notelaers, 2008) have increasingly considered psychological detachment from the positive perspective in an organisation. It is said that detachment from work will enhance relaxation which will bring about refreshing the employee for the tasks ahead or to be ready physically and psychologically for the next day's work.

However, this research work considered psychological detachment from a negative aspect, that is, negative conditions that warrant employees being detached from work. This detachment makes employee not to have anything to do with his/her work. It doesn't give the employee the refreshing thought or cleared mind to prepare for work the next day but it just about not willing to get involved in any work related issues because of the negative circumstances in the organisation. When employees perceive unfairness from their organisations, when promotions are not coming as at when due, when salaries are being delayed, when favouritism are shown to some employees within an organisations, when the procedure of the organisations is not been fair, when employees are not treated properly in an organisations, employees may lose interest in their job and once there is no interest in the job, they detach psychologically from the job. The moment the employee perceives that organisation is not keeping up with their agreement in terms of their contract, it may results in employees' detachment from work, not because of the stress of the job, not because of the challenges of the job or to refresh him/herself for the task ahead or for the work for the next day, but because there is a perceived unfair treatment from the organisation. The situation keeps the organisation on a slow pace to function effectively and efficiently in the environment. Government workers are going through a rough period in Nigeria because most States of the federation are struggling to pay salaries and other entitlement of the workers. We have states that owe up to 12 months' salary. In Ekiti State, the government owes couple of months' salary. The situation at hand has proven that organisations are not doing what they are supposed to do in terms of being fair to the employees and the employees tends to detach from their work psychologically even when they are on the job because the motivation organisational justice will give them is being tampered with and the situation is getting worse every day.

Organizational Justice

Organisational justice refers to the extent to which employees perceive outcomes, procedures and interpersonal relationship in an organisation to be fair. The concept of perception of fairness in an organisation is an imperative concept for employees because it affects their attitudes and behaviours which in turn lead to positive or negative employee satisfaction and performance. An unfair perception leads to dissatisfaction with outcomes or rewards. An employee exerts less effort on the job and ultimately part with the organisation when unfair treatment is perceived. (Mowday, 1987).

As organisational justice is a versatile concept, so it covers everything from system of payment to treatment by one's boss. Researchers of Organisational behaviour identified three types of organisational justice, which are distributive justice, procedural justice and interpersonal justice which are further divided into interactional and informational justice (Colquitt 2005, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005).

Before 1975, organisational justice was primarily concerned with distributive justice. Conventionally, Adam (1965) with his Equity Theory did the groundwork for most distributive justice research (Berneth, Feild, Giles, Cole, 2006). According to Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry (1980), Thibaut & Walker (1975) research in organisational justice goes further than equity theory. They stated that individuals not only define justice in terms of distributive justice of inputs and outcomes but they also view justice in terms of the procedures which determine those outcomes, categorized as procedural justice.

According to Cropanzano, Rupp, Mohler and Schminke (2001), individuals along with the economic importance of outcomes, also consider their socio-emotional value. The socio-emotional value focuses on the quality of the relationships among people, containing aspects of status and dignity. Bies & Moag (1986) came up with the concept interactional justice, which refers to the treatment that an employee receives in terms of explanations for decisions and the information with compassion and respect.

Innumerable literature in the organisational and industrial psychology has observed organisational justice as well as its related outcomes. The influence of organisational justice on job satisfaction is a widely studied topic because it is an employee's attitude towards the organisation (Kumar, Bakhshi, and Rani, 2009). In order to keep employees satisfied, committed, and loyal to the organisation, it needs to be fair in its system of distributive, procedural, interactional and informational justice. Decision makers must give special

attention to issues like allocating monetary resources, hiring employees in organisations, policy making and its implications in respect of justice as they affect other people in the organisation (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). When employees feel that they are treated fairly by the organisation in every aspect, they are inclined to show more positive attitude and behaviours like job satisfaction.

