



ORGANIZATIONAL GRIEVANCE HANDLING PROCEDURES AND CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE OF EMPLOYEES OF NIGERIAN MONEY DEPOSIT BANKS

Eromafuru Edward Godbless*

Department of Business Administration,
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

Akobundu Eleazar Goddey

Department of Business Administration,
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

Egbule Solomon

Department of Business Administration,
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

The study sought to examine the impact of organisational grievance handling procedures on employees' contextual performance in money deposit banks. The target population of 250 employees of eight (8) money deposit bank branches spread across Nigeria was used and a sample size of 245 bank staff was derived through stratified random sampling. A cross-sectional research survey method was adopted and data collected by means of Likert scale was analyzed using descriptive statistics involving the mean, standard deviation, multiple regressions and inferential statistics. Dimensions (except stages) of organizational grievance handling procedures were found to significantly and positively impact on employees contextual performance. While it could be averred that grievance handling may not address all employees' workplace-related issues, a pragmatic approach to managing employees' discontentment will create platform for employees to seek grievance-redress in a harmonious working setting. We further posit that banks should act promptly to establish effective and efficient grievance handling mechanisms, revolved around organization justice; pursuing deliberate policies to abridge the length of time for grievance resolution, and putting policies in place effective organizational structure that encourages their employees to air their grievances.

Key words: Grievance Handling, Nigerian, bank, Money Deposit, employee

Cite this Article: Eromafuru Edward Godbless, Akobundu Eleazar Goddey and Egbule Solomon, Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures and Contextual Performance of Employees of Nigerian Money Deposit Banks, *International Journal of Management*, 11(10), 2020, pp. 23-38.

<http://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJM?Volume=11&Issue=10>

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizations are made of individuals of different age group, education backgrounds, religious beliefs, ethnicity, and social status, brought together by the need to further attainment of both group and individual goals. The work relationship between or amongst these parties may not always be harmonious and cordial as issues of imaginary or genuine feeling of disaffection, injustice, misapplication or ambiguity of policies and procedures often arise. The employees of banks are not immune from the effects of the above conditions which have led to poor customer service and shabby work behaviors (Waktola, 2019; Al-Omari & Okasheh, 2017). Amid the above unhealthy work climate, it has become evident that effective machinery to forestall crisis escalation be put in place. Every organization requires an effective structure to manage employees' complaints bordering on conditions of service (Suwati, Minarsih, & Gagah, 2016). The establishment of grievance handling procedure is in tandem with the spirit of due process which guarantees the application of procedural justice and ethical decision making in an organization. Even with a well-organized institutional framework for handling grievances in place, what excite employees the most are the prevailing culture, leadership style, timeliness and value system in the organisation. Employees' grievances are often connected with dissatisfaction among employees on issues relating to work procedure, working facilities (Badayai, 2012; Bean, 2004), ambiguities in company's policies (Ayadurai, 2006) and the violation of provisions of terms and conditions of employment (Salamon, 2010).

Organizational grievance handling is all about the process of handling complaints and dissatisfaction pertaining to and arisen from employee-employee relationship and employee-employer relationship and addressing them following established parameters. Employee performance in the context of the study refers to the employee's contextual performance rather than task performance. Task performance will require the retrieval and the analysis of the past and present appraisal ratings of the bank staff in Nigeria which will be difficult to access as these ratings are centrally managed by banks' Human Resource (HR) experts outside Nigeria

Although there have been avalanche of academic researches on grievance handling in unionized and non-unionized organizations, especially in advanced economies (Taru, 2016; Hunter & Kleiner, 2004; Bemmels & Foley, 1996; Balamurugan & Shenbagapandian, 2016), the understanding of its effect on employee contextual performance in developing countries and by extension Nigeria money deposit banks still remained nebulous. Array of studies undertaken in this area predominantly are in the areas of employees' general level of performance which failed to address contextual factors as determining indices of work place behaviors among employees. Furthermore, Nigerian banks have few regulations that control how management should deal with employee-related issues as this has resulted in different banks adopting different grievance handling processes that suit the whims and dictates of management which may not be favorable to their staff, thus making the generalization of research work in this area even more difficult. This research seeks to produce outcomes that are realistic and in line with the Nigerian banking environment. Consequently, the study is

poised to examine the existing grievance handling practices within the banks and how these gestures influence employees' contextual performance. In addition, study aims to identify grievance handling mechanisms by Nigerian banks and show how effective and efficient these mechanisms are in resolving workplace grievances and their attendant effects on employee performance.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in this study.

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between existence of opportunities to air grievance and employee's contextual performance.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between adequate stages in grievance handling process and employee's contextual performance.

