A STRATEGIC ANALYSIS OF WORKPLACE GRIEVANCE RESOLUTION AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM THE FEDERAL AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF NIGERIA

Adeshola Oluwaseyi Peter[1]*, Charles Adefikayo Jimoh[2], Fred Ojochide Peter[3], James Aransiola Ishola[4] & Bunmi Sarah Adeoti[5]

[1,2,4,5]Department of Business Administration, Thomas Adewumi University, Oko-Irese, Kwara State, Nigeria

[3]Department of Business Management, MIVA Open University, Yaba, Lagos State, Nigeria

*adeshola.peter@tau.edu.ng

ABSTRACT: Unaddressed employee grievances lower morale, disrupt harmony, and reduce productivity, yet many organisations overlook effective grievance management. This study investigates the impact of employee grievances on organisational performance, focusing on the Federal Airports Authority of Nigeria (FAAN) in Lagos State. It focuses on leadership style, communication, and employee relations as key dimensions influencing productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. Using a quantitative approach, data were collected through structured questionnaires from 75 of 80 sampled employees and analysed with regression models. Findings reveal significant positive relationships between leadership style and organisational productivity, as well as employee relations and organisational effectiveness, while communication enhances efficiency. The study concludes that unresolved grievances hinder performance with emphasis on the need for proactive grievance management. It recommends regular reviews of organisational policies and practices to identify and address employee concerns, thereby promoting harmony, boosting morale, and fostering a supportive work environment that enhances overall productivity and effectiveness.

Keywords: Employee Grievances, Employee Relations, Leadership Style, Organisational Performance, Organisational Productivity

Background to the Study

Harmony in the workplace is a critical factor in improving employee morale, organisational effectiveness and productivity. As such, grievances have become a significant concern within the organisation as employees can be unhappy due to a decision the management has made, a policy in place or conditions of service (Obiekwe & Eke, 2019). Organisations' reactions to such complaints rely on the sort of management system, scale of the organisation, educational level of their employees, technological advancement, and level of labour unionisation (Wilton, 2019). Within modern organisations, workers should be given a chance to voice their discontent with any aspect of their work, particularly in democratic workplaces. An employee grievance is the complaint of an employee who feels he has been treated unfairly by management or circumstances at work, an "injustice" that is felt by the worker, whether objectively present or not, in the employment relationship (Maiwada & Oshionebo, 2024). Employees are the most important asset of any organisation, so their knowledge, skills and commitment are essential to its success. Therefore, employee satisfaction is considered a key component in enhancing the overall performance and maintaining organisational success (Bryson et al., 2017). As Harrison and Wielga (2023) say grievances arise when staff members object to an organisation's policy or decision they feel is unfair or arbitrary. Likewise, Armstrong and Taylor (2023), states that grievances tend to occur when management fails to honour agreements made with the employees or their representatives. Typical complaints include poor performance reviews, being passed over for a promotion, salary disagreements, and conflicts with others. Furthermore, small issues at work that involve taking credit for others' ideas and interrupting others can generate conflicts within the organisation (Mikkelsen & Humle, 2020). Grievances, if not addressed promptly, could further escalate into conflict, which can have an adverse impact on employee morale, commitment and productivity, leading to an impact on organisational performance (Igbinoba et al., 2022). Organisations need to ensure they have sound grievance-handling processes in place to address employee concerns in a timely and equitable manner, thereby maximising organisational performance. The key benefits of effective grievance resolution include enabling management to gauge employees' attitudes and perceptions of the organisation's policies, facilitating communication between employees and management, and identifying practices that could be affecting the organisation's effectiveness (Khuwaja, Ahmed, Abid, & Adeel, 2020). The findings from this study will contribute to management literature and provide practical guidance for organisations seeking to enhance performance through effective leadership, employee relations, and organisational communication. The current study aims to analyse the effect of grievance handling in the workplace on organisational performance. Based on the foregoing, this study sought to ascertain the impact of leadership style on organisational productivity, examine the effect of employee relations on organisational effectiveness, and determine the impact of communication on organisational efficiency. In line with these objectives, the study tested the following null hypotheses: leadership style has no significant impact on organisational productivity, employee relations do not have a significant effect on organisational effectiveness, and Communication has no significant impact on organisational efficiency.