Procedural justice is the idea of fairness in the processes that resolve disputes and allocate resources. Justice is considered as a major concern in our daily life, both in home or work related issues especially when decisions are made regarding limited resources. It deals with the aspect of whether procedure to justice in an organisation is being followed adequately and the procedures are fair to the employees. Its concerns with the fairness and the transparency of the processes by which decisions are made, and may be contrasted with distributive justice (fairness in the distribution of rights or resources), and retributive justice (fairness in the punishment of wrongs). Hearing all parties before a decision is made is one step which would be considered appropriate to be taken in order that a process may then be characterized as procedurally fair. Some theories of procedural justice hold that fair procedure leads to equitable outcomes, even if the requirements of distributive or restorative justice are not met. It has been suggested that this is the outcome of the higher quality interpersonal interactions often found in the procedural justice process, which has shown to be stronger in affecting the perception of fairness during conflict resolution.

Distributive justice concerns the nature of a socially just allocation of goods in an organisation. An organisation in which incidental inequalities in outcome do not arise would be considered an organisation guided by the principles of distributive justice. The concept includes the available quantities of goods, the process by which goods are to be distributed, and the resulting allocation of the goods to the members of the organisation.

To determine whether distributive justice has taken place, individuals often turn to the distributive norms of their group. A norm is the standard of behaviour that is required, desired, or designated as normal within a particular group. If rewards and costs are allocated according to the designated distributive norms of the group, distributive justice has occurred. Distributive justice affects performance when efficiency and productivity are involved (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Improving perceptions of justice increases performance (Karriker & Williams, 2009). Organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) are employee actions in support of the organisation that are outside the scope of their job description. Such behaviours depend on the degree to which an organisation is perceived to inculcate distributive justice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Karriker & Williams, 2009). As organisational actions and decisions are perceived as more just, employees are more likely to engage in OCBs. Perceptions of distributive justice are also strongly related also to the withdrawal of employees from the organisation (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

Interpersonal justice, a subcomponent of organisational justice, has come to be seen as consisting of two specific types of interactional treatment (e.g. Greenberg, 1993). The first labelled interactional justice reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes. The second, labelled informational justice, focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion. Where more adequacy of explanation is prevalent, the perceived level of informational justice is higher. (Sam Fricchione 2006).

It is important that a high degree of interpersonal justice exists in a subordinate/supervisor relationship in order to reduce the likelihood of counterproductive work behaviour. If a subordinate perceives that interpersonal injustice exists, then the subordinate will hold feelings of resentment toward either the supervisor or institution and will therefore seek to “even the score.” A victim of interaction injustice will

have increased expressions of hostility toward the offender which can manifest in actions of counterproductive work behaviour and reduce the effectiveness of organisational communication.

Abuse directed toward a subordinate from a supervisor often stems from displaced aggression. In this case, the individual (supervisor) is unwilling to retaliate against the direct source of mistreatment and will therefore abuse a less threatening target such as a subordinate since the subordinate is incapable of retaliation. Thus, interpersonal injustice can essentially trickle-down from the top of an organisation to the bottom due to displaced aggression that exists in the top ranks of the hierarchy.

Hypotheses

1. There will be a significant influence of organizational justice on psychological detachment.
2. There will be a significant influence of procedural justice on psychological detachment.
3. There will be a significant influence of distributive justice on psychological detachment.
4. There will be a significant influence of interactional justice on psychological detachment.
5. There will be a significant gender difference in the perception of organizational justice and psychological detachment.

Method

Participants

A total number of 520 participants were purposively selected from 3 different sector of the civil service in Ekiti-State. Purposive sampling was used because they are most suited for this study. They are selected from the Ministry of Finance, Ekiti State secretariat Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State Teaching Hospital, Ado-Ekiti and Nigerian Police Force, Ado-Ekiti. Three different organisations with different settings were chosen for better insight. Ministry of Finance and Ekiti State teaching hospital were chosen because they are facing financial issue their organisation in terms of salary delay and deductions while Nigerian police were chosen because of the challenges of their job in their offices and on the field. A total number of 182 (93 males and 89 females) participated from the Ministry of Finance Ekiti-State Secretariat Ado-Ekiti, 175 (89 males and 86 females) from Ekiti-State Teaching Hospital, Ado-Ekiti and 163 (87 males and 76 females) from Police Headquarters, Iyin road, Ado-Ekiti. 51.73% of the participants were male while 48.27% of the participants were female (269 males and 251 females) ranging from the age of 23 years to 65 years. Research participant were approached individually and given questionnaire containing four sections. Section A contains the demographic information like sex, age, marital status e.t.c. Section B contains the Psychological detachment scale, and Section C Organisational justice scale.