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between timeliness of grievance resolution and employee's contextual performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Concepts Clarifications and Theoretical Framework

Grievance is a sign of discontentment with one's job or relationship with colleagues and may even be exacerbated by lack of clarity in company rules or policies (Garima, 2017). It can be presented by an employee or group of employees either formally or informally with respect to work related issues that may directly affect employees' job work attitude. A grievance is specific, formal dissatisfaction expressed through an identified procedure (Gupta 2006). A prompt response that leads to quick resolution of a complaint or grievance may boost employee morale and productivity and can forestall costly legal action to both parties (Bichang'a & Numusonge, 2016). Grievances might be unvoiced or explicitly stated, written or oral, justifiable, genuine or untrue, can be associated with the organizational work, or member of staff which may influence work performance or outcome. Grievances might involve employment contract issues, working environments, alteration of service conditions, biased approach, and failure to apply principle of natural justice, occupational norms and work-loads (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, & Wright, 2003; Garima, 2017). According to Locke (2009) grievance can be classified under three categories, which include management policies, work conditions, and individual factors. Grievance ensuing from management policies consists of rate of wages, leave rules, overtime, absence of career planning, role conflicts, lack of respect for joint agreement and difference between worker's skills and job accountability. Various grievances that emanate from working conditions include: inadequate safety and poor physical layouts, lack of tools and suitable machinery, poor self-control and impractical target. Grievances that arise from inter-personal features include: poor interactions between team members, autocratic leadership exercised by managers, poor relations with superior and disputes with associates and colleagues. Grievances can also be categorized into visible grievances and hidden grievances as a worker may have a perception of infringement of his or her rights, in which case, grievance may even exist in the mind of the individual employee (Locke (2009).

Grievance is a major part of organizational challenge. However not all grievances are bad. Through grievance handling, issues that affect employee performance and attitude to work can be identified and dealt with in the overall interest of the organization (Obiekwe & Uchechi, 2019). It will be counter-productive if management fails to make available avenues for employees to express their discontentment at work. There are no strict rules on how organization should set up their grievance procedures. Experience from field work suggests

that different organization have developed and adapted their grievance handling methods in line with their human resource management strategies.

However six major types of grievance handling methods (Hook, Rollinson, Foot, & Handely, 1996) are discussed here-under:

Open door policy: Under this policy, the aggrieved employee is free to meet the top executive of the organization and get his/her grievance redressed. Such may work well for small or departmentalized organizations but may be difficult to enforce in large organizations as management most likely will not have time to attend to all grievances.

Step ladder policy: Under this method, grievance settling involves series of ladder-like-step starting from employee's immediate supervisor to top management or voluntary arbitration depending on the organization and the individual pursuing redress. The steps are stated below:

Grievant-supervisor: Under this stage the, grievant orally presents his/her grievance to his/her immediate supervisor. Grievances of employee are analyzed and recorded one by one. Supervisor tries to settle such grievances as much as possible. Where the supervisor is unable to resolve the issue or the grievant is not satisfied with the outcome of the resolution he or she may proceed to the next stage.

Grievant- departmental head: At this stage the grievant discusses the issue with his/her departmental head who normally is senior to the supervisor. The grievant moves to the next stage in the ladder if he or she fails to get the required resolution.

Grievant-grievance committee: A grievance handling committee is set up to handle the issues raised by the grievant. Grievance committee members, especially for large organization with regional branches are normally drawn from staff or management staff who work outside where the incidence of discontentment took place. For smaller organizations it may comprise of staff from other departments. Grievance committee members are usually well experienced and can handle issues which the departmental head may not have the required experience or skill to handle.

Grievant- top management: This is the final stage in internal grievance handling process. At this stage the top management attempts to resolve the issue the best way it can in the overall best interest of the organization. Grievant in unionized organization may seek external arbitration or alternative dispute settlement process if he/she is not satisfied with resolution at this stage.

Grievance handling process refers to the way an organization seeks to provide resolution to an aggrieved issue. It is the steps that help management articulate and proffer resolution to the issue of contention. The steps are stated below:

Defining and describing the nature of the grievance: This step helps to define and describe the nature of grievance as clearly as possible.

Collect all the facts: All the facts regarding to grievance is collected and analyzed. This helps to explain how, when, where, why and to whom the grievance occurred. This step helps to gather all the information with facts and figures.

Establishing tentative solution to the grievance: After getting the clear picture of the grievance, the next step involves the establishment of the tentative solution to the grievance.

Check the validity of tentative solution: Facts are gathered on the basis of the tentative solutions. Management establishes a tentative solution and then observe critically whether the hypothesis is right or wrong. It analyzes and searches for multiple solutions to the grievance.

Apply the solution: Management may seek audience with the aggrieved employee and may also seek for more information from other employees before applying the solution. It finally selects the best feasible and possible solution and implements same.

Follow up: Follow up is the last step. Management may not conclude that the grievance has been resolved until a check is made to determine whether the employee's attitude has been favorably changed. Checking can be done through casual observation while the employees are working.

