

Analysis of Grievance-Productivity Nexus among Employees of Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State, Nigeria

Juliet Chidinma Egwuom; Ogadinma Ikonne (Ph.D) & Ebere Augustine Ugwueje (Ph.D)
Abia State University Uturu, Nigeria

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.701092>

Received: 25 September 2023; Accepted: 04 October 2023; Published: 07 November 2023

ABSTRACT

Studies on grievance have focused mainly on its effects on employee performance while no attention has been given to its effect on productivity. This study therefore investigated employee grievance and productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd Aba, Nigeria. Survey design was adopted; quantitative data were collected through questionnaire while the qualitative data were generated through in-depth interview. Quota sampling procedure was used to select 398 respondents for the qualitative study while interviews were conducted on six (6) heads of department including from Human Resources, Administrative, Production, Sales, Distribution, and Accounting to generate the quantitative data. The availability sampling technique was also used to select the actual respondents from each department. The quantitative data was processed using SPSS and analyzed using frequency distribution tables and percentages. The stated hypotheses were tested using Chi-square. The findings showed that employee grievance persisted as a result of delay and denial of salary payment, poor working condition, not getting the employees involved in organizational decision-making process. It was therefore recommended that grievance can be reduced if not completely stopped when the organization ensure to provide the employees with all the necessary things needed to make work easy such as payment of salary as when due, conducive work environment and involving the workers in organizational decision-making process. It is concluded that when all these are in place, it will increase productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

There are three essential resources to manage in every organization. They are human resources, financial resources and material resources. The most important element of organizational resources is its human resources. This is because both financial and material resources are ineffective without efficient human resources. Therefore, for workers to perform efficiently, they must be motivated have morale to do so. However, there are many factors that influenced productivity of the organization. These factors could be internal or external. Some of them are business competition, availability of raw material and effective utilization of human resources. Therefore, a grievance among workers is one of the factors that directly affected employee's productivity in the work place (Gupta, 2006).

Organizations are made of individuals of different age group, education backgrounds, religious beliefs, ethnicity, and social status, brought together for the achievement of both group individual goals. The work relationship between or amongst employees and employers may not always be harmonious and cordial because imaginary or genuine feeling of disaffection, injustice, misapplication or ambiguity of policies and procedures often arise (Al-Omari & Okasheh 2017; Waktola, 2019). In the midst of the above unhealthy work climate, it has become difficult to put in place that effective machinery to forestall crisis escalation. Every organization requires an effective structure to manage matters bordering on conditions of service, employees complaints (Suwati, Minarsih & Gagah, 2016).

Employee grievances are often connected with dissatisfaction among employees on issues relating to work procedure, working environment, delay and denial payment of salary, unfair ambiguities in company's

policies and the violation of provisions of terms and conditions of employment. All these lead to complaints, and when these Complaints are not properly attended to, may lead to dissatisfaction which causes grievances displayed in form of anger, unhappiness, absenteeism and labour turn over, (Bean, 2004; Badayi, 2021 & Salamon, 2010).

Employee grievances had been as old as industrial society and had eaten deep into the fabrics of every organized industrial establishment, be they private and public alike. Employee grievances denote a dissatisfaction or discontent on the part of labour or management; and a negative feeling that finds its expressions in various form, ranging from complaint to strike action or destructive reactions which have its root cause from Non-payment or delay of employees entitlement, unfair-treatment by management, poor welfare, breach of terms of contract by management, management's insensitivity to the problems of their workers, denial of information etc (Ohiri, 2002).

Therefore grievance procedure can differ slightly from one province to province, or State to State, though the process itself was quite similar whether it occurs in Canada or the United States. In order to have efficient grievance handling process, the organization would ensure an establishment of an in built mechanism for absorbing, resolving and eliminating grievances. Furthermore, human resources play a very important role in the achievement of efficiency and productivity. That is why the present day organizations, have developed various, laws, policies, regulations and process to ensure that their objectives are properly met in respect to the working conditions of their employees. More also, grievances could be any discontent or dissatisfaction that is either expressed or not, valid or not, arising out of anything connected with the organization which an employee thinks and feels is unfair, unjust or inequitable (Dwivedi, 2009).

The International Labour Organization (2008) also defined employee grievance "as a complaint of one or more workers in area of salary payment, allowances, conditions of work and interpretation of service stipulations, such areas as overtime, leave, transfer, promotion, seniority, job assignment and termination of service". Employee grievances is the dissatisfaction or discontent on the part of labor or management, which occur either from management policies, or working conditions or personality traits of employee, which are the primary forces that give impetus to the emergence of employee grievance in the work place which affect productivity (Singh, 2013). 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 (Bichanga & Numusonge 2016).

Furthermore, causes of grievance could be classified under three categories, which include management policies, work conditions, and individual factors (Gerhart & Wright 2003; Locke 2009, Noe, 2015 & Garima 2017). 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 workers 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 productivity 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 suggested that different organization have developed and adapted their grievance handling methods in line with their human resource management strategies. On the other hand, productivity is an assessment of the efficiency of

workers or group of workers, which could be evaluated in terms of output of an employee in a specific period of time (Sumanth, 2009).

