

PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE, ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT AND GROUP EFFICACY ON JOB INVOLVEMENT AMONG NON-TEACHING STAFF IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN OGUN STATE NIGERIA.

OSITOYE WALE O.

Department of Guidance and Counseling Psychology College of Specialized and Professional Education
Tai Solarin University of Education,
Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria.

&

ADESOYE E. O.

Department of Educational Foundations
& Counseling, Faculty of Education,
Olabisi Onabanjo University,
Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria.

Abstract

It is widely acknowledged that job involvement is a construct that has great potential to enhance employee performance. Despite efforts by various organisations to improve the level of job involvement of their employees in order to achieve organisational goal, many organisations are still battling with poor job involvement of their employees and this has become a major concern to researchers over the years and as the decline continues so does the search for solutions. In order to address the decline in the level of job involvement of non teaching staff in both public and private universities in Nigeria, this paper examines the predictive power of perceived organizational justice, organizational support and group efficacy on the criterion measure (job involvement). Results suggest that there was significant prediction of employee job involvement, which shows that Organizational Justice, Group efficacy and organizational Support are good predictors of job involvement but organizational justice is a more potent contributor to employee job involvement, followed by group Efficacy and

organizational support. Recommendation from these findings and suggestions for future research are addressed.

Keywords: *Perceived Organisational Justice, Organisational Support, Group Efficacy, Job Involvement, Non-Teaching.*

Introduction

Human behaviour plays a significant role in maximizing organizational effectiveness, regardless of technological development. In particular, any effort to maximize organizational effectiveness requires a higher degree of job involvement among members of an organization (Elankumaran, 2004). Job involvement is an important motivational variable for any organization. In the modern economic in particular, job involvement has contributed to the overall availability of human resources (Gore, 2001). For highly involved employees, their jobs seem inexorably connected to their diverse identities, interests, and life goals, as well as the satisfaction that they can derive from performing their duties effectively. More involved persons also feel more competent and successful at work (Elankumaran, 2004).

Despite the efforts by various organisations to improve the level of job involvement of their employees in order to achieve organisational goal, many organisations are still battling with poor job involvement of their employees. There had been a decline in the level of job involvement of the non teaching staff of Nigerian universities (Adesoye, 2012) and this has become a major concern to researchers over the years and as the decline continues so does the search for solutions.

In Nigeria, the university system faces a lot of problems that may not allow the system to make the expected contribution to social, political and economic development of the nation (Adesoye 2012). Among the numerous problems confronting university in Nigeria, is the perceived poor job involvement of some staff members, especially the non - teaching staff. In recent years, stakeholders in the education industry complained about the job involvement of non - teaching staff in the Nigerian universities including Ogun State. It has often been expressed by the public that the non - teaching staff are not dedicated and committed to the job. It appears the non-teaching staff who are trained and expected to produce a host of cherished societal virtues such as honesty, humility, fairness, integrity, punctuality, dedication and patriotism are not dedicated and committed to their job (Idowu, 2012)

There are instances where some non - teaching staff place too much emphasis on crossing over to academic line since they feel they are not equally remunerated (Idowu 2012). Also, there are observed cases of students, even external clientele who tell stories of non-teaching staff is challant attitude towards

their job. All these perceived problems seem to have negative effect on the quality of graduates produced for the labour market. In apparent reaction, the former Vice-Chancellor of the Federal University of Technology Akure, Professor Albert Ilemobade observed in the *Punch* newspaper of 30th April, 2004, page 18 that there were in the system, a number of parasites that should not find a place in an academic environment, yet university environments are stocked with them.

The various factors responsible for the poor non – teaching staff job involvement appear to be both internal and external to the university. Internal factors include strikes, lack of employees' motivation and weak accountability for educational performance, poor work environment and excess workload (Newton & Keenan 2003) while the external factors comprise, staff shortage, corruption and inadequate funding of the system by government. Afe (1995) in Adesoye (2012) pointed out that administrative task is done through conscious and deliberate effort. For non - teaching staff to carry out this conscious and deliberate effort, he needs a conducive environment devoid of strike, inadequate motivation, weak accountability for educational programmes, inadequate personnel, corruption, inconsistent funding by the government among others.