Research Design:

Owing to the nature of present study, factorial design was adopted. The design made it possible to test for the individual and interaction influence of the identified independent variables on the dependent variable.

Measures

Psychological detachment was measured with Recovery Experience Questionnaire Scale developed by Sonnentag and Fritz's. The REQ (Sonnentag& Fritz, 2007) includes four subscales, namely detachment from work, relaxation, mastery, and control. Each of the instrument was rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree, 5 = totally agree). Sample items includes; "I forgot about work during my off-job time". The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for psychological detachment from work subscale varied from .88 to .95, for relaxation from .90 to .95, for mastery from .88 to .91, and for control from .87 to .93. and the global score range from .88 to .93.

Organisational justice was measured with Organisational Justice Scale developed by Colquitt (2001). The scale consists of four dimensions, namely procedural justice, distributive justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice. This is based on Colquitt's four-dimensional measure that includes:

Distributive Justice (four items), Procedural Justice (seven items), Interactional Justice (informational and interpersonal justice) (nine items), and Informational Justice (five items). The subscales obtained reliability indices for Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, and Informational Justice, respectively in the field samples of these study: .61, .71, .29, .68 (Colquitt, 2001). All outcome measures was measured with 5-point Likert scales with anchors of 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree

Procedure

When the data was to be collected, the researcher seeks permission from the appropriate authority which was granted. The researcher distributed the questionnaires across the participants from each of the organisation. Access was granted to meet with the workers in their different offices and the researcher personally administered the questionnaire to them and encouraged them to complete the questionnaire. The workers were encouraged to respond as honest as possible and they were assured on utmost confidentiality of their responses. A total of 600 copies of questionnaire were administered, only five hundred and thirty seven were recovered and five hundred and twenty were found usable and data collection took approximately 4 months.

Statistical Analysis

Regression was used to analyse hypothesis 1 because the independent variable (Organisational Justice) has four subscales. Hypotheses 2, 3, 4 and 5 were analysed using independent t-test to be sure of it detailed influence on dependent variable (Psychological Detachment) and the dependent variable is on interval scale of measurement.

Result

Hypothesis one which states that there will be a significant influence of organisational justice on psychological detachment was tested using regression. The result is presented in the table below.

Table 1. Regression summary table showing the influence of organisational justice on psychological detachment

Model	B	T	R	R ²	F	P
Distributive Justice	.025	.146	310 ^a	.096	13.636	<.01
Procedural Justice	.248	2.846				
Informational Justice	-.085	-.631				
Interactional Justice	.691	5.601				

Table 1 shows that there is a significant influence of organisational justice on psychological detachment. (F (4, 514) = 13.636 P<.05)]. Hypothesis supported.

Hypothesis two which states that there will be a significant influence of procedural justice on psychological detachment was tested with independent t-test. The result is presented in the table below.

Table 2: Independent t- test summary table showing the influence of procedural justice on psychological detachment

	procedural justice	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	t	P

Psychological detachment	Low	209	48.69	12.302	.853	518	1.397	<.05
	High	311	50.02	9.368	.531			

Table 2 reveals that there is a significant influence of procedural justice on psychological detachment. ($t(518) = 1.397 P < .05$). Using mean score, the result reveals that individual high in experiencing procedural justice ($N = 311$, Mean = 50.02, SD = 9.368) tends to experience psychological detachment than those with low procedural justice ($N = 209$, Mean = 48.69, SD = 12.302).

Hypothesis three which states that there will be a significant influence of distributive justice on psychological detachment was tested using independent t-test.

Table 3: Independent t- test summary table showing the influence of distributive justice on psychological detachment

	Distributive justice	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t	P
Psychological detachment	Low	245	51.12	10.600	.680	518	3.146	>.05
	High	275	47.95	10.440	.630			

Table 3 reveals that there is no significant influence of distributive justice on psychological detachment ($t(518) = 3.146, P > .05$). Nonetheless, comparison of the mean score reveals that individuals which are low in the experience of distributive justice ($N = 245$, Mean = 51.12, SD = 10.600) tends to be little more detached psychologically than those with high distributive justice ($N = 275$, Mean = 47.95 SD = 10.440). Hypothesis four which states that there will be a significant influence of interactional justice on psychological detachment was tested using independent t-test.