The concept of productivity was defined in two ways by (Lawlor, 2015). First, as a relationship between goods produced and sold or service provided as output and the resources consumed in doing it (output/input= productivity). Second, productivity as a comprehensive measure is how efficiently and effectively organizations satisfy the following five aims: objective, achievements, efficiency of the process, effectiveness, comparability with other organizations and trend- productivity measured over a period.

From the above definition, it is observed that productivity of a given worker can be accessed relatively to an average of employees doing similar work because every organizational success lies on the productivity of its workforce. Therefore, employee productivity is an important consideration in business and can only be hindered once there are grievances and quarrel amongst the workforce in an organization. One of the major factors affecting productivity in a work environment especially when there is grievance among employees is what is called lack of motivation. Being in the era of competition, organizations of today emphasizes on the management of human resources for maximum productivity.

Motivation is defined as a human psychological characteristic that add to a person's degree of commitment. This is also a management process of managing employee's behavior in the work place, which helps to remedy grievance in the work place, (Badu, 2005). Motivation is a key strategy in human resources management that has helped to a large extent to achieve great performance and productivity within the organization (Robert, 2008).

Over times both at the national and international level, research has practically observed that improper or unsatisfactory way of handling grievances in many organization, leads to high labor, employee turnover, repeated training of new staff, strike, poor human relations, absenteeism and ineffective communication of the organizational objectives. Although there have been avalanche of academic researches on grievance and performances in both a unionized and non-unionized organizations, especially in advanced countries (Bemmels & Foley 1996; Hunter & Kleiner 2004; Balamurugan & Shenbagapandian, 2016 Taru, 2016).

The understanding of its effect on employee's productivity in developing countries and by extension Nigeria non- unionized private organization still remained ill-defined. Array of studies undertaken in this area predominantly are in the areas of employees general level of productivity which failed to address contextual factors as determining indices of work place behaviors among employees. Furthermore, Nigerian private organizations have few regulations that control how management should deal with employee-related issues as this has resulted indifferences in 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 aimed at producing outcomes that are realistic and in line with the Nigerian work environment. Consequently, the study poised at examining the inherent grievances, causes and practices within Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia- State and how these gestures influences productivity in organization. In addition, this study aims at identifying possible ways to reduce these identified grievances to enhance productivity.

Objectives of the Study

This study has the following specific objectives:

1. To identify the inherent grievances in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba Abia State.
2. Find out what causes grievance in Aku International Company (Nig), Ltd, Aba, Abia- State?
3. To examine delayed promotions and grievance in the organization?
4. To find out if irregular retraining of staff contribute to grievance and reduction in productivity in the organization?

5. To examine how labour turnover as result of grievance affects productivity in the organization.

Research Questions

1. What are inherent grievances in Aku international Company (Nig), Ltd, Aba, Abia- State?
2. What are the causes of grievance in Aku International Company (Nig), Ltd, Aba Abia State?
3. To what extent does delayed promotion affect grievance?
4. Does irregular training opportunities affects grievance and productivity of Aku International Company (Nig), Ltd, Aba Abia State?
5. To what extent has grievance caused labour turnover in the organization and how has it affected productivity?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for this study:-

1. Improper handling of grievance causes labour turnover in Aku international Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State.
2. Lack of staff compliant receiving channels leads to employee low productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A combination of social exchange theories propounded by George Homans (1961) and Peter Blau (1964) are adopted as a framework for this study. This is because, both theories argued from a sociological, organizational and psychological stand point. Homans' framework built on a combination of behaviorism and basic economics. Social exchange theory based its concept on the notion that relationship between two people is created through a process of cost-benefit analysis. In other word, it is a metric designed to determine the effort poured in a person to person relationship. The theory, in its uniqueness, does not measure relationships on the bases of emotional metrics, rather in its systematic processes that rely on mathematics and logic to determine balance within a relationship. More also, this theory is applicable in any form of relationship, be it friendship, workplace behavior, organizational management, business decision, social power, leadership, politics, etc. This is because it determines the balance there in. On the other hand, peter Blau believes also that most thriving friendship can occur when both participants are of the same status, which allows equal potential for exchange and benefits though out the relationships. This means that if costs of the relationship are higher than the rewards, such as if a lot of efforts or money were put into a relationship and it is not reciprocated, then the relationship may lead to grievance. Once grievance occurs, the relationship maybe abandoned or terminated as the case may be. This is the point this study hopes to establish.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design: a mixed research method was adopted in this study to enable the researchers generate both quantitative and qualitative data within the limited time frame

Organization of Study: Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd. is a limited liability company and was incorporated on the 21st of September 1972 as a building and engineering service company. The company has grown to have many other subsidiaries and areas of interest such as Aluminum frame for windows and doors and other building materials. The engineering services and consultancy unit is headed by highly trained professionals most of whom were trained overseas. The company maintained a corporate head office

at 9/10 Ojike Lane Aba- Abia State with a branch office at 37b Models Street Surulere, Lagos. Over the years, the company has built an excellent wealth of experience in the importation of general construction materials as well as the production of multipurpose sacks. The successful sales and growth of the company has resulted to the establishment of developmental centers in various states in Nigeria. Their products include aluminum window profiles, plywood, doors, white cements, particle boards and Formica.