According to Newton & Keenan (2003), job involvement and organizational commitment are related, but distinct types of work attitudes because of their different referents. For employees with a high level of job involvement, the job is important to one's self-image (Kanungo, 2002). These individuals identify with and care about their jobs. Job involvement in this regard involves internalization of the core values about the goodness of the work in the worth of the individual (Sheldon, 2001). Employees who exhibit high levels of job involvement consider their workplace duties to be very important part of their lives and whether or not they feel well about themselves is to a large extent dependent on how they perform on their respective jobs.

For example, the job itself can help an individual meet his/her intrinsic growth needs (Kanungo, 2002), while the organization can help an individual meet his/her social and other extrinsic reward needs (Angle & Perry, 2003; Sheldon, 2001). Also, based on past empirical research, it seems that job involvement and organizational commitment complement one another.

Job involvement as an attitude is an important variable that helps in maximizing organizational effectiveness. The higher the degree of job involvement, the greater the organization's effectiveness. Improving employee behaviours are major aspects of a manager's job. Managers often try to influence work-related attitudes in order to create behavioral changes. Also Job Involvement is the extent to which an individual is personally involved with his or her work role (Reeve & Smith, 2001).

Job involvement is generally described as an attachment to one's job that exceeds normal levels of commitment. The employee can become so involved

with his job that it affects performance in other life role areas. “The degree to which an employee is engaged in and enthusiastic about performing their work is called Job Involvement” (Lodahl & Kejner 2005). Organizations need to know how to achieve the highest degrees of JI or improve these levels. Although all organizations aspire to encourage a high degree of JI, this effort is extremely difficult, largely because of the inherent differences in the degrees of JI among employees. Business managers are typically well aware that efforts to promote job involvement among staff tend to pay off substantially since employees will be more likely to assist in furthering their organizational objectives. Job involvement is a degree to which an employee identifies with his job, actively participate in it, and consider his job performance important to his self-worth.

Ajay, Gagan, and Swati (2012) have defined it as “the merging of a person’s ego identity with his or her job.” Organizational effectiveness scholar, Lawler and Hall, (2007) and their colleagues identified four interlocking principles for building a high-involvement work system that help to ensure that the system will be effective and that the various practices will work together to have a positive impact on employee engagement. These principles can be summed up as providing employees with power, information, knowledge and rewards. High-involvement work practices are positively related to corporate financial performance.

The findings of Blau and Ryan (1997) revealed that job involvement is positively related to work effort and performance. This implies that individuals with high levels of job involvement should be the most motivated to go to work and to go on time. On the other hand, individuals with low levels of job involvement should be the least motivated. Both highly motivated and non-motivated employees may miss work or come late for excusable reasons (e.g., illness, religious holiday, vacation time, and transportation problems). However, highly motivated employees will be more involved in the organisations business. Also such an individual feel more competent and successful at work, believe that their personal and organizational goals are compatible, and tend to attribute positive work outcomes to their internal and personally controllable factors.

Individuals with higher levels of job involvement are likely to exhibit less unexcused lateness and unexcused absence than individuals with lower levels of job involvement (Blau, 2006; Lawler & Hall, 2007).

Furthermore, organizations need to know how to achieve the highest degrees of job involvement or improve these levels. Although all organizations may likely aspire to encourage a high degree of job involvement (JI), this effort is extremely difficult, largely because of the inherent differences in the degrees of JI among employees. These differences may be due to variations in personality, a key individual difference variable, though enriching individual dimensions might help solve behavioral problems and thereby contribute to organizational

effectiveness (Elankumaran, 2004). From research findings, it is clear that high job involvement brings in additional commitment and motivation to work and subsequently enhances employees' and ultimately organizational performance. The concern of researchers should then be looking for human activator variables that can foster employees' job involvement. Such variables put together in this study are perceived organisational justice, organisational support and group efficacy.