Statement of Problem

Employee relations play a significant role in human resource management, and many companies do not have any formal grievance handling methods, so employee grievances are not addressed (Obiekwe, 2019). It has been cited that grievance management has a negative impact on productivity, employee absenteeism, indiscipline, work quality, and employee morale, which affects organisational performance (Obiekwe & Eke, 2019). Likewise, ineffective grievance management has been linked to lower worker commitment and loyalty in industrial and educational settings (Nosike et al., 2023). When grievances are not addressed, they can turn into a workplace issue, resulting in dissatisfaction, decreased motivation, attendance problems, and diminished job performance (Sharma, 2021). Workplace grievances are indeed important for the success of an organisation; therefore, it is important that organisations pay attention to workplace grievances strategically to maintain productivity and competitiveness (Hartadi & Sujoko, 2025; Yertas, 2024; Azmy, 2023). The workplace, though, remains a challenging environment due to the continuous evolution and change in the business world, and effective grievance resolution is increasingly crucial. In this study, the effect of workplace grievance management on organisational performance is explored by evaluating the effect of leadership style on organisational productivity, employee relations on organisational effectiveness and communication on organisational efficiency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concepts of Grievances

A grievance is described as any unhappiness or displeasure stemming from a sense of injustice or a conviction that it has occurred to workers or a group of workers in relation to the workplace (Opatha, 2019). When a worker's right at the workplace is infringed by management, the author intended for readers to understand that employees are often non-managerial workers who are union members. Conflicts over how the joint negotiating arrangement should be interpreted, possible violations of federal or state rules, infractions of previous corporate regulations, or infractions of leadership's obligations can all result in grievances (e.g., provision of a healthy working environment). An administrative procedure, method, or management practice which causes displeasure or distress is the subject of a grievance. This grievance may be submitted by an employee or by the union, whether or not it is justified (Costello, 2024). A formal complaint made to a union official or the proper management representative is what Armstrong and Taylor (2023), characterise as a grievance. They also give two terms that are distinct from grievance terminology: displeasure and complaint. Whatever makes a worker uneasy, whether they express it verbally or in writing, is considered discontent. A complaint is when an employee brings their discontent to the manager (Neall, Li & Tuckey, 2021). In their opinion, a grievance is a formal complaint made by the affected employee to the proper manager or a union representative.

Employee Relations and Management

Chalmers (2016) claims that organisational fairness, which comprises organisational culture, management systems, and complaint and dispute firmness procedures, is a template that governs interactions among management and employees. Employee relations, according to Marginson (2015), is the study of the regulations that control how employees are treated both individually and collectively. According to Marginson (2015), employee relations mean that a wider range of employment opportunities are covered, with equal importance given to white-collar jobs and non-union work arrangements. Al Doghan and Zakariya (2023) made the case that the socio-economic bond that forms and revolves around a contract between the parties to perform labour in exchange for job benefits like income is what employee interactions are all about. Brhane and Zewdie (2018) state that employee relations encompass interactions and communication that aid employees in achieving adequate performance and productivity, job satisfaction, enthusiasm, and drive. According to Uchendu, Omomo and Esiri (2024) the following factors support good employee relations in an organisation: employee involvement and empowerment; employee suggestions; measures for handling disputes and grievances; facilitation of collective bargaining; professional training and development; encouragement of teamwork; and open communication.

Leadership Style and Organisational Performance

It is impossible to overstate the significance of leadership, the lifeblood of any business. Despite numerous authors having studied these phenomena, there is little agreement on the best ways to develop and use leadership, no clear definition of it, and no dominant model for analysing it (Day et al., 2014). Leadership, according to Yukl & Gardner (2020), is the capacity to manage a team of subordinates in a way that affects the decisions made by another individual or group. The collection of traits, skills, abilities, and behaviours that leaders utilise to interact with their subordinates is referred to as their leadership style. Leadership is a style of administrative behaviour intended to combine organisational and personal interests in the pursuit of certain goals (Mohammed et al., 2014). Thakur, Verma, and Sharma (2019) described a leadership style as a form of interaction in which an individual uses their techniques to persuade a sizable group of people to work together to accomplish a task. Recent leadership studies (Nanjundeswaraswamy et al., 2024; Avolio & Bass, 2022; Northouse, 2021; Tao et al., 2021) have outlined the five leadership philosophies of charismatic leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, visionary leadership, and culture-based leadership. Northouse (2021) also lists four leadership philosophies that have been widely embraced and used.