Population of the Study: The employees of Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba Abia State constituted the population of the study which is a total of (620) worker.

Table 1: Target Population of Study by Departments

DEPARTMENT	POPULATION SIZE
Human Resources	120
Administration	70
Production	100
Sales	80
Distribution	100
Accounting	150
Total	620

Source: Staff registers of Aku International Nigeria Limited Aba.

Sample size The sample size for this study is 398 persons. This was statistically generated by using Taro Yamane Statistical method to determine the sample size and is as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where: n = Sample size

N = Target Population

e = error of sample (it could be 0.10 down to 0.01, but in this work, 0.03 was used)

1 = unity or constant

Therefore;

$$n = \frac{620}{1+620(.03)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{620}{1+620(0.0009)}$$

$$n = \frac{620}{1+0.558}$$

$$n = \frac{620}{1.558}$$

$$n = 397.9460847$$

$$n = 398 \text{ workers}$$

Sampling technique: The researchers used quota sampling technique. Quota sampling technique is a sampling methodology wherein data is collected from a homogeneous group. It involves a two-step process

where two variables can be used to filter information from the population. It was easy administered and helped for quick comparison. This is because; all the departments do not have equal size.

Secondly, a total of six (6) departments were selected. They are Human Resources, Administrative, Production, Sales, Distribution, and Accounting.

As a result, the availability sampling technique was used to select the actual respondents from each department as shown in table 2.

Table 2: Population of workers and their departments in Aku International (Nig) Limited

S/N.	DEPARTMENT	POP SIZE	PECENTAGE	PROPORTION CALULATION
1	Human Resources	120	19.4	$120/620 \times 398/1 = 77$
2	Administration	70	11.3	$70/620 \times 398/1 = 44$
3	Production	100	16.1	$100/620 \times 398/1 = 65$
4	Sales	80	12.9	$80/620 \times 398/1 = 51$
5	Distribution	100	16.1	$100/620 \times 398/1 = 65$
6	Accounting	150	24.2	$150/620 \times 398/1 = 96$
	Total	620	100%	398

Instrument for Data Collection: The instruments that were used in this study are questionnaire and in-depth interview. In this study, 50% quantitative and 50% qualitative data were used for the research on Employee grievance and productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd. Aba, Abia-State. The questionnaire, specifically, was used to collect quantitative data, and it was highly structured with only few unstructured questions. It had two different sections. The first section contained the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents while the other section addressed the substantive issues in Employee grievance and productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd. Aba, Abia-State.

The in-depth interviews (IDIs) on the other hand, were employed to gather qualitative data to complement the quantitative data for deeper understanding of employee grievances and productivity in the area of study. The IDIs was anchored mainly on unstructured questions with necessary probes.

Method of Data Collection: The questionnaires were administered by the researchers themselves with the help of 2 research assistants. The two research assistants were a male and a female that hail from the organization under study. They were trained for three (3) days on the objectives of the study, relevance of the study, administration and retrieval of questionnaire.

The in-depth interviews were conducted by the researchers with the help of two of the research assistants, which were also selected from the organization. The heads of departments and supervisors were interviewed at appropriate time. This means that the two research assistants were involved in the in-depth interviews at one point in time or the other depending on the head of departments or supervisors that was interviewed. The researcher moderated the interviews, while the two assistants were taking notes and recording respectively.

Method of Data Analysis: The quantitative data was processed with SPSS 20.0. The socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and the substantive issues in all sections of the questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as simple frequency distribution tables and percentages. Inferential statistics, particularly, Chi-Square were used to test the stated hypotheses to enable the researcher make inference about the unknown population. The qualitative data was analyzed using QDA Miner.

RESULTS

Table 3: Socio-Demographic Characteristic of the Respondents

Description	Demographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	221	56.52%
	Female	170	43.48%
	Total	391	100
Marital Status	Single	105	26.85%
	Married	273	69.82%
	Widowed	13	3.33%
	Total	391	100
Age	20-29 years	89	22.76%
	30-39 years	73	18.67%
	40-49 years	105	26.85%
	50-59 years	92	23.53%
	60-69 years	18	4.60%
	70-79 years	14	3.58%
	Total	391	100
Educational Qualification	OND	18	4.60%
	HND	79	20.21%
	B.Sc.	288	73.66%
	M.sc/Ph.D.	6	1.53%
	Total	391	100
Religion	Christianity	391	100.00%
	Total	391	100
Years of Service	15 years	38	9.72%
	21 years	6	1.53%
	10 years	48	12.28%
	9 years	20	5.12%
	8 years	45	11.51%
	5 years	133	34.02%
	4 years	101	25.83%
	Total	391	100

Field survey: 2021

Table 3 shows that 221(56.52%) of the respondents are male while 170(43.48%) are females. It also shows the marital status as 273(69.82%) of the respondents were single, while 13 (3.33%) were widowed. In terms of age it was found that 105(26.85%) were between the age range of 40-49 years while 14(3.58%) were 70-79 years. The table equally indicated the educational qualification of the respondents it was found that 288(73.66%) had their first degree while 6(1.53%) had their M.sc/Ph.D. The table also shows that all the respondents 391(100%) were Christians. Finally, the table shows that 133(34.02%) had worked for 5 years in

the organization while 6(1.53%) were those who had worked for 21 years in the organization.