Early research on grievance handling was adopted from the work of Hirschman's theory of "Exit, Voice and Loyalty" and focused more on quit rate of employees who were not given opportunity to air grievances at their workplace (Hirschman, 1970). Later researchers like Peterson & Lewin (2001) focused more on the impartiality and due process of the grievance procedures. Grievance processing refers to when, where and how grievances are resolved (Bemmels & Foley 1996). Various organizations have developed their independent structures and grievance processes thereby making it difficult to have a generalized standard (Walker & Hamilton, 2011). However (Lewin & Peterson, 1988; Colquitt, Greenberg, & Scott, 2005) identified two important criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of grievance processing namely, speed and satisfaction.

Organizational literature addressing how employees determine whether they have been treated fairly and the impact of this perception on organizational functioning is shown from the works of (Greenberg, 2005). The findings from these researches suggested that those employees who believe they are treated fairly will be favorably disposed towards the organization. According to Lewin and Peterson (1988) there is lack of consensus as to what constitute effectiveness in grievance procedure. However, Budd & Colvin (2008) proposed the three central concepts of "equity, efficiency, and voice" as core standards which could be used for comparing and evaluating procedures across unionized and non-unionized industries. Traditional unionized industries contain strong procedural safeguards which ensure due process protection. For non-unionized systems like the banks, studies conducted by (Feuille & Delaney, 1992) reported varied procedural formality and offered only modest levels of due process protection and independence from management. The implication is that these self-style approaches may be vulnerable to procedural abuses.

2.2. Contextual Performance

Job performance has generally been defined as the degree to which an individual helps the organization achieve its goals. A two-factor theory of job performance consisting of task performance and contextual performance was proposed by Borman & Motowidlo (1997). When employees use technical skills and knowledge to produce goods or services or accomplish a specialized task that support the actual functions of an organization, the employees are said to be involved in task performance. An employee engages in contextual performance when he/she is involved with voluntarily helping colleagues, putting in extra effort to complete a given task, putting in extra hours to get work done on time and so forth. In addition to fulfilling job specific tasks (task performance), employees have to constantly communicate, work together and perform in such a way that goes beyond their routine job descriptions (contextual).

2.3. The Constructs of Contextual Performance

Contextual performance involves behaviors that deviate from an employee's routine job description (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996) and consists of two types of behaviors, namely, interpersonal facilitation behavior and job dedication behavior.

Interpersonal Facilitation Behaviors

Interpersonal facilitation behavior includes behaviors that are connected to interpersonal orientation of an employee that contribute to an organization's goal achievement. Such behavioral acts aid in maintaining the social and inter-personal environment required for effective task performance in an organization. Such gestures are normally associated with improving employee morale, encouraging cooperation and helping co-workers with their tasks. These behaviors are normally shown by employees who are satisfied with their jobs and align with the social exchange theory with the proposition that social exchange involves a series of interactions that generate obligations.

2.4. Job Dedication Behaviors

Job dedication behaviors revolve around the self-discipline of the individual. Van Scotter & Motowidlo (1996) indicated that job dedication is the inspirational underpinning of job performance. Such behavior propels employees to act in a way that promotes the organization's best interest. When an employee is satisfied with their job, they will tend to work harder than required, put in extra shifts, exercise discipline and self-control and tackle problems with more enthusiasm as well as follow rules and procedures and defend the organization's objectives.

2.5. Measures of Employees Contextual Performance

Employee contextual performance is rarely measured by unit of output or the amount of resources utilized but the willingness of the employee to go the extra mile in helping to achieve the organizational goal. Several authors have used seemingly same variables to measure employee contextual or organizational citizenship behavior. For example Organ (1988) introduced the concept of five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior namely: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness. Podsakoff & Mackenzie (2000) distilled the five dimensions into three categories; helping behavior, civic virtue and sportsmanship behaviors. Later Borman and Motowidlo, (1997) proposed a three factor model that include; interpersonal support, organizational support and conscientiousness activities.

2.6. Grievance Handling and Employee Contextual Performance

Early research on grievance handling focused more on employees quitting their jobs because of lack of opportunity to voice their grievance (Hirschman 1970). The research narrative later shifted to the employee's response to a potential grievance issue, the effectiveness of grievance processing and finally to the outcomes, that is, the employers/employees response to the outcomes of successfully resolved grievance. With the shift in focus of industrial conflict from collective confrontation to grievance between employee and employer (Walker & Hamilton 2011), recent researches are beginning to focus on the effect of grievance handling on both employee and organizational performance. Consequently, it is important for a grievance handling mechanism to stimulate and sustain employee satisfaction with his/her working environments for better productivity (Saundry, Latreille, Dickens, Irvin, Teague, Urwin, & Wibberly, 2014). Colquitt, Greenberg, & Scott (2005) have argued that employees who think they have been treated fairly will most often engage in a pro-social organizational behavior while employee who perceives that he/she has been treated unfairly will have a feeling of resentment which may lead to acts of retribution against the employer. This research will build on the above findings and strive to produce research outcomes that are in consonant with our environment and culture.