The term 'organisational justice' refers to the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions and outcomes to be fair in nature (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Organizational justice can be addressed most simply by asking the question of any workplace relationship or exchange: Was it fair? Generally speaking, the question of fairness can be applied to any work situation and is evaluated by the individual and the organization. Often, this question is asked by employees when comparing outcomes, such as pay, and is also asked when comparing the process by which a pay raise was or was not given (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Moorman (1991) expanded the concept of "was it fair" to include the ways in which these assertions influence a variety of other work related variables, such as job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviours.

Employees assess the process (input) by which the resulting outcomes were received, and at the second level, they assess the outcomes (output) provided. From an organizational perspective, supervisors evaluate the process by which rewards were given to employees via a bilateral connection. If this connection between manager and employee is balanced and remains equitable, then mutual respect, reciprocal trust, and a sense of obligation between the two parties will occur (Roch & Shanock, 2006). These levels of measurement are subsumed under the heading of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001).

According to equity theory (Adams, 1965), employees make comparisons about whether outcomes (i.e., output) offered in an organization (e.g., pay, promotions) are fairly distributed based on the amount of effort put forth (i.e., input) (Blakely, Andrews, & Moorman, 2005). Individuals who view themselves as under-rewarded will often experience some level of distress, which can result in decreased workplace attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, job involvement) (Ingram, Lee & Lucas, 2001). In an effort to identify individual preferences for different input-output combinations, Huseman, Hatfield & Miles, (1987) proposed the construct of equity sensitivity, based on relative equity preferences (i.e., benevolents, sensitives, and entitlements). Organizational justice also extends equity theory by turning attention to employees' views of whether they are fairly treated by the organization (Greenberg, 1987).

Organisational support as the second independent variable introduced in this research is one of the most important organizational concepts that keep

employees in the organisation, (Rhodes and Eisenberger, 2002). Research on perceived organizational support shows that as the organization concerned about the commitment of employees to them, so also are employees concerned with the commitment of organization to them. Employees need to be highly valued, as the organization is the main source of their tangible benefits, such as medical benefits, salary, social benefits, admiration and caring. Hutchison, Sowa, Eisenberger, and Huntington [2006] indicated that employees' perceptions of organizational support are related to their beliefs regarding the extent to which organizations value their contributions and care about their fringes, thus increasing employee affective attachment to the organization and the expectation that greater effort to meet organizational goals will be rewarded.

Hutchison et al. (2006) argued that employees become affectively committed to their organizations because of perceptions that their organizations are committed to them (perceived organisational support). Several empirical studies have found a strong relationship between perceived organisational support (POS) and organisational commitment [Eisenberger et al 1990; Cherniss, 1991, Shih & Chiang, 2003; Wayne, 1993]. Furthermore, organizational climate that supports individuals in their careers, the cause of POS, has been suggested to be an important factor in managing employees [Cherniss, 1991], since organizations with more supportive organizational climates enhance employee perceptions of organizational support and increase individual opportunities for career achievement compared to organizations without a supportive organizational climate.

Employees need to be valued and are more concerned with the commitment of the organization to them. Being valued by the organization yields such benefits like pay, promotion, respect, other forms of aids, and access to information by which they can carry out their jobs better. Reciprocity norm applied by both employee and employer in their relationship leads them with beneficial results. When people are treated well, the reciprocity norm obligates encouraging fulfilling action in return (Hutchison et al, 2006). Perceived organizational support is directly linked with three categories of favorable treatment received by employees, such as, organizational rewards and favorable job conditions, fairness and supervisor support, in return favorable outcomes are achieved such as job satisfaction and job involvement. All these relations support organizational support theory (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