Table 4: Independent t- test summary table showing the influence of interactional justice on psychological detachment

	Interactional justice	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	t	P
Psychological detachment	Low	275	49.90	10.726	.647	518	.930	<.05
	High	245	49.03	10.548	.674			

Table 4 reveals that there is a significant influence of interactional justice on psychological detachment. ($t(518) = -.930 P < .05$). Hypothesis confirmed. It can also be pressed further from the comparison of mean scores that individuals with high interactional justice ($N = 245$, Mean = 49.03, SD = 10.548) tends to be more detached psychologically than those with low interactional justice ($N = 275$, Mean = 49.90, SD = 10.726).

Hypothesis five which states that there will be a significant gender difference in the perception of organisational justice, psychological detachment and work centrality was tested using independent t-test

Table 5: Independent t-test summary table showing the differences of Sex in the Perception of Organisational justice and Psychological Detachment

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t	P
Psychological detachment	Male	269	48.86	10.150	.619	518	-1.415	>.05
	Female	251	50.18	11.123	.702			
Organisational justice	Male	269	70.0520	12.15621	.74118	518	2.140	<.01
	Female	251	64.9243	12.47871	.78765			

Table 5 shows that there is a significant gender difference in the perception of organisational justice ($t(518) = 2.140, p < .01$). Male are higher in the perception of organisational justice than their female counterpart from their mean score (Male = 70.0520, Female = 64.9243). Also, the table reveals that there is no significant difference in perception of psychological detachment by both genders. ($t(518) = -1.415, P > .05$).

Discussion

As pointed out before, this study examined the mediating role of work centrality on the perceived influence of organizational justice and psychological detachment among employees in Ekiti State, Nigeria. The study postulated five hypotheses in the perceived influence of organizational justice and psychological detachment among employees in Ekiti State, Nigeria. The first hypothesis stated that there will be a significant influence of organisational justice on psychological detachment and the result reveals that there is a significant influence of organisational justice on psychological detachment. The result shows that the employee detached from work because they felt that the organisational justice of the organisation has not been fulfilling its obligations concerning the employees. It shows that the employee felt that the organisation has not been fair in terms of organisational justice in the organisation and this allows the employee to detach from work because the situation within the organisation is not encouraging enough for the employee to be committed and not to detach from their work. It means that if employee finds the organisation fair in terms of the organisational justice, they will not detach from their work.

An organisational justice refers to the extent of which employees perceive outcomes, procedures and interactions of an organisation to be fair. This hypothesis was supported with the work of RabiaAslam, SadafShumaila, ShamaSadaqat, Hira Bilal, MehwishIntizar (2010) that shows a positive correlation between organisational justice and job satisfaction. In their study they found out that once the organisation is being fair in terms of distributive, procedure, interaction, the employee exhibit job satisfaction which leads to commitment and giving in their best to the organisation. Also, Olowodunoye (2015) tested if organisational justice had a significant positive relationship with knowledge sharing behaviour and it was confirmed from the result obtained from the study that organisational justice had a significant positive relationship with knowledge which implies that the higher the level of perception of organisational justice, the higher the commitment to knowledge sharing behaviour. It shows that the more the employee perceived their organisation of being fair to them, the more they will not detach from their work, stay committed and be ready to give their best to the organisation.

The second hypothesis stated that there will be a significant influence of procedural justice on psychological detachment and the result shows that there is a significant influence of procedural justice on psychological detachment. The result shows that the employee detached from their work because they felt that the organisation has not fulfilled their part of the agreement concerning procedural justice. This brings about the fact that if there is a proper procedure in an organisation and the procedure is being followed in the way of remuneration within an organisation, workers having their own say in making decision in the

organisation and also been involved in the process of policy making in the organisation, workers will always work to the best of their ability so as to give the organisation the best result from their workforce and to make the organisation produce their goods and services effectively and efficiently. It allows workers to work for the organisation even when they are not on the job or during working hours. They will make sure the work of the day is done before they can rest even at the expense of doing the work after work hour. There will be no lacklustre behaviour on the job provided the procedure agreed upon is duly followed and taken to cognisance.