Labour Union and Management

Communication with labour unions refers to the exchange of information, ideas and negotiations between an organisation and a labour union representing its employees (Hodorogea & Căşvean, 2021). Employees typically seek assistance from unions if they do not receive organisational justice (Kochan et al., 2023). Employees, management, and unions make up the labour relations system, and the government has an impact on how these three parties interact (Gasparri & Tassinari, 2020). The union and the employer share a common interest, which should result in wise and respectful agreements. An amicable conclusion is secured when all parties demonstrate a sincere interest in the company's continued economic growth and the welfare of its employees, as well as when they approach their interactions with one another with courtesy and a spirit of cooperation (Geary & Signoretti, 2022). The majority of unions share a few common goals in general. The first goal of unions is to obtain "more" for their members. Samuel Gompers made this point very obvious, and George Meany just reaffirmed it. Higher pay, more holidays, vacations, pensions, and other financial perks are what unions really mean by "more." Nothing is wrong with unions striving to get better benefits for their members.

Relationship between Employee Grievance and Employee Performance

The output or outcomes that a person has attained might be thought of as their employee performance. It is the level of performance that an employee achieves when compared to other employees. Each individual's performance contributes to the group's performance, which in turn contributes to the entire company's performance. The existence and productivity of companies depend heavily on their human resources. Any management team will benefit from the ability of management to ensure that employee grievances are handled impartially, justly, and equitably since good handling of employee grievances ensures a friendly connection between workers and management (Ahmed, Khan, Thitivesa, Siraphatthada & Phumdara, 2020). When management and employee relationships are positive, employees become more devoted, which leads them to put in more effort, boosting performance. Any type of grievance has an effect on employee performance, and since grievance management explicitly addresses issues impacting employees, it might also have an effect on productivity (Obiekwe, 2019). Suppressed worker grievances have been connected to workplace accidents, absenteeism, strikes, different sorts of industrial disturbance, low morale, and a loss in employee commitment. Employee morale and commitment increase as a result of implementing employee grievance management, and corporate citizenship behaviour even begins to show.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Procedural-Distributive Justice Theory (John Rawls, 1971)

The concept of procedural-distributive justice, often known as organisational justice, concerns how employees assess whether they have been fairly treated and how this affects organisational functioning domains such as job satisfaction, commitment, and disengagement. The 1970s and 1980s due process approach, which focused on the degree to which orderly and fair procedures supply elements like punctuality and impartiality, was partially followed by organisational justice (Brest, 2020). While justice theory has applications for grievance initiation, it has primarily been used for grievance processing. When workers feel they have been treated properly, they will engage in organisational pro-social actions. Retaliatory actions against the employer may result from what is seen to be unjust treatment on the other side of the coin (Racabi, 2022).

Equity Theory

The Equity Theory posits that employees are motivated when they perceive fairness in the relationship between their contributions (inputs) and the rewards (outputs) they receive relative to those of others (Adams, 1963; Adams, 1965; Miner, 2015). Inputs refer to the resources individuals contribute to their work, such as skills, knowledge, experience, time, effort, and commitment, while outputs include rewards such as salary, recognition, promotion, autonomy, and other benefits. Employees compare their input–output ratio with that of relevant referents, who may be colleagues performing similar roles or individuals with comparable responsibilities. When employees perceive equity, they are more likely to remain motivated, satisfied, and committed, which ultimately enhances organisational performance (Adams, 1963; Adams, 1965; Miner, 2015). The Procedural–Distributive Justice Theory (Rawls, 1971) is the theory that ultimately underpins this study. This is because workplace grievance resolution depends largely on employees' perceptions of the fairness of grievance procedures (procedural justice) and the fairness of outcomes or decisions reached (distributive justice). When employees perceive both the process and outcomes as fair, trust, commitment, and cooperation are strengthened, resulting in improved organisational performance. Since the study focuses on how grievance resolution influences organisational performance, this theory provides a more comprehensive explanation than Equity Theory, which primarily emphasises fairness in the distribution of rewards relative to individual inputs.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology adopted for this study is a quantitative research design. The choice of a quantitative approach was based on its objectivity and suitability for statistical testing. The study population comprised 85 staff members of the Federal Airports Authority of Nigeria (FAAN), specifically those working in the human resources department of the international airport terminal. The study used a census approach given the limited nature of the population, i.e. the whole population forms the sample size for the study. 10 staff members of the Federal Airports Authority of Nigeria (FAAN) were out of reach as at the time the questionnaires were distributed, which explains the ten-respondent gap. Of the 75 questionnaires distributed, 70 were completed and returned, resulting in a 93% response rate. The data for the study were collected from primary sources using structured questionnaires. The questionnaire was designed using a five-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1), to capture the degree of agreement or disagreement with various statements. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before data collection, and participation was entirely voluntary. The confidentiality and anonymity of participants were strictly maintained throughout the study. 70 respondents participated in the study. Of which, 37 (52.3%) were male and 33 (47.7%) were female, indicating a nearly balanced gender distribution. The majority of respondents (35.4%) were aged 30–39 years, while the 50–59 years age group had the fewest respondents (18.5%). The remaining percentage are of age 40-49 and 29 and below. The research instrument also drew insight from textbooks, online sources, and related literature to enrich the content and validity of the items. The reliability of the research instrument was tested using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. The reliability analysis confirmed that the research instrument was highly reliable, with a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.913, indicating strong internal consistency amongst the measurement items. The obtained reliability coefficient indicated that the instrument was reliable and suitable for data collection. Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between employee grievances and organisational performance. Regression analysis was deemed appropriate as it provides predictive insights and reveals the strength and direction of the relationship between the variables.