2.7. Theory of Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to the extent to which employees perceive workplace procedures, interactions and outcomes to be fair (Gordon & Fryxell, 1993). These perceptions can influence attitudes and behavior for good or ill and in turn having a positive or negative impact on employee performance and the organization's success (Baldwin and Kain, 2006). There are basically three types of organizational justice namely; distributive, procedural and interactional justice. Distributive justice in the workplace refers to the perceptions of fairness about job input and outcome. Employees experience equity when perceived equivalent job inputs (such as education, performance, tenure, and skills) result in equivalent job outcomes in the forms of compensation, promotion, recognition, and job security. Put differently, equity is perceived when employees with the same or similar work experience and time on the job are promoted or transferred equally (Adams, 1963; Fischer, & Smith, 2003). Employees are usually sensitive to outcome issues and they are often subject of grievance at the workplace. Procedural justice is concerned with the perceived fairness of the procedures that are relied on to make decisions (Ambrose, & Arround (2005). Most literature on procedural justice had focused mainly on grievance handling process in organizations. Leventhal (1980) identified six criteria that may contribute to employee's perception of a fair decision process including consistency, accuracy, neutrality, correctness, representativeness and morality and ethicality.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a descriptive research design. The research design was chosen for this research because of its capability to depict participants or phenomenon in an accurate manner. Consequently, the research design was aligned to the case study to ensure that the evidence obtained enabled the study to effectively address the research problem logically and as unambiguously as possible. The population for this study comprises core staff of eight (8) leading banks in Nigeria. The Banks which include First Bank, United Bank of Africa, Zenith Bank, Guaranty Trust Bank, Eco Bank, Unity Bank, Skye Bank, and Fidelity Bank had their corporate headquarters in Lagos, Nigeria. The total staff strength of these banks is 250 which also was sample size adopted for the study. Primary data was collected using questionnaire to generate quantitative response. The questionnaire was divided into two parts: Part one looked at the demographics of the respondents and part two captured the scale for measuring organizational grievance handling and employee contextual performance in the bank. The researcher explained the goal of the study and offered direction to the staff on how to fill in the questionnaire before giving out the same to be filled. They were assured verbally that the information obtained from them will be treated with due confidentiality. They were therefore implored to provide honest answers to the questions asked. The questionnaires were administered through drop and pick method, that is, the questionnaires were given to the staff of the bank to fill at their own suitable time. The researchers made follow up visits and courtesy calls to the various banks to remind the staff to fill-in the questionnaires by so doing increasing the chances of the response rate. The study depended on data collected through a questionnaire designed to address the goal of the study.

3.1. Measurement of Variables

The responses to the factor questions or statements of the dependent variables were measured using the Likert scale. An ordinal scale score of 1 to 5 were assigned to represent the degree to which the respondent agree to a particular question or statement where 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3 =neutral, 4= disagree and 5 = strongly disagree. The central tendency of the responses was analyzed using mean while standard deviation was used to analyze the

variability of the responses. The association or relationship between the dependent and independent variables were analyzed using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

3.2. Model Specification

Contextual Performance = f (Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures)

OGHP = (OAGR, SGRH, TGRR)

$COPF = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 OAGR + \beta_2 SGRH + \beta_3 TGRR + U_i$

Where:

COPF = Contextual Performance

OGHP = Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures

OAGR = Opportunities to air grievance

SGRH = Adequate stages in grievance handling process

TGRR = Timeliness of grievance resolution

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data analyzed and presented include the population size and response rate, the bio data of the employees, causes of grievance, methods of handling grievance as well as findings related to Organizational Grievance Handling and Employee Contextual Performance in banks in Nigeria.

Table 1 Response rate

Questionnaire	Frequency	Percentage
Total administered	250	100
Number Retrieved	245	98

Source: Fieldwork, 2020

The response rate as per table 1 reveals that 250 questionnaires were administered to employees in the eight (8) commercial banks in Nigeria. Out of the 250, 245 of the respondents completely filled and returned their questionnaire which is an indication of 98% participation in the survey.

Table 2 depicts the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. Male employees (62.9%) in commercial banks in Nigeria were more than the female employees (37.1%). This result without prejudice to female workers who prefer to work in larger commercial cities where they have opportunity for marriage and even when they are posted to Nigeria they seek for transfer to other cities once they get married. Also males have shown resilience in coping with the Nigeria terrain. On age distribution, majority of the employees were on their youth age. Specifically, employees within the ages of 29-39 (53.9%) accounted for half of the employees working in the banks in Nigeria while those within the ages of 40-50 years accounted for 28.2%. The young adults working in the bank (18-28 years) accounted for 11.8%. Those above 50 years of age were just 6.1%. Educational qualification was also measure and distributed among the respondent. The result shows that all the respondents had a formal education but the degree of formal education vary amongst them. 73 (29.8%) had MBA qualification while 4.9% already had master degree. Other certifications possess by respondents accounted for 2.4%. Work experience count when dealing with grievance and grievance handling in any organization.