The last variable of consideration in this study is group efficacy. Group efficacy is a group's belief in its ability to perform effectively (Lindsley, Brass, & Thomas, 1995). Researchers have established that group efficacy is a meaningful and measurable group attribute. Levels of group efficacy vary even among groups that appear to have equal skills, abilities, and resources (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993; Earley, 1993; Guzzo, Yost, Campbell, & Shea, 1993). For example,

two groups of employees who have equal training and supplies may hold very different beliefs about their ability to provide quality service to the same group of customers. These beliefs may differ because the groups differ in the amount of information they have about their task, because they have different processes for sharing this information and communicating, or because they have different levels of commitment and identification among group members. Thus, groups that outwardly look similar in many respects may form different beliefs about their ability owing to differences in group processes. Group efficacy has the potential to affect a group's mission and commitment, the manner in which group members work together, and the group's resilience in the face of difficulties (Bandura, 1997).

While working on tasks that require high levels of interaction among team members, individual perceptions of self-efficacy may not be sufficient to explain group performance because these perceptions do not reflect members' judgments of team processes that are crucial for team performance (Shamir, 1990; Weldon & Weingart, 1993). The meaning of efficacy necessarily changes when the focus shifts from individual competence to group competence. Therefore, group-efficacy has been suggested as a meaningful parallel on the group level to the concept of self-efficacy on the individual level. This change occurs in two steps (Chan, 1998); first, individuals shift their reference from the individual to the group level when they evaluate team efficacy. Second, the agreement among all team members elevates the construct itself to the group level. Thus, collective-efficacy reflects the shared beliefs of the group members in their group's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to produce given levels of attainments on a specific task (Gibson, 2003).

Group-efficacy influences what people choose to do as a group, how much effort they put into the group's objectives and their persistence when group efforts fail to produce results (Bandura, 1997). However, in view of the above discussion the present study seek to investigate perceived organisational justice, organisational support and group efficacy on job involvement among non-teaching staff in public and private universities in Ogun State Nigeria.

Hypotheses:

In the pursuance of bringing the topic under study into proper perspectives, the following hypotheses were formulated for testing

1. There is no significant combined contribution of Perceived organisational justice, organisational support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee's job involvement of non teaching staff of public and private universities in Ogun State Nigeria.
2. There is no significant relative contribution of Perceived organisational justice, organisational support and group efficacy in the prediction of

employee's job involvement of non teaching staff of public and private universities in Ogun State Nigeria.

3. There is no significant relationship among Perceived organisational justice, organisational support, group efficacy and job involvement among participants

Method

Design and Participants

This study adopted the descriptive research design of the ex- post facto type. This is because the researcher will not manipulate any of the variables. For the purpose of this study disproportional sampling technique was used in selecting the respondents from six public and private universities in Ogun State. It's pertinent to know that there are three public and nine private universities in Ogun State which are: Olabisi Onabanjo University Ago-Iwoye, Tai Solarin University of Education Ijagun Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Hallmark University, Adetokunbo University, Sagamu, Babcock University, Ilisan Remo, Bells University of Technology, Ota, Covenant University, Ota, Crawford University, Igbesa, Crescent University, Abeokuta, McPherson University, Seriki-Sotayo and Mountain Top University, Lagos-Ibadan Expressway, Nigeria. Three public and three private universities were randomly selected for this study namely: Olabisi Onabanjo University Ago-Iwoye, Tai Solarin University of Education, Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Babcock University, Covenant University and Macpherson University. Six hundred (600) respondents were randomly selected from ten departments of the Universities as follows: bursary, maintenance, student affairs, registry, library, academic departments, sport, security, human resources, and medical centre. The sample was based on one hundred (100) respondents from each University which comprises both senior and junior staff, in each of the department, ten (10) respondent were selected, five (5) senior staff and five (5) junior staff making a total 600 respondent in all

Instrument

Four standardized instrument were used in collecting data for this study. They are: **Job Involvement questionnaire:** job involvement scale developed by Karacaoglu (2005), was adopted for the purpose of the study, Each item was measured on a five-point scale where a value of 1 corresponded to "Strongly Disagree" and a value of 5 corresponded to "Strongly Agree". The scores obtained on each of the 23 items were averaged to produce a single score for job involvement. It is a reliable and useful measure of job involvement and as a result this scale was utilized to measure the construct of job involvement in the present study. The value of coefficient alpha for this sample was 0.83.