Procedural justice has shown significant linkages to organisational outcomes such as satisfaction, organisational commitment. Procedural justice enhances the commitment of employee within an organisation and also their effectiveness. Perceptions of monitoring procedures have a significant effect on organisational commitment (Douglas Flint, Lynn M. Haley and Jeffrey J. McNally, 2013). Also, in their work of diagnostic measure for procedural justice further support this hypothesis that perception of procedural justice enhances the commitment of an employee in an organisation. Also, a study by (ArtiBakhshi, Kuldeep Kumar, Ekta Rani, 2009) support this hypothesis that procedural justice influence psychological detachment. Procedural justice positively correlates with Organisation commitment. By this affirmation, it is said that procedural justice influences psychological detachment in the sense that the perception of procedural justice gives employees the right attitude to work even as off time duty and also during vacation so as to get the best for the organisation and to get the right elevation and effectiveness for the organisations as well.

The third hypothesis stated that there will be a significant influence of distributive justice on psychological detachment and the result of this study go against the hypothesis. Perceptions of an unfair distribution of work rewards relative to work inputs create tension within an individual and the individual is motivated to resolve the tension (Adams, 1963). This simply shows that civil servant in Ekiti did not detach from work because they felt that distributive justice in the organisation is being upheld. This talks about the fact that with the perception of distributive justice in their organisation, this shows that distributive justice is not the cause of the workers been detached from work. There is this perception that the organisation is been fair to them in terms of distributing the rewards according to their input to the organisation. It is supported by the work of (Kamran Iqbal , 2014) which state that distributive justice do not have significant impact on job satisfaction. In respect to this, it shows that distributive justice does not influence psychological detachment of Ekiti-state employees. Based on the result of this study, perception of a fair distribution of work is adequate and upheld. It encourages them to work effectively because distributive justice within the organisation is being followed as agreed upon by the organisation and the employees.

The fourth hypothesis stated that there will be a significant influence of interactional justice on psychological detachment and from the result, there is a significant influence of interactional justice on psychological detachment. This shows that the way the organisation respects the dignity and politely addressed the employees goes a long way in which the employee will not detach from work. This makes the employee to detach from because the perception of interactional justice is being truncated. This was supported with the work of MarziehHeidari, Saeed Rajaeepoor, Sayyed Mohammad Reza Davoodi and Nima Bozorgzadeh (2012) that interactional justice has a significant relationship with organisational citizenship behaviour. This shows that organisations has to take the perception of interactional justice as serious as possible so as to allow their employee have an idea of how information is been passed and manage in the organisation and the relationship between the superior and the subordinate within the organisation should be as cordial and respectful as possible so as not to let the employee detach from their work due to such negative factors.

The fifth hypothesis stated that there will be a significant gender difference in perception of Organisational justice and psychological detachment. From the result of the study, there is a significant gender difference in the perception of organisational justice and work centrality while there is no significant

gender difference in the perception of psychological detachment. This result made us to understand that the way male perceive organisational justice is different from the way female perceived, this isn't supported with other some studies that has been carried out on the perception of organisational justice by gender. Al-Zu'bi(2010) found out there is no significant relationship between gender and of respondents and their perceptions of organisational justice. Also, (Alsalem&Alhaiani, 2007) get to know from their study that there is no significant sex perception on organisational justice.

Conclusion

From the result of this study, it can be concluded that for employees to be committed to their work and not to detach from their work in the organisation, organisational justice must prevail. Through this fact, employee will be able to commit themselves to the organisation by given their best and not to detach from their work psychologically.

Procedural justice must be intact in the organisation. By this, the workers will put in their best on the job even when they are not on the job or during the working hours. Basically, procedural justice stands a motivating factor in an organisation in other not to allow employees to be detached from their work. From the result of this study, it shows that workers detached from work due to the fact that they felt the procedure been used in the organisation is been truncated.

Also, it is known that the perception of distributive justice their organisation does not bring about workers been detached from work because the fact remains that the workers know that distributive justice is intact in the organisation and this made them not detach from work. Its shows that perception of fair distribution of work rewards relative to work inputs does significantly make the employee not to detach from their work.

In this study also, it's evident also that through the fact in this study that the organisation failed the face of interactional justice and in this respect, the employees are not giving in their best to their work in the organisation. This shows that respect is reciprocal within an organisation and the way an organisation is been set up in term of hierarchy go a long way in the way the employee will have to put in their best for the organisation. The relationship between the superior and the subordinate, how information is been passed, used and managed in the organisational and even the convenience in the organisation is very important. A conducive environment is also important.