Table 2 Bio Data of Employees

Variable(s)	Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	154	62.9
	Female	91	37.1
Age	18-28	29	11.8
	29-39	132	53.9
	40-50	69	28.2
	50 and above	15	6.1
Educational Qualification	Primary	0	0.0
	Secondary	0	0.0
	MBA	73	29.8
	First Degree	154	62.9
	Masters Degree	12	4.9
Work Experience	Other	6	2.4
	Below 5 years	51	20.8
	6-10 years	149	60.8
	11-15 years	29	11.8
Work Position	Over 15 years	16	6.5
	Manager	8	3.3
	Head of Operation	8	3.3
	Marketer	96	39.2
	Customer Care Service	26	10.6
Tell/ Cash Officer	92	37.6	
Executive Director	15	6.0	

Source: Fieldwork, 2020

The study therefore attempted to know the distribution of work experience of employees in the selected banks. The distribution shows that 60.8% of them have acquired a working experience of 6-10years accounting for over an average of the respondents. 20.8% of them have 5 years and below working experience while 11.8% have 11-15 years working experience. Those having above 15 years working experience accounted for 6.5%. The distribution of work position, as shown in table 2, reveals that bulk of the bank staff are marketers (39.2%) and operations staff (37.6%), because of the drive for deposit mobilization and good service delivery sought by the banks. Out of the other respondents, 8 managers and 8 heads of operation were also interviewed, while the Executive directors accounted for 6.0% of the total staff.

Table 3 Causes of Grievance in Banks

Elements of grievance	Mean	SD
Work group relationship	3.56	.77
Working Facilities	3.27	.77
Confusion on provisions stated in company's policy	3.45	.87
Leadership style of management	3.33	.79
Salary, Incentives and Rewards	3.12	.92
Perceived injustice and unfair treatment	3.15	.94

Source: Fieldwork, 2020

Table 3 shows the causes of work place grievances particularly among banks staff. The mean score reveals that the work group relationship ($3.56 \pm .77$) generates more grievances in the work place than any other cause. A staff interviewed revealed that work group issues like strained relationship between different units, e.g. marketing and operations, incompatibility with peers, feeling of neglect, obstruction and victimization are the major causes of grievance

Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures and Contextual Performance of Employees of Nigerian Money Deposit Banks

in the bank. . Another high rated cause by the respondents is the confusion/misinterpretation of company policy and procedures (3.45±.87). Bank policies are not clear to many of the staff as most staff do not clearly understand what their banks really want to achieve with a particular policy and the implication in handling bank transactions. Other causes are leadership style adopted by management (3.56±.77), working facilities (3.27±.77) particularly among marketers, perceived injustice and unfair treatment (3.15±.94) and the problem of staff remuneration (3.12±.92).

Table 4 Methods of Handling Grievance in the Banks

Grievance Handling Style/policy	Mean	SD
Open door policy	3.11	.98
Step ladder procedure	3.55	.73
Grievant- supervisor	3.24	.98
Grievant-grievance committee	3.42	.78
Grievant-Top management	3.39	.91

Source: Fieldwork, 2020

Table 4 shows the methods banks usually adopt in handling grievances. Rated high among the methods is the step ladder procedure (3.55±.73). Many of the staff agreed that when unresolved grievance move from one step of resolution level to another, the system will be more transparent and fair. This will make employees to believe in the process and want to air their grievance. Another highly rated method of handling grievance in the banks is the grievance committee (3.42±.78) and the grievant supervisor method (3.24±.98) where the supervisor solely handles the grievances. Though, staff contacted acknowledged the fact that grievance committee is not yet in operation in the bank, they nonetheless would appreciate bank taking steps to incorporate the committees. Given the responsibility of grievance handling to top executive and management (3.39±.91) and operating an open door policy (3.11±.98) were considered as other methods of handling grievances in the banks. Top executives are believed to have good knowledge of all the processes of the organization and have been involved in several disputes and conflict resolutions within the organization.

Table 5 Employee contextual performance

Contextual Performance	Attitude Exhibited by Employee	Mean	SD
interpersonal facilitation	I help orient new people even though it is not required	3.63	.68
	I help others who have heavy work loads	3.47	.82
	I willing help others who have work related problems	3.32	.89
	I help others who have been absent	3.51	.83
	I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me	2.59	1.12
	I feel am one of the most conscientious/vigilant employees	2.77	1.10
Average		3.22	0.91
job dedication	I believe in giving an honest days' work for any honest day pay	2.36	1.05
	My attendance at work is above the norm	2.72	1.03
	I do not take extra breaks	2.92	.97
	I obey company rules and regulations even when no one is watching	2.89	.92
	I keep abreast changes in the organization	3.28	.95
	I attend meetings that are not mandatory but are considered important	2.74	1.07
	I attend functions that are not required but help the organization image	2.62	.98
	I read and keep up with organization announcements, memos and so on	2.56	1.03
Average		2.76	1.00

Source: Fieldwork, 2020

Employee contextual performances as shown in the table above were captured in two dimensions namely interpersonal facilitation and job dedication behaviors in line with the

questionnaire designed and used by Van Scotter & Motowildo in their work in 1996. For interpersonal facilitation, questions 1 to 6 dealt primarily with aspects related to interpersonal facilitation behavior amongst bank staff. These questions were used as a tool to measure such behavioral aspects which aid in maintaining the social and inter-personal environment required for effective task performance within the organization which potentially leads to improved morale, promotion of cooperation and helping of co-workers with their tasks. The table above indicates a relatively high mean of positive responses for all of the questions pertaining to interpersonal facilitation behaviors with a mean score for all the interpersonal facilitation items standing at 3.22 ± 0.91 .