TEST OF HYPOTHESES AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.913	22

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The reliability statistics of the research instrument used in this study are presented in Table 1. As shown in the results, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the 22 items in the questionnaire is 0.913. This value exceeds the generally accepted value of 0.70, indicating a very high internal consistency of the instrument. This finding suggests that the constructs measured by the instruments used in this study are consistent and reliable for assessing the variables examined in the study. Hence, the instrument can be used for further statistical analysis, and the resulting data can be trusted for analysis and interpretation to draw valid conclusions about the relationship between the resolution of grievances in the workplace and organisational performance.

Objective 1: To ascertain the impact of leadership style on organisational productivity.

Hypothesis 1: Leadership style has no impact on organisational productivity.

Table 2: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.903[a]	.816	.813	1.02679
a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership				

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The model summary for the regression analysis used to examine the influence of leadership style on the productivity of the organisation is presented in Table 2. The resultant correlation coefficient (R) is 0.903, showing the positive correlation between leadership style and the productivity of the organisation is very high. This means that there is a strong correlation between an improvement in leadership practice and a rise in productivity in the organisation. Moreover, the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.816, demonstrating that about 81.6% of organisational productivity variations are accounted for by leadership style. It has a very high explanatory power, which suggests that leadership plays a significant role in determining productivity in the organisation studied. The adjusted R^2 value of 0.813 further verifies the robustness of the model, which indicates that the model is well fitted, and degrees of freedom have not been overestimated. In addition, the standard error of the estimate (1.02679) is relatively low, indicating that the model has a good predictive power and the observed values are near the predicted values.

Table 3: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	317.579	1	317.579	301.222	<.001[b]
	Residual	71.692	68	1.054		
	Total	389.271	69			

a. Dependent Variable: productivity
b. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) for testing the overall significance of the regression model is shown in Table 3. The result shows that the regression is statistically significant, F statistic = 301.222, p-value is less than 0.001. What this indicates is that the model has a high level of confidence, and the leadership style can predict organisational productivity. The large F-value shows that the amount of variation measured by the model is significantly larger than the amount not measured by the model, and so the model should be a good representation of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. That is, the chance of obtaining such a result is very small and gives strong evidence of the impact of leadership style on productivity.

Table 4: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.306	.413		.740	.462
	Leadership	.516	.030	.903	17.356	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Productivity

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The regression model coefficients are given in Table 4, which gives detailed information about the nature and significance of the relationship between leadership style and organisational productivity. Based on the above result, leadership style has a positive and statistically significant connection with productivity, with a beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.903$) and p-value less than 0.001. This implies that, for each unit increase in some leadership practice, there is a corresponding increase in the productivity of the organisation. The unstandardised coefficient ($B = 0.516$) also suggests that with an increase of one unit in leadership style, productivity will be increased by about 0.516 units, given that all other factors remain unchanged. The t value is extremely high (17.356) to support the statistical significance and strength of the relationship. Nonetheless, leadership style does not meaningfully influence team productivity ($B = 0.306$, $p = 0.462$).