Analyses of Research Questions

Research Question One: Do workers in Aku international company (Nig), Ltd, Aba, Abia State, experience grievance?

Table 4: Nature of Grievances experienced in the organization

Description	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Excessive work load	89	22.76%
	Lack of Salary payment	69	17.65%
	Lack of promotion	70	17.90%
	Unfair policy	46	11.77%
	Unfair Treatment of Staff	67	17.14%
	Poor work environment	50	12.78%
	Total	391	100%

Table 4 shows that more of the staff of the company 89(22.76%) complain about excessive work load while 46(11.77) complain about unfair policy. An IDI respondent, however, had a different perspective from the first stating thus;

Since you said the research is for academic purpose and not sponsored by our management or (Oga) boss I will be honest with you... I am not just aggrieved... Am very sad.. (Iwe juru mu obi) my heart is grieving. They will make promises... they won't fulfill it, any small mistake they will sack the person... in fact their policies are very unfriendly... it's just because of lack of other job opportunities that one is suffering all these things (Male, production unit, 25 years old

Research Question Two: What are the causes of these grievances in Aku international company (Nig), Ltd, Aba, Abia State?

Table 5: Causes of Grievances in the Organization

Description	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Delay in payment of salary	68	17.39%
	Poor work environment	43	11.00%
	Not getting the workers involved in the organizational decision making	12	3.07%
	All of the above	230	58.82%
	None of the Above	38	9.72%
	Total	391	100%

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 5 shows that a majority of the respondents 230 (58.82%) said the major causes of grievances within the organization include a combination of the options listed (delay in salary payment, poor work environment, not getting the workers involved in the organization decision making) while 12 (3.07%) said the major cause of their grievance is not getting the workers involved in the organization decision making,

not a combination of all. The study further generated data on possible causes of grievances.

For example, an IDI respondent stated thus:

A lot of things lead to grievance which includes: poor, delay and denial of salary payment, feeling of unfair treatment with lack of respect, overtime and excessive workload without commensurate payment leads to grievance; unnecessary and strict supervision from the employer, poor work environment and sudden organizational policy changes without the notice of the employees leads to grievance (Female, Production Unit, 34 years old).

Research Question Three: To what extent does delayed promotion affect grievance?

Table 6: delayed promotion and grievance

Description	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Strongly Agree	267	68.29%
	Agree	68	17.39%
	Disagree	24	6.14%
	Strongly Disagree	32	8.18%
	Total	391	100%

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 6 shows that a majority of the respondents 267 (68.29%) strongly agreed that delayed promotion leads to grievance and affects employee performance while 24(6.14%) disagreed that delayed promotion leads to grievance and affects employee performance. An IDI respondent corroborated this finding with the following assertions:

I don't even know how to say this but you know a hungry man can never perform very well. Delayed promotion, hmm, is not funny at all. You work tirelessly and every year you are still in the same cadre, it makes one very worried, yet you are still working. The truth is that you will lack concentration. So I can tell you, it leads to grievance and affects performance (Male, Accounting Department, 37 years old).

Research Question four: Does the level of training opportunities affect grievance and productivity of Aku international company (Nig), Ltd, Aba, Abia State?

Table 7: If employees attend training programs regularly

Description	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Regular	12	3.07%
	Very regular	36	9.21%
	Not Regular	238	60.87%
	Not very regular	105	26.85%
	Total	391	100%

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 7 shows that a majority of the respondents 238 (60.87%) said employees attend training opportunities not regularly while 12(3.07%) said employees attend trainings regularly. The IDI data corroborated the quantitative information. As the respondents stated clearly that trainings are very scarce, if at all it comes,

only management staff benefit from such. An IDI respondent captured it as thus;

Did you say training, we don't know about anything of such in this organization...They feel what we do is very simple once they show you how after employing you, what other training do you need? So, we don't benefit from such... they consider it a luxury... It's Just the managers (the Ogas) that sometimes you will hear they went for training (Male, Production unit, 29 years old)

Table 8: Level of Training Opportunities given to Staff

Description	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Positively	36	9.21%
	Very Positively	49	12.53%
	Not Positively	262	67.01%
	Not very positively	44	11.25%
	Total	391	100%

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 8 shows that a majority of the respondents 262 (67.01%) said the level of training opportunities given to staff is not positive while 36(9.21%) equally affirmed that it is not very positive. This means that the level of training opportunities is not as expected The IDI data brought out more information regarding the level of training as the respondents stated: *'This question is very funny, who gives you training not to talk of level, We don't know anything like that in this department at all '(Male, production unit, 23 years old).*

However, another respondent had a different view stating thus: *'Well, sometimes we are sent for trainings to upgrade our capacity even though is not as expected because the expected time frame is not enough.'* (Male, Management, 56 years old).