On the other hand questions 7 to 15 measures job dedication behaviors and covers the following; willingness to work overtime to get a job done, paying attention to details, asking for challenging work, exercising personal discipline and self-control, taking initiative, overcoming obstacles, tackling problems with enthusiasm, and working harder than necessary. The table above also indicates a relatively high mean of positive responses for all of the questions pertaining to job dedication with a mean score of 2.76 ± 1.00 . This implies that employee's contextual performance favors more of interpersonal facilitation than job dedication. This is because employees do not see their whole duty in the bank as dedicated to job alone just as they must also help others in achieving their interpersonal needs and goals which in the long run will affect the organization positively.

4.1. Test of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested using OLS Multiple Regression in the table 6 below:

Table 6: OLS Regression Result of Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures and Contextual Performance

Table 6 OLS Regression Result of Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures and Contextual Performance

Variables	B	T	P>/t/
Opportunities to air grievance	0.4993707	9.89	0.000
Adequate stages in grievance handling process	0.2575323	4.95	0.000
Timeliness of grievance resolution	0.2169156	4.73	0.000
Cons.	0.0737748	0.39	0.700
R-squared	0.6782		
Adj. R-squared:	0.6742		
F	169.28		
Prob.>F.	0.0000		

4.2. Hypothesis One

H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between existence of opportunities to air grievance and employee's contextual performance.

The test of hypothesis on whether there is a significant relationship between existence of opportunities to air grievance and employee's contextual performance. In table 6, the result reveals that the statistical test was significant. Existence of opportunities to air grievance has a positive significant relationship with employee contextual performance amongst bank staff ($\beta = 0.499$, $p = 0.000$). This implies that giving employee adequate opportunities to air their grievance will significantly and positively influence employee's contextual performance in the banks.

4.3. Hypothesis Two

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between adequate stages in grievance handling process and employee contextual performance.

The result shows that the statistical test is not significant ($\beta = 0.257$, $p = 0.000$). This result reveals that the stages in grievance handling process being practiced by the banks do not really influence staff contextual performance as employees are more concerned about getting their discontentment resolved rather than the stage where the issue is resolved. By implication what is more important to the employees are the availability of opportunity to air their grievance and the assurance that they will get a fair resolution.

4.4. Hypothesis Three

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between the timeliness of grievance resolution and employee's contextual performance.

The statistic test result of hypothesis 3 as shown on Table 6 is on whether there is a significant relationship between timeliness of grievance resolution and employee's contextual performance. The result was statistically significant and related to employee contextual performance among bank staff ($\beta = 0.216$, $p = 0.000$). By implication, timely grievance resolution will influence employee contextual performance because most employees look at the timeliness in grievance resolution before deciding whether to file for grievance or not to file or channel it through other external methods. Timeliness of the resolution to most employees signifies transparency and fairness and shows that management has interest and concern for their workplace issues.

The Adjusted R-squared value of 0.67 shows that 67% of the change in the level of employee's contextual performance is explained by Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures. The F-statistic of 169.28 and its associated P-value of 0.000 shows that the linear regression model on the overall is statistically significant at 1% level.

5. DISCUSSIONS

This study examined organizational grievance handling and employee contextual performance in banks in Nigeria. The following findings were made; Firstly, the study revealed that staff workgroup relationship, the misinterpretation of banks policies, poor remuneration and leadership style of superiors are the major causes of grievance in the bank (Wadhvani, 2014; Nurse & Devonish, 2006). Secondly, the study revealed that the step-by-step methods of handling grievance while most preferred method among bank organizations were not found to positively impact on bank staff contextual performance (Daud, Isa, Nor, & Zaonol, 2013). Thirdly, the study revealed that bank staff contextual performance tended more towards interpersonal facilitation behavior than job dedication behavior. Fourthly, the study revealed that the existence of adequate opportunities to air grievance affects employee contextual behavior positively due to the availability of the grievance airing opportunities (Lee, 2018). Finally, it was revealed that timely grievance resolution influences employee contextual performance probably because most bank staff believes that resolving a contentious issue as quickly as possible reduces the stress of bearing grudges, the emotional effect of having to put up the issue for a long time and the feeling that sometimes justice delayed might be justice denied.