Organizational justice: Two questionnaires developed by Price & Mueller (1986) and Niehouf & Mormen (1993) were used to measure 2 dimensions of organizational justice which are: Distributive justice and Procedural justice. Distributive justice is a five-item scale which measures the degree to which rewards received by employees are perceived to be related to performance inputs. Each item asks for the degree to which the respondent believes that he or she is fairly rewarded on the basis of some comparison with responsibilities, education and training, effort, stresses and strains of job, and performance. The scale reported Chronbach alpha reliability of 0.90, and the scale has shown discriminant validity in relation to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Moorman, 1991). While procedural justice was measured using 15 items developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), because the scale consists of two factors: systematic and informational justice that are consistent with a taxonomy of procedural justice. Among the 15 items, six (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) measure the degree to which job decisions include mechanisms that ensure the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice, and an appeals process, while nine items (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15) measure the degree to which employees feel their needs are considered. The scale reported reliabilities co efficient of .90.

Perceived organisation support questionnaire: Perceived organisation support questionnaire developed by Eisenberger et al. (1997) was adopted for this study. The questions were worded to tap the extent to which respondents believed their organisation valued their contribution, considered their goals and interests, made help available to solve personal problems, and cared about the employees' well-being. The reliability coefficient (Chronbach alpha) for this scale was 0.86.

Collective Efficacy Beliefs Scale:

The collective efficacy belief scale (CEBS) developed by Riggs and Knight's (1994) was adapted for this study. The CEBS scale consists of 7 items which measure the success of a group in performing a task. The scale was measured using a 5-point Likert scale; however, the questions are changed to have a 7-point Likert scale, since a 7-point Likert scale captures responses more accurately than a 5-point Likert scale (Groves et al., 2009). Also the original term 'my department' is modified to 'my group' to reveal the context accurately where they were having group work. The original 7 items showed good internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha = .88

Results

The interpretation of the results are arranged and presented in the order of the hypotheses formulated and a summary of the major findings of the study is presented.

Demographic Data

Table: 1 Distribution of Respondents by sex

Sex	Frequency	%
Male	308	52.5
Female	279	47.5
Total	587	100.0

Source: Author's field survey, 2017

Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents by sex. According to the result of the analysis. 308 (52.5%) of the respondents were male while 279 (47.5%) were female. This shows that a majority of the respondents were male.

Table: 2 Distribution of respondents by years of working experience

Years of working experience	Frequency	%
0-5 years	34	5.8
6-10 years	60	10.2
11-15 years	95	16.2
16-20 years	203	34.6
21-25 years	152	25.9
Above 25 years	43	7.3
Total	587	100.0

Source: Author's field survey, 2017

Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents by years of working experience. According to the result of the analysis, 34(5.8%) of the respondents had below 6 years of working experience, 60(10.2%) were between 6-10 years of working experience, 95(16.2%) were between 11-15 years of working experience 203(34.6%) were between 16-20 years of working experience and 152(25.9%) were between 21-25 years of work experience while 43 (7.3%) were above 25 years of working experience. This shows that a majority of the respondents were between 16-25 years of work experience.

Table: 3. Distribution of respondents by Cadre

Sex	Frequency	%
Senior	242	41.2
Junior	345	58.8
Total	587	100.0

Source: Author's field survey, 2017

Table 3 presents the distribution of respondents by cadre. According to the result of the analysis, 242 (41.2%) of the respondents were senior staff while 345 (58.8%) were junior staff. This shows that a majority of the respondents were junior staff.

Test of the Hypotheses.

Combined contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement of non teaching staff of universities in Ogun State.