Research Question five: To what extent has grievance caused labour turnover in the organization and how has it affected productivity

Table 9: Grievances causes labour turnover in the organization

Description	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
	Often	48	12.28%
	Very Often	61	15.60%
	Not often	239	61.13%
	Not very often	43	11.00%
	Total	391	100%

Source: Field Survey 2021

Table 9 shows that a majority of the respondents 239 (61.13%) said it's not often that grievances cause labour turnover while 43 (11.00%) said not very often. The IDI response corroborated with the IDI data thus; *yes, grievances cause labour turnover in this organization, if you are angry can you perform well? We don't perform at our highest capacity I can tell you that for sure, (Female, production unit, 28 years old).*

Table 10: Multiple Regression indicating effects of grievances on productivity

Variables	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Nature of grievances experienced in the organization	3.010	.000	0	.000
Irregular payment of salaries	3.010	.000	0	.000
Non-Attendance of training	3.010	.000	1	.000
Low training opportunity	319.453	.100	3	.100
Delay in promotion	3.010	.000	0	.000

Field survey: 2021

Tables 10 show the variables on grievances predicting productivity. It was found that all the variables ranging from nature of grievance, irregular payment, non-attendance of training, delay in promotion were all found to predict low productivity at ($p = .000$) except low training opportunity that was found to contribute less to productivity challenge at ($p = .100$).

Test of hypotheses

Hypothesis One: there is no relationship between improper handling of grievance and labour turnover in Aku international company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State.

Table 11: Cross tabulation between improper handling of grievance and labour turnover

Improper handling	Labour turnover		Total	$X^2 = 24.493, (N = 391), df = 2,$ $P = .000$
	Yes	NO		
Often	26(11.2%)	15(9.5%)		
Very often	27(11.5%)	30 (18.9%)		
Not often	78(33.5%)	28(17.7%)		
Not very often	102(43.7%)	85(53.8%)		
Total	233(59.6%)	158(40.4%)	391 (100)	

Field survey: 2021

Chi-square statistic was used to test the relationship between improper handling of grievance and labour turnover. The result of the test shows that there is no statistical significant relationship between improper handling of grievance and labour turnover at $X^2 = 24.493, (N=391), df = 2, P = .000$. In order words, improper handling of grievance by the management does not affect labour turnover in Aku international company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State. This could mean that employees may have other reasons for exiting the company beyond how their grievances are being handled by the management of the company.

Hypothesis two:

Lack of Staff compliant receiving channels does not leads to employee low productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State

Table 12: Cross tabulation between channels of receiving complaints and decrease in productivity.

Effective Channels of compliant	Employee low productivity					
	A	SA	D	S D	Total	
Agree	11	23	11	41	391 (100)	$X^2= 21.110, (N = 391),df = 4,$ $P = .000$
Strongly Agree	16	18	34	29		
Disagree	19	18	32	45		
Strongly Disagree	10	31	14	39		
Total						

Chi square statistic was used to determine the relationship between channels of receiving complaint and decrease in productivity in Aku international company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State. The result shows that there's no statistical significant relationship between the channels of receiving complaints and decrease in productivity as determined at $X^2= 21.110, df = 4, (N =391), P= .000$. This suggests that channels of receiving compliant have nothing to do with decrease in productivity. This could be that there may be other reasons why there is decrease in productivity that is not yet known the management other than the channels of receiving complaint in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated employee grievance and its effect on productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia-State. It was found that grievance had been as old as industrial society itself and as well a very serious area of concern in the organization of study. The major reasons or causes of grievances in the organization are: delay or denial of salary payment, poor working environment, not getting the workers involved in the organizational decision making process. Data from the qualitative component of the study also corroborated the findings of quantitative data. The result of the related hypothesis (one) stated that the improper handling of grievances causes labour turnover in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia-State.

However, hypothesis one was tested with Chi-square statistical tool to know the relationship between improper handling of grievance and labour turnover. The result of the test shows that there is no statistical significant relationship between improper handling of grievance and labour turnover at ($P= .000$).

In order words, improper handling of grievance by the management does not affect labour turnover in Aku international company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State. This could mean that employees may have other reasons for exiting the company beyond how their grievances are being handled by the management of the company. This finding was due to the fact that some respondents in the organization believe that improper handling of grievance encourages employee to resign from the organization. The findings, however did not contradict the fact that grievance still exist in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia-State, it rather suggested that there could be additional causative factors which could give room to labour turnover in that organization which could be raised for further studies on this issue. These findings are in accordance with Twari and Singh (2014) who opined that grievance is a matter raised by a representative to communicate disappointment with the code of conduct and is an endeavor to bring out changes and when is not handled well, brings about grievance. The finding is also partly in tandem with the view of Gordon and Miller (1984) asserted that the influence of the supervisors approach in identifying the issue of grievance is very important. The author further argued that rules should be set up so that those supervisors are directed by their predominance. The finding also corresponds with Herzberg's two factors theory (1966) which is based on the satisfaction and dissatisfaction expressed by workers at all the workplace. However, in drawing the relationship, the author differentiated between motivation and the hygiene factor. The basic premises behind

this theory of motivation are factors that bring about job satisfaction. Herzberg further said that salary is very significant in job satisfaction.