Objective Two: To examine the effect of employee relations on organisational effectiveness

Hypothesis Two: Employee relations do not affect organisational effectiveness

Table 5: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.276[a]	.076	.063	2.04476

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Relations

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The regression analysis with which the effect of employee relations on organisational effectiveness was tested is presented in the model summary in Table 5. The correlation coefficient (R) was 0.276, meaning there is a weak but positive relationship between employee relations and organisational effectiveness. This indicates that better employee relations are related to higher levels of organisational effectiveness, but that the correlation is not strong. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.076, indicating that 7.6% of the variation in the organisational effectiveness can be explained by employee relations. This means that although employee relations make an impact, 92.4% of the difference in effectiveness is caused by some other reasons that are not measured in the model. The value of adjusted R^2 of 0.063, after controlling for the degrees of freedom and number of samples, is an additional confirmation of the small power of the model. Also, the standard error of the estimate (2.04476) is quite larger as compared to the objective one, indicating that the model has less predictive power.

Table 6: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23.533	1	23.533	5.628	.021[b]
	Residual	284.310	68	4.181		
	Total	307.843	69			

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Relations

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The overall significance of the regression model is tested by analysis of variance (ANOVA), which is shown in Table 6. The result shows that the model is statistically significant with an F-statistic of 5.628 and a p-value of 0.021, which is lower than the significance level of 0.05. This suggests that although the relationship between employee relations and organisational effectiveness is relatively weak, it still positively predicts organisational effectiveness. The results of statistical significance mean that the relationship observed is not likely to have been a coincidence, and thus the model is valid. The overall explanatory power of the model (F value) is, however, relatively low when compared to Objective One, indicating that the model has limited overall explanatory power. Thus, although ERs can have an impact on organisational effectiveness, other organisational factors can also be important in explaining the outcomes of effectiveness, and are not exclusive or the most important.

Table 7: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.338	.793		5.469	<.001
	EmployeeRelations	.121	.051	.276	2.372	.021

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The regression coefficients are detailed in Table 7 and indicate detailed information about the impact of employee relations on organisational effectiveness. The findings obtained indicate that employee relations have a positive and significant impact on organisational effectiveness with a standardised beta coefficient ($\beta = 0.276$) and p-value of 0.021. This means that when employee relations improve, so will organisational effectiveness, but the impact of employee relations is not that great. The unstandardised coefficient ($B = 0.121$) shows that for a one-unit increase in employee relations, the effectiveness coefficient increases by 0.121, while controlling for other factors. The value of t is 2.372, which again supports the statistical significance of the relationship. However, the constant term ($B = 4.338$, $p < 0.001$) is statistically significant and indicates that organisational effectiveness is present even when there is no strong employee relations, which may be related to other organisational structures or processes.

Objective Three: To determine the impact of communication on organisational efficiency

Hypothesis Three: Communication does not have significant impact on organisational efficiency.

Table 8: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.885[a]	.784	.780	1.11115

a. Predictors: (Constant), Communication

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The regression model for the study on the influence of organisational communication on organisational efficiency is shown in Table 8. The results reveal a very high positive correlation between communication and organisational efficiency ($R = 0.885$). This translates to better communication systems being closely linked to higher levels of efficiency in the organisation. Approximately 78.4% of the variation in organisational efficiency is explained by communication, as determined by the coefficient of determination (R^2). This indicates a high explanatory power, which means that communication is an important factor in the organisation's efficiency. The adjusted R^2 value of 0.780 also confirms the reliability and stability of the model, suggesting that the model is not over-fitting the data, even after considering the sample size and degrees of freedom. Also, the standard error of the estimate (1.11115) is relatively low, implying that the forecasted values are close to the experimental values, indicating good predictive accuracy.

Table 9: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	304.116	1	304.116	246.318	<.001[b]
	Residual	83.956	68	1.235		
	Total	388.071	69			

a. Dependent Variable: efficiency
b. Predictors: (Constant), Communication

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the overall significance of the regression model is presented in Table 9. The F-statistic value is 246.318, and the significance level (p-value) is < 0.001. This means the regression model is very statistically significant and organisational communication is a good predictor of organisational efficiency. The large F-value indicates that the model significantly accounts for a large percentage of the discrepancy as related to the variance not explained, thus providing evidence for the strength and validity of the relationship between communication and efficiency. The p-value is very small, meaning that the chance of obtaining this result is very low, which lends good support to the validity of the model.