Table: 4. Model summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for the Combined Contributions of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement

sig.	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Regression .000 ^b	1994.191	3	664.730	130.834
Residual	2962.058	583	5.081	
Total	4956.249	586		
Model Summary	R = .634 ^a ; R ² = .402;p <.05			

a. Dependent Variable: Job involvement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Justice, Group efficacy and organizational Support

The results is table 4 indicated that with all the predictor variables (Organizational Justice, Group efficacy and organizational Support) entered into the regression model at once, there was a significant prediction of employee job involvement (R-.634a; R² = .402; F (3.383) = 130.834; p<.05). this showed that all the variables accounted for 40.2% of the variance in job involvement of university workers in Ogun State. The hypothesis of no combined contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of job involvement of non teaching staff of university in Ogun State was by this finding rejected. In effect, Organization Justice, Group efficacy and organizational Support will combine to predict job involvement of non teaching staff of university in Ogun State.

Relative contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement among non teaching staff of university in Ogun State.

Table: 5. Coefficients of the Multiple Regression Analysis for the Relative contributions of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement

Model Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
	(Constant)	20.215		3.465
		5.834		
	Organizational Support	.131	.239	6.324
		.021		
1	Group Efficacy	.333	.339	9.184
		.036		
	Organizational Justice	.460	.245	
		.066		
7.022				

a. Dependent Variable: Job involvement

Results in table 5 also indicated that organizational support (B= .333; t= 9.184; p<.05) and organizational justice (B= .460; t = 7.022;p < .05) are potent contributors to employee job involvement. However, group efficiency is more potent than organizational justice and organizational support in influencing employee job involvement. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude statistically that there is a significant relative contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement among non teaching staff of university in Ogun State

Relationship among organization justice, organization support, group efficacy and employee job involvement among non teaching staff of university in Ogun State.

Table: 6 Pearson Product Moment Correlation of relationship among organization justice, organization support, group efficacy and employee job involvemnt.

	Men	Std. Dev.	Job Inv.	Org. Supt.	Grpeff
OrgJus					
Job Involvement	79.9642	2.90822	1	.492**	.527**
.434**					
Organizational	44.5434	5.32360		1	.479**
.369**					
Support					
Group Efficacy	32.0511	2.95659			
1	.299**				
Organizational					
Justice	93.9046	1.54492			
1					

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The result in table 4.2.3 indicated that there are positive relationships among study variables. Significant relationship was observed between job involvemnt and organizationl support ($r = .492$; $p < .05$); between job involvement and group efficiency ($r = .527$; $p < .05$); and between job involvement and organizational justice ($r = .434$; $p < .05$). Positive relationship was also observed between organization support and group efficiency ($r = .479$; $p < .05$, relationship existed between organizational support and organizational justice ($r = .369$; $p < .05$) and also between group efficiency and organizational justice ($r = .299$; $p < .05$). thus the null hypothesis is thus rejected and conclude statistically that there is a significant relationship among organization justice, organization support, group efficacy and employee job involvement among non teaching staff of university in Ogun State.

Summary of findings

The findings of this study showed that:

1. There is a combined contribution of organisation justice, organisation support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement of non teaching staff of university in Ogun State
2. There is a significant relative contribution of organisation justice, organisation support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement of non teaching staff of university in Ogun State
3. There is a significant relationship among organisation justice, organisation support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement among non teaching staff of university in Ogun State.

Discussion

Hypothesis one which state that there is no combined contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement of non teaching staff of university in Ogun State was hereby reject and statistically it concluded that there is a combined contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement of non teaching staff of university in Ogun State. This implies that organizational justices influence job involvement of non teaching staff of university in Ogun State likewise organizational support and group efficacy. This were in line with the work of Aderibigbe et al (2014) who investigated self-efficacy, meaning in life, education and age as predictors of job involvement among civil servants in Nigeria. According to them. Self efficacy and meaning in life will jointly and independently predict job involvement. The result of their analysis revealed that self-efficacy and meaning in life jointly predicted job involvement $F(2,211) = 33.512$; $R^2 = 0.234$; $p < .05$. it further showed that self-efficacy ($B = 0.432$; $t = 7.009$; $p < .05$) independently predicted job involvement. Moreso, the findings are in line with that of Ike et al., (2016) whose result shows that there is a significant difference between different types of leadership styles on job involvement as well as self efficacy and job involvement.