Finally, the study further found that Lack of Staff compliant receiving channels does not leads to employee low productivity in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State. Chi square statistical tool was run to determine the relationship between channels of receiving complaint and decrease in productivity in Aku international company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State. The result shows that there's no statistical significant relationship between the channels of receiving complaints and decrease in productivity as determined at ($P = .000$). This suggests that channels of receiving compliant have nothing to do with decrease in productivity. This could be that there may be other reasons why there is decrease in productivity that is not yet known to the management other than the channels of receiving complaint in Aku International Company (Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia State.

This implied that the way staff complaint are received and handled will determine the outcome or result seen in the organization, In agreement with some literatures reviewed, it was observed that there are different compliant receiving channels in the organization, it could be formal or informal, written or oral as the case may be. It also varies in their requirement and handling procedures. It was found that when complaints goes through the stated channels to the appropriate quarters in the organization and are not properly handled, leads to dissatisfaction. It affects employees' morale and commitment to work and have direct negative effect on their attitude to work and productivity as well. The finding agreed with Tiwaria and Singh (2019) which studied that grievance is a matter raised by a representative to communicate disappointment with the organization and it is their duty to endeavor to bring out changes.

Gomathi (2014) also stated the need for effective grievance mechanism. This would create good employees' relations and harmony in the work environment and enhance employees' efficiency and productivity. Furthermore, when complaints are lodged through a simple phone call where the operator guides the employee on the selection of the category of their problems and specify what exactly the issue was. The complainer could also submit the complaint in writing through email or letter. This channel is appropriate when the extent of the complaint is moderate. Moderate levels of complaints can include issues with the amount paid as salary, theft, excessive workload or perhaps a lack of friendliness in the work environment. However, when there are cases of workplace harassment or other offensive behavior being faced by someone, it is directly taken to an appointed/authorized person in the company so that an immediate action could be taken against the person causing the offense.

There are two types of complaint procedures that could be found in almost all the companies across the globe, Nigeria included. The first is an informal complaint procedure. In this case, if the issue remains unresolved, the employee could report the matter directly to his manager or departmental administrator verbally. This type of procedure can be followed by any employee. But, in the formal complaint procedure, it must be in a written material where concerns are addressed regarding a specific term or provision of the company's policies and regulations. Formal procedures are mostly employed by staff members who are prone to facing technical or ethical issues in their field of work. Sexual harassment is one of the examples where the victim might prefer a formal procedure of reporting the case as they feel more comfortable in doing so without having to discuss the matter with the offender. Further, Thompson, (1981) advised that the management should show concern and use a philanthropic approach in dealing with employee grievances because these grievances may possibly have little consequence on the administration. More also he said that officer in charge of this complaint receiving channels should ensure to treat employees complaints with apt attention, so as to avert its consequences.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated employee grievance and productivity in Aku international company (Nig) Ltd, Aba,

Abia- state. It was found that grievance is still seen in the organization as a result of delay and denial of salary payment, poor working conditions, overtime and excess work load without a related compensation, unfavorable policy change without the consent of the workers, lack of promotion, allowances, incentives and other welfare packages to boost the employee morale for work, lack of training of employees, poor working relationship between the employees and owners of the management, not taking employees complaint seriously All these factors obviously have lead to grievance and low productivity in Aku international company(Nig) Ltd, Aba, Abia- state

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. The organization should ensure that employees are provided with all the necessary things needed to make work easy such as payment of salary, provision of conducive work environment, reduction of work load through division of labour and specialization, promotion as when due and involving them in the policy and decision making process, as all these will help for a better result in the organization. In the cases of over time, the management should give them a commensurable compensation as a way of encouraging them to do more,
2. The organization should treat every employee with respect, as well as giving adequate attention to complaints for better results to ensure that things do not get out of hand.
3. The organization should as well carry their employee along in every of their decision making process and policy change. It helps them be in the same page of information with the organization. This will enable a peaceful co- existence and improve a good relationship with the employee and vice versa.
4. The organization should consider it a matter of policy to organize training, develop programs such as seminar, workshops on monthly or quarterly basis to build the employee' capacity for efficiency and productivity.
5. The organization should try as much as possible to create an enabling environment for mutual trust between the worker and the organization.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, J. S. & Rosebaum, W.B (1963) "Equity Theory: Inequality in social exchange". *Advanced Experimental Psychology*, 62:335-343.
2. Armstrong, M. (2006). *Grievance process, step by step*. 10th Edition, Kogan Page. London, UK.
3. Assafuah, E. K., (2017). *Grievance handling procedures and employee performance: A case of JayeeUniversity College*. University of Cape Coast.
4. Apeteley, D & Aboagye, B (2015), *Effect of grievance on employee*. *Advance sociological experiment*, 78: 149- 150.
5. Anyadike, I. (2015). *Investigation Grievance and productivity: Investigation strategy & plan*. 78: 236-237.
6. Balaji, K. M (2013) *Employee Welfare and reward on job satisfaction and productivity*. *Researchscientist in Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India*.
7. Badaya, D. (2012), *Grievance and Dissatisfaction: Anger strategy management*. 30 (8), 27-29.
8. Bean, B. (2004), *Strategic Investigation, Plan & solution; Handling processes*, 17 (7)376-40.
9. Balamurugan, G., Shenbaga pandian, V.(2016). *A study on effectiveness of grievance handling procedures in international airport, Tiruchirappalli*. *International Journal for Innovative Research in Science & Technology* 2.
10. Badu, E.E (2005) *A comparative Analysis on employee motivation*. Ist edition, February 1, 2005 *Research Article, University Libraries in Ghana*:
11. Bemmels & Foley (2006). *Basic grievance policy*. British Columbia: University of British Columbia 2006.