6. CONCLUSION

The study examines the impact of organization grievance handling on employee contextual performance in eight (8) commercial banks in Nigeria. Grievance is inevitable in every

organization however what is paramount is how these grievances are managed in the bank to ensure that the drive for growth/profitably and excellent customer service are not derailed. Consequently, grievances management should not be left for chance. There has to be a deliberate policy from the banks to ensure that opportunity exist for staff to air their grievances and such grievances are resolved as quickly as possible to ensure that workers contextual performance is sustained. The study concludes that institution of grievance handling process in banks may not solve all workplace issues, however, it remains a rational attempt by management to ensure that employees are aware and have unencumbered access to well-defined, efficient, equitable and fair grievance handling process that can adequately address workplace grievances to the benefit of the workers and the organization.

7. STUDY IMPLICATIONS

There is need for banks to establish efficient and effective grievance handling mechanism built on organizational justice that offers peaceful and orderly ways of resolving workplace issues to reduce the fears, emotional stress, and uncertainty faced by employees when they have grievance to file and the negative effect this will have on organizational functioning. Banks should pursue deliberate policies that seek to standardize the length of time within which a grievance is filed and a resolution reached. By so doing employees grievances are addressed before they become too big and as such helps management and employees to focus on the achievement of organizational goals. There is need for banks to put policies in place that encourages employees to air their grievances. While management may think that formalized grievance airing is to the advantage and interest of the workers, the result can also be in management's advantage. When employees choose to remain in the organization and have their grievance resolved rather than quit, there is the strong likelihood that the results will assist management in its attempt to control some of the cost associated with staff turnover and the corresponding need to recruit, select and train new employees. Future research should aim to expand the scope of this study beyond banks in Nigeria and to include other financial institution. More research should be done on the area of supervisory/organizational retribution and its effect on the willingness of employees to use the organizational grievance handling process.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, J.S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67:422-436.
- [2] Al-Omari, K., & Okasheh, H. (2017). The influence of work environment on job performance: A case study of Engineering company in Jordan. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, Vol. 12, No. 24, pp. 15544-15550.
- [3] Ambrose, M.L. & Arround, A. (2005). Are procedural justice and distributive justice conceptually distinct? In Greenberg J, at Colquit J.A (editors) *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp 59-84) New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum
- [4] Ayadurai, D., (2006). *Industrial Relations in Malaysia: Law and Practice* 2nd edition. Kuala Lumpur: Malayan Law Journal.
- [5] Badayai, A. R. (2012). A theoretical framework and analytical discussion on uncongenial physical workplace environment and job performance among workers in industrial sectors. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 42, 486-495.
- [6] Bagraim, J. (2007). *Motivating the South African Workforce*. In Werner, A. (Ed.) *Organizational Behavior, a Contemporary South African Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. Pp.68-98

Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures and Contextual Performance of Employees of Nigerian Money Deposit Banks

- [7] Balamurugan, G., & Shenbagapandian, V. (2016). A study on effectiveness of grievance handling procedures in International National Airport, Tiruchirappalli. *International journal for Innovative Research in Science & Technology*, Vol. 2, No. 10, pp. 195-199
- [8] Baldwin, M., & Kain, J.S. (2006). Sensitivity of several performance measures to displacement error, bias, and event frequency. *Weather Forecasting*, 23, 636-648 <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF9331>
- [9] Bean, R. (2004). Comparative *Industrial Relations: An Introduction to Cross-National Perspectives*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.
- [10] Bemmels, B., & Foley, J. (1996). Grievance procedure research: A review and theoretical recommendations. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 359-384
- [11] Bichang'a, L. K., & Numusonge, G. S. (2016). Effects of Grievance handling on organizational commitment among National Hospital Insurance Fund (NHIF) employees, Thika Branch. *International Journal of Science and Research*, Vol. 5, No. 10 Doi: 10.21275/ART20162546.
- [12] Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 6, 1-21, McClelland, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- [13] Budd, J. W., & Colvin, J. S. (2008). Improved metrics for workplace dispute resolution procedures: Efficiency, equity and voice. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, Vol. 47, No. 3.
- [14] Colquitt, J.A. Greenberg, J. & Scott, B.A. (2005). *Organizational justice; where do we stand?* In Greenberg, J. E. Colquitt, J.A (Eds). *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, pp.589-622, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [15] Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct Validation of a measure, *Journal of applied psychology*, vol 86 pp. 386-400.
- [16] Daud, Z., Mohd Isa, M. F., Mohd Nor, W. S. & Zaonol, Z. (2013). Do we need to train our managers in handling grievances? *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 1-13
- [17] Feuille, P., & Delaney, J. T. (1992). The individual pursuit of organizational justice: Grievance procedures in nonunion workplaces. Pp.187-232 in G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Vol. 10, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [18] Fischer, R., Peter, & Smith, P. B. (2003). Reward allocation and culture: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 251-268.
- [19] Garima, B. (2017). Grievance handling: Motivational tool for employees. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp 130-134.
- [20] Gordon, M.E., & Fryxell, G.E. (1993). *The role of justice in organizational grievance systems*. In Cropanzano, R., (Ed). *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management: Series in Applied Psychology* (231-255). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbawn Associates.
- [21] Greenberg, J., (2005). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and information classes of organizational justice. In Cropanzano. R. (ed). *Justice in the workplace; approaching fairness in human resource management*.79-103. Lawrence Erlbaum, New Jersey.
- [22] Gupta, D. (2006). Towards affirmative action. *India International Centre Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3/4, pp. 150-161.
- [23] Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *"Exit, Voice and Loyalty": Responses to decline in Firm, Organization and States*. Retrieved from en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exit-Voice-and-Loyalty-text Pages, 162