This were also in line with the work of Farahbod (2013) who indicated that organizational justice acts as a factor to increase trust in the organization and makes employees more motivated to work together. If employees feel supported by the organization, thus they will add the commitment to the organization. One of effective methods to increase organizational commitment is perceived organizational support. Organizational support has effect on increasing commitment and job involvement.

The result of hypothesis two which state that there is no significant relative contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement among non teaching staff of university in Ogun State was hereby rejected and statistically, this study indicated that there is a significant relative contribution of organization justice, organization support and group efficacy in the prediction of employee job involvement among non teaching staff of university in Ogun State. This were inline with the work of Yang ety al., (2006) who indicated that both the job self-efficacy and job involvement of clinical nursing teachers are at a medium to high level and that significant differences exist in job self-efficacy and job involvement.

The result of hypothesis three which state that there is no significant relationship among organization justice, organization support, group efficacy and employee ob involvement among non teaching styaff of university in Ogun State was hereby rejected and statistically, there is a significant relationship among

organization justice, organization support, group efficacy and employee job involvement among non teaching staff of University of Ogun State.

The finding Rahman et al., (2015), who investigates the impact of the three facets of organizational justice on employee job satisfaction as perceived by the respondents in a particular pharmaceutical company in Bangladesh. The model explains about 75% of the variance in the employee job satisfaction and insolvent and it is immune to multi-collinearity among the independent variables such as organizational justice. The study findings demonstrate significant impact of distributive justice and interactional Justice on job satisfaction and job involvement at $P < 0.001$ and $P < 0.01$ respectively. Moreso, the findings were in line with the work of some previous research such as (Eisenberger et al., 1997; Allen et al., 2003; Kim, 2002; Driscoll & Randal, 1999) who carried out a study and revealed that perceived organizational support has a positive relationship with job satisfaction and job involvement; also the openness to experiences dimension of employees' characteristics showed a positive moderating affect on the relation between perceived organizational support and job involvement. Moreso, the findings were inline with that of Parker (2012) who revealed a significant relationship between job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment.

Conclusion

In the theoretical position indentified in this study, it has shown that both the organizational justice, organizational support and group efficiency were found individually and collectively to influence job involvement among the non-teaching staff of public and private universities in Ogun State and organization. Thus, for University staff in Ogun State to be more involved in their job towards better performance measure to be achieved in line with the laid down policy of the system, there is the need for routine evaluation and amendment in the area of organizational justice, organizational support and group efficiency.

Recommendation

Inline with the above, it is thus recommended among others that

- 1) There is need for cordial harmony among employee in the educational setting
- 2) There is the need for proper organizational support and organizational justice to be put in place since they are catalyst that binds other factors together for better job involvement in an organization.
- 3) There is need for the organization to show concern towards their employee so as to enhance better job involvement.
- 4) The management of university should ensure that Organizational justice is binding on all members of the organisation as this will encourage

uniformity among members of the organization and thus enhance job involvement.

- 5) More attention should be given to work environment with a view of making it more conducive for staff in order to enhance better job involvement.
- 6) Conclusively, non-teaching staff need to be more concerned with the commitment of the organization and disabused their mind from the rivalry with the teaching staff since both of them work hand in hand to enhance better performance.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Ajay Bhatia, Gagan Deep, and Swati Sachdeva (2012) Analyzing the role of job involvement on organisational effectiveness: an empirical study among the employees of punjab national bank, *international journal of computing & business research* issn (online): 2229-6166
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109
- Angle, H., & Perry, J. (2003) Organizational commitment: Individual and organizational influences. *Work and Occupations*, 10, 123-146.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 75-78.
- Blakely, G., Andrews, M. C., & Moorman, R. H. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 259-273.
- Blau, G.J., 2006. Job involvement and organizational commitment as interactive predictors of tardiness and absenteeism. *Journal of Management*, 12(4): 577– 584.
- Campion, M, A., Medsker, G, J., & Higgs, A, C, 1993, Relationships between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46: 823-850,
- Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 234-246.
- Cherniss, C. 1991. Career commitment in human service professionals: A biographical study. *Human Relations* 44 (5) 419-437.

- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2005). How should organizational justice be measured? In J. Greenberg and J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational justice*
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445.
- Earley, P, G, 1993, East meets West meets Mideast: Further explorations of coUectivistic and individualistic work groups. *Academy of Management journal*, 36: 319-348, Earley, P, G., Gibson, G, B., & Ghen, G, 1999, How did I do versus how did we do? Intercultural contrasts of performance feedback search and self-efficacy in Ghina, Gzechoslovakia, and the United States, *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*: In press, Eisenberger, R., P. Fasolo, V. Davis-LaMastro. 1990. Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **75** (1) 51-59.
- Elankumaran, S. (2004) Personality, organizational climate and job involvement: An empirical study, *Journal of Human Values*, **10**, 117 – 130.
- Gibson, C. B. (2003). The efficacy advantage: Factors related to the formation of group efficacy.
- Gore, N. (2001) What’s all this mobilizing about, *Canadian HR Reporter*, **14**, 17-19.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22.
- Groves et al (2009) Survey methodology: An accessible introduction to the science and application of sample surveys ISBN: 978-0-470-46546-2.
- Guzzo, R, A., Yost, P, R., Gampbell, R, J., & Shea, G, P, 1993, Potency in groups: Articulating a construct, *British journal of Social Psychology*, 32: 87-106.
- Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D., & Miles, E. W. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 222–234.
- Hutchison, S., D. Sowa, R. Eisenberger, R. Huntington. 2006. Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **71** (3) 500-507.
- Ingram, T.N., K.S. Lee and G.H. Lucas, 2001. Commitment and involvement: Assessing a sales force typology. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19(3): 187-197.

- Kanungo, R. (2002) *Work alienation: An integrative approach*. New York: Praeger.
- Kanungo, R.N. (2002). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 341-349.
- Lawler, E.E. and D.T. Hall, 2007. Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54(4): 305-312.
- Lindsley, D, H., Brass, D, J., & Thomas, J, B, (1995), Efficacy- performance spirals: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 645-678,
- Lodahl, T.M. & Kejner, M. (2005). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49(1), 24-33.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626-638.
- Moorman, R. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Newton, T.J. and Keenan, A. (2003) Is work involvement an attribute of the person or the environment, *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 4, 169 – 178.
- Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1986). *Absenteeism and Turnover of Hospital Employees*. Greenwich Conn: JAL Press
- Reeve, C.L & Smith, C.S. (2001). Refining Lodahl and Kejner's job involvement scale with a convergent evidence approach: Applying multiple methods to multiple samples. *Organisational Research Methods*, 4(2), 91-104.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (4), 698–714.
- Riggs, M.L., & Knight, P.A. (1994). The impact of perceived group success-failure on motivational beliefs and attitudes: A causal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 755-766.
- Roch, S. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2006). Organizational justice in an exchange framework: Clarifying organizational justice distinctions. *Journal of Management*, 32(2), 299-322.
- Shamir, B. (1990). Calculations, values, and identities: The sources of collectivistic work motivation. *Human Relations*, 43(4), 313-332.
- Sheldon, M. (2001) Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 142-150

- Shih, H.A., Y.H. Chiang. 2003. Exploring relationships between corporate core competence, corporate strategy, and HRM practices in training institutions. *Asia Pacific Management Review* **8** (3) 281-309.
- Weldon, E., & Weingart, L. R. (1993). Group goals and group performance. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32(4), 307-334.