12. Bichanga & Numusonge (2016). Quick Complaint and Solution; Employers pattern. 10(2)16-178.
13. Blau, P.M (1964). "Exchange and power in social life" 1ST edition, 1. New York: John Wiley and sons, Inc, 1964. Print.
14. Block, R. N., Beck, J., & Olson, A. R., (1996). Low profile/High potential: A look at Grievance Mediation. *Dispute Resolution Journal*, 51(4), 54-61.
15. Carmines & Zeller, (1979). Levels of Reliability; Test on Reliability. 5(7)14-17.
16. Casey, I. (1984). Industrial Relations and Economic Performance, Grievances and Productivity. *Journal of Labour Research*, winter, 10(2):1-10
17. Cole, G.A. (2000). Strengthening human resource Management, The grievance management challenges. South Africa: Publishing Faculty of commerce and administration, North-west University.
18. Costantino, C. A. & Sickles, M. C. (1996). Designing conflict management systems. Published by San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
19. Chahal, S. (2013). Job satisfaction amongst Bank Employees: An Analysis of the contributing variables towards job satisfaction. *Journal of Scientific & technology Research* 2 (8): 11-20.
20. Charles, W. M (2012). The Social thought of C. Wright Mills. Thousand Oaks, California: Pines forge press.
21. D'curz, O. (2004). Discontent or Dissatisfaction in the work place. *Journal of white and blue collar job in Canada*, Research 13(10); 10-19
22. Desal, A. W. (1987). Motivation of Blue collar and white collar workers. *Journal of white collar job in India*, Research 5(15): 19-22
23. Dewivedi, R. S. (2009). A Textbook of human resource management, P. 343-345. Published by Vikas Publishing house PVT Ltd. Factory Improvement Programme (FIP): Good practices guide, International Labour Organization (ILO). P. 1. Printed. 95 .
24. Donnelly, D. P (1995). Employee Satisfaction, Loyalty and Commitment in Service organization *Management Research News* 28(10):780-801.
25. Drucker, P. F. (2013). The best of Peter F. Drucker on management, people and performance. 1909-2005, Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business, School Press, 2007.
26. Friedman, A. (1977). "Capitalism and Friedman: Industry and labor class struggle at work and monopoly capitalism". (Edition). *The Wall Street Journal*- November, 17- (2006).
27. Garima, N. (2017). Grievance cases & categories. Chicago University press, 2017 edition, 40(5) 20-35
28. Gupta, S. (2006). Human Resources Management, Theory and Practice,:24.8-24.14. Published, Lagos: by Sultan Chand & Sons.
29. Gordon, M. E. & Miller, W. (1984). "Influence on Supervision Approach Identifying issues of grievance" sage publications, Inc. 45, (1): 15-30.
30. Gomathi, S., 2014. A study on grievance management in improving employee performance in a pvt enterprise. *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci*.
31. Geshart & Wright(2003). 'Grievance cases, categories and management Procedures. Chicago University press, 10(7) 10-15
32. Herzberg, Mauser, & Sideman, (1966). The motivation to work (2nd). New York: John Wiley. ISBN 0471373893.
33. Heinz, W. & Harold, K. (2005). Management: A global Perspective. Mc-Graw-Hill, ISBN: 0071239464. 18(29) 200-250.
34. Homans, C. (1961). Exchange in perspective: the promise of George c. Homans on Behavioral theory in *Sociology*, 3(23):14-18.
35. Hunter & Weiner (2004). Organization and Process, 5th Edition, John Wiley: New York, ISBN 0471373893.
36. Ivancevich, R. M. (2008). "Organizational Behavior and management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 7(12):103-109.
37. Ichniowski, C. (2003). "Beyond Incentive pay: inside Estimates of the value. *Journal of Economic Perspective*- 17(1): 155- 180, winter 2003.
38. Igbaekemen, A (2018) Capacity Building; A tool for Increase Productivity. . *Journal of Economic*