- [24] Hook, C. M., Rollinson, D. J., Foot, M., & Handely, J. (1996). Supervisor and manager styles in handling discipline and grievance: Part one – comparing styles in handling discipline and grievance. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 20-24.
- [25] Hunter, S., & Kleiner, B. H. (2004). Effective grievance handling procedures. *Management Research News*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 85-94.
- [26] Lee, H. (2018). The implications of organizational structure, political control, and internal system responsiveness on whistleblowing behavior. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, Sage Journals, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 155-177 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x18792054>
- [27] Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationship. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27–55). New York: Plenum
- [28] Lewin, D., & Peterson, R.B., 1988. *The modern grievance procedure in the United States*. New York: Quorum Books.
- [29] Locke, E. (2009). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Journal of industrial and Lawrence Nurse*,
- [30] Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2003). *Human Resource Management*, New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- [31] Nurse, L., & Devonish, D. (2006). Grievance management and its links to workplace justice. *Employee Relations*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 89-109.
- [32] Obiekwe, O., & Uchechi, E. (2019). Impact of employee grievance management on organisational performance, *International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, Vol. 5, No. 1 www.iiardpub.org
- [33] Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- [34] Peterson, R. B., & Lewin, D. (2001). Research on unionized grievance procedures: Management issues and recommendations. *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 39, No. 4
- [35] Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Paine, J. B. & Bachrack, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3):617-635.
- [36] Rao, V. S. P. & Narayana, P. S. (1998). *Organization Theory and Behavior*, (Delhi: Konark Publishing Company), (329-330)
- [37] Rollinson, D. J, Hook, C.M, Foot, M., & Handley, J. (2006). Supervisor and Management Styles in Handling Discipline and Grievance (part two): Approaches to Handling Discipline and Grievance. *Personnel Review*, 25(4), 38-55.
- [38] Salamon, M. (2010). *Industrial Relations: Theory and Practice*. 4th Edition. Great Britain: Prentice Hall.
- [39] Saundry, R., Latreille, P., Dickens, L., Irvine, C., Teague, P., Urwin, P., & Wibberley, G. (2014). 'Reframing Resolution – Managing conflict and resolving individual employment disputes in the contemporary workplace, *Acas Policy Series*.
- [40] Suwati, M. M., Minarsih, M., & Gagah, E. (2016). Influence of motivation work, career development and cultural organization on job satisfaction and implications on the performance of employees. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 2, No. 2
- [41] Taru, R. D. (2016). Effectiveness of grievance handling mechanism. *International Engineering Journal for Research and Development*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 1-19.
- [42] Van Scotter, J. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*. [Psycnet.apa.org](http://psycnet.apa.org), Goggle Scholar.
- [43] Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley. Goggle Scholar.

Organizational Grievance Handling Procedures and Contextual Performance of Employees of Nigerian Money Deposit Banks

- [44] Wadhvani, S. (2014). Causes and effects of grievances in small companies. *International Journal of Advanced Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 3, No. 6
- [45] Doi:10.15693/ijaist/2014.v3i16.117-324
- [46] Waktola, B. S. (2019). Boosting employee performance; impact of working environment on employees performance: Case study on Ethio-Telecom at Ambo Branch. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, Vol. 19, No. 11, pp. 43-50.
- [47] Walker, B. & Hamilton, R. (2011). "Employee–Employer Grievances" *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 13, Issue 1, pp. 40-58

APEPENDIX

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	245
Model	64.2905546	3	21.4301849	F(3, 241) =	169.28
Residual	30.5094454	241	.126595209	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	94.8	244	.38852459	R-squared =	0.6782
				Adj R-squared =	0.6742
				Root MSE =	.3558

coef	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
sgrh	.2575323	.0519896	4.95	0.000	.1551203	.3599442
tgrr	.2169156	.0458585	4.73	0.000	.1265811	.3072502
oagr	.4993707	.0505094	9.89	0.000	.3998744	.598867
_cons	.0737748	.1911851	0.39	0.700	-.3028323	.450382

	coef	sgrh	tgrr	oagr
coef	1.0000			
sgrh	0.6878	1.0000		
tgrr	0.6060	0.5494	1.0000	
oagr	0.7648	0.6489	0.5172	1.0000

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity

Ho: Constant variance

Variables: fitted values of coef

chi2(1) = 0.06

Prob > chi2 = 0.8101

|. estat vif

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
sgrh	1.94	0.516518
oagr	1.85	0.541916
tgrr	1.53	0.653566
Mean VIF	1.77	