In the perception of organisational justice not being fair to the employee, work centrality mediates the influence of organisational justice on psychological detachment. It shows that even in the face of the organisation not be fair in terms of justice, employee are committed to their work and are using even their leisure time to work for their different organisation.

Finally, its shows that in those organisations, both male and female has different perception about organisational justice but perceived psychological detachment the same way. This shows that the male take cognisance of organisational justice more than the females. Females should be encouraged not to take back sit and be contented with anything that comes there way. They should be able to stand up for their right.

References

- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequality in Social Exchange in *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, L. Berkowitz (ed.), Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Alsalem, M., and Alhaiani, A. (2007). Relationship between Organisational Justice and Employees Performance. *Aledari, March*, (108), 97-110.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109
- ArtiBakhshi, Kuldeep Kumar, Ekta Rani, (2009). Organisational justice as prediction of job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *International journal of business administration*. Vol 4. No. 9

- Bernerth, J.B., Feild, H.S., Giles, W. F., Cole, M.S., (2006). Perceived Fairness in Employee Selection: The Role of Applicant Personality, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(4), 545-563.
- Bies, R.S., Moag, J.S. (1986), "Interactional justice: communication criteria of fairness", in", in Lewicki, R.J., Sheppard, B.H., Brazerman, M.H. (Eds), *Research on Negotiations in Organisations*, JAI Press, Greenwich, pp.43-55.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organisations: A meta-analysis. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278–321.
- Colquitt J.A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. (2005). What is organisational justice? An historical analysis. In Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J.A. (2005). *Handbook of organisational justice pp3-57*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organisational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386–400.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. (2001). Three roads to organizational justice. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management*. 20, 1-113. New York: JAI Press
- Douglas Flint, Lynn M. Haley and Jeffrey J. McNally. (2013). A diagnostic measure for procedural justice. *American Journal of Business and Management* Vol. 2, No. 1, 2013, 1-12 DOI: 10.11634/216796061302247
- Etzion, D., Eden, D., & Lapidot, Y. (1998). Relief from job stressors and burnout: Reserve service as a respite. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 577–585. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.4.577
- Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: interpersonal and informational classes of organisational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: approaching fairness in human resource management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Pp. 79-103.
- Kamran Iqbal, (2014). Determinants of Organisational Justice and its impact on Job Satisfaction. A Pakistan Base Survey.
- Karriker, J.H.; Williams M.L. (2009). "Organisational Justice and Organisational Citizenship Behavior: A Mediated Multifoci Model". *Journal of Management* 35, 112
- Kuldeep Kumar, Arti Bakhshi, Ekta Rani (2009). Organizational Justice Perceptions as Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment. *International journal of business and management*. Vol. 4
- Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction* (pp. 167-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lorence, J. (1987). A test of "gender" and "Job" models of sex differences in Job involvement. *Social Forces*, 66, 121-142.
- Marzieh Heidari, Saeed Rajaeepoor, Sayyed Mohammad Reza Davoodi and Nima Bozorgzadeh (2012). Investigating the Relationship Between Perceptions of Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Teachers of Abadeh. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 18 (1): 113-122, 2012 ISSN 1818-4952 © IDOSI Publications, 2012 DOI: 10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.18.01.197.
- Mowday, R., T. (1987). Equity theory predictions of behaviour in organisations. In R. M. Steers & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and work behaviour* (pp. 89-110). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oguegbe T. M., Okeke M., Akune C., Ogochukwu O. C. (2014). Role of Self-Efficacy and Sex on Work Centrality among Workers. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 4, No. 5(1)*;

- Olowodunoye S. A. (2015) Organizational Justice and Educational Status as Correlates of Knowledge Sharing Behaviour. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences* 2015, 5(3): 128-133 DOI: 10.5923/j.ijpbs.20150503.04
- Sam Fricchione (2006). Influence of interactional justice on the turnover behavioural decision in organisation. *Journal of behavioural studies in business*.1-11.
- Sonnentag, S., & Bayer, U. V. (2005) A new look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518–528. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.518.
- Sonnentag & Fritz, (2007). The recovery experience questionnaire: development and validation of measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 204-221.
- Thibault, J.W., Walker, W.L. (1975), *Procedural Justice. A Psychological Analysis*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Hillsdale.