- Perspective- 12(7): 15- 18, winter 2018.
39. Jean, M. (2011). Autocratic Managerial style and aggressive. *Journal of leadership perspective*- 201(39): 45-70.
 40. Juneja, C.(2018). Effect of Grievance on Productivity. *Journal of management perspective*- 60(15): 20-35.
 41. Karambayya, R. & Brett, J.M. (1989). Employee Discontent: Manager Handling Disputes. Third party roles and perceptions of fairness. *Academy of Management Journal* 32(4). 687-704.
 42. Kerlinger, N.(1977). Reliability Test. *Methods of Sampling*, 15(6)3-10
 43. Khatoun, N.(2014). Grievance handling procedure and its effect on Employee Productivity. *Manjeera Journal for Research in Social Science*.
 44. Kingsley, D.& Wilbert, M. (1945).” principles of stratification.” *American sociological Review* 10(2), 242-9.
 45. Lawlor, B. (2015). “Concept of Productivity: *Journal for Research in Social Science*,30(7)67-70.
 46. Locke, O. (2009). Management Failure: handling grievance cases, *International Economic journal*.(40), 590-605, 2009.
 47. Margolies, K. (2004). Strategic Grievance Handling, *Steward Update*, 15(1): 20- 25.
 48. Mead, G H. (1934). *Mind, self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 90(7) 50-65. 1934.
 49. Noe, H (2015) Grievance cases, categories and management policy 1. Procedures. Chicago Universitypress, 30(15) 28-35.
 50. Ndukwu. M.C. (2010). Management and determinants of production through increased efficiency. *Chilean journal of agricultural research* 70(4), 633-639, 2010.
 51. Obasi, F.(1999). Sampling Measuring Technique. *Methodology and sampling*,(6) 12-14.
 52. Obiekwe, O., Eke, N.U. (2019). Impact of employee grievance management on organizational performance. *International Journal of Economics* .86 (2),200- 210.
 53. Ohiri, A.U (2002) Personnel management and application in Nigeria Environment, Luton: Management services Chicago.
 54. Okereke, C. I. (2010). Staff welfare and Productivity in Patani Local Government on Council, Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and international finance*, 2(12):313- 320.
 55. Okafor, E. E. & Bode Okunade, A.S. (2005), *Introduction to Industrial and Labour Relation*. *Journal of labour relation*, 2(1):21-47, Mubak Press Ibadan
 56. Opatha, H. (2001). *Human resource management personnel*. University of Sri Jayewar denepura, 3(5):7-15.
 57. Oni, S. & Okanlawon, K.(2006). Nigeria’s transport infrastructural development: an integral strategy(NEEDS), *Journal of social and policy issues*, 3(2),7-13.
 58. Pradeep, A., Niha, A., Gopan, G., Kumar, V. (2018). Best practices in grievance handling mechanism:a study in Kerala. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology* 7, 177–179.
 59. Rollinson, D. J. (2000). Supervisor and manager approaches to handling discipline and grievance: A follow up study, *Personnel Review*, 29 (6):743-768.
 60. Ramya, G., Shenbaham, A.(2014). Study on Effectiveness of Grievance Handling Mechanism at Swastik Apparales, Erode. *Journal of Social Science* 4, 12. 27.
 61. Rawat, P., Sukhdani, M.(2015). Effectiveness of Grievance Handling Procedure: A Case Study of Bhilai Jaypee Cement Limited.”12-22.
 62. Rebert, N. (2008). Grievance and performance: *Grievance Management Technique*; 6, 17, 19.
 63. Rose, N.(2004). Expression of Dissatisfaction. *Management procedure*; 15, 18, 40.
 64. Sydney, K. (2009). Grievance management, A case study of NFC Zambia Research Proposal. Zambia : Grievance Management.200-215.
 65. Singh, J.P. (2013). The managerial culture and work. *Related value in India*, 5(8):40-45.
 66. Samantha, D.J. (2009). *The production engineering and management in Delhi, India*. New York: McGraw- Hill Edition.
 67. Sean, C. D. (1999). *The grievance procedure, the heart of the collective agreement*. Canada: Publications Orders: 613 533-6709. Industrial Relations Centre.

68. Salamon, M. (2010). Industrial relations. London: Prentice Hall, 96. 3(7):14-19.
69. Sharma, B. R. (1993). Organization determinants of supervising. *Management Relations*, 4(6):20-29
70. Sickles & Zelenyuk (2019). Measurement of productivity and efficiency theory and practice. 1(5):80-
85. New York: Cambridge University press, (2019), ISBN 1139565982.
71. Suwati, Minarsih & Gagah (2019). Grievances and Dissatisfaction. Sociological work related issues, New York: Mc graw- Hill 6th
72. Tiwari, M. Y., Singh, S.(2014). An Analysis And Interpretation On Grievance Handling Procedure, In Selected Cellular Provider Companies. *Ijsrr.Co.In*.
73. Tiwaria & singh (2019), " grievance matters and Representatives." *Sociological Journal* 4(9). 39-50.
74. Toru, p. (2016). productivity and Process. *Production journal* 3(8):40-45. New York: Cambridge University press, (2019), ISBN 1139565982.
75. Wable, S. (2017). A Study on the Awareness and Satisfaction Level of Grievance Handling Mechanism. Birla Precision Limited, Aurangabad.
76. Waktola, Al-omari & Okasheh (2019). Work Relationship between and among Employees and Employers. *Labour relation journal*, 9 (3), 13-15.