Table 10: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	-2.130	.575		-3.707	<.001
	Communication	.435	.028	.885	15.695	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: efficiency

Source: Author's Computation (2026)

Table 10 shows the regression coefficients, which give insight into the size and direction of the relationship between communication and organisational efficiency. The standardised β coefficient (0.885) and the extremely low p value (<0.001) indicate that communication has a positive and statistically substantial impact on efficiency. This means the greater the effective communication, the greater the efficiency of the organisation. A one-unit increase in communication will lead to a 0.435 increase in efficiency (other factors remain constant), as represented by the unstandardised coefficient (B = 0.435). The t value is 15.695, which is extremely high and thus highlights the strength of the relationship and its statistical significance. Interestingly, the constant term is negative (B = -2.130) and statistically significant, indicating that if there was no effective communication, the efficiency of the organisation would be quite low.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Regarding objective one, it is clear from the regression analysis that leadership style has a highly significant effect on the productivity of the organisation. Findings revealed a highly positive correlation between leadership style and productivity, as the R-value is 0.903 and the R^2 value is 0.816, indicating that leadership style explains about 81.6% of the variation in organisational productivity. In addition, ANOVA revealed the significance of the regression equation, and also the coefficient analysis showed the positive effect of leadership style on productivity. Thus, it is evident that the null hypothesis stating that leadership style does not have any impact on organisational productivity is rejected. It means that good leadership styles, including participative decision making, solving problems promptly, motivating employees, and proper handling of conflicts, play a crucial role in enhancing the productivity of the organisation. The finding is consistent with the study of Mohi Ud Din and Zhang (2025), who found that effective leadership significantly enhances organisational performance by fostering employee trust, psychological safety, and innovation. Their study concluded that organisations with effective leadership practices experience higher levels of employee effectiveness and overall organisational productivity. As concerns objective two, the data show that there is a significant positive impact of employee relations on organisational effectiveness. Even though this relationship is slightly less powerful compared to the relationships between leadership and communication and organisational effectiveness, it is shown by the regression analysis that employee relations have a significant predictive power in terms of effectiveness. As it is seen from the R^2 value, 7.6 percent of the variability in organisational effectiveness can be explained by employee relations. At the same time, the coefficient analysis demonstrates a positive link between the two variables. Thus, the null hypothesis suggesting that employee relations do not affect organisational effectiveness was rejected. Good communication between managers and workers, treatment of workers, teamwork, and proper complaint handling can lead to higher organisational effectiveness. The result is consistent with the study of Anitha (2014), who reported that while employee relations have a positive effect on organisational effectiveness and employee performance, the magnitude of the relationship is relatively modest when compared with other organisational factors such as leadership, training, compensation, and work environment. This supports the present study's finding that employee relations positively influence organisational effectiveness, although the explanatory power of the relationship is weak. For objective three, communication was found to have a very strong impact on organisational efficiency in this research. There is a very strong correlation between communication and efficiency since the regression model showed a relationship between the two variables with an R-value of 0.885 and an R^2 value of 0.784, indicating that communication explains about 78.4% of the variance in organisational efficiency. ANOVA tests revealed that the regression model has a high level of significance, and coefficient tests show that effective communication positively impacts organisational efficiency. Therefore, the hypothesis that there is no significant impact of communication on organisational efficiency was rejected. It is evident from this result that an organisation needs to have an efficient communication system for coordination, clarity, better employee relations and efficiency. The finding is consistent with the study of Maiwada and Oshionebo (2024), who found that internal communication has a significant positive influence on organisational performance by improving employee engagement, coordination, and workplace relationships. The study concluded that organisations with effective communication systems are more likely to achieve higher levels of efficiency and overall performance. This supports the present study's finding that organisational communication is a strong predictor of organisational efficiency. Workplace grievance handling has been found to be another factor that has a great impact on organisational performance. Leadership style and communication were found to be very important factors for productivity and efficiency, respectively, while employee relations were found to positively contribute to organisational effectiveness.

Conclusion and Recommendation

In this paper, the effects of workplace grievance resolution on the performance of organisations have been explored, particularly, the effects on leadership style, employee relations and internal communication. It is clear from the results that workplace grievance resolution processes significantly affect the productivity, effectiveness and efficiency of organisations. For the first objective, it has been shown through regression analysis that leadership style has a very strong positive and substantial effect on organisational productivity. That means that 81.6% of the variation in productivity is caused by leadership style and the hypothesis testing has confirmed that leadership has a weighty impact on organisational productivity. This means that leadership practices which include fast decision making, employee participation and appropriate conflict management are important to enhance the productivity of organisations. For the second objective, the results have shown that employee relations have a positive and substantial effect on organisational effectiveness. Though the model has weak explanatory power, it has been confirmed that good employee relations have a significant effect on organisational effectiveness. This means that cordial relations between management and employees along with fairness in dealing with employees are important to achieve organisational goals. For the third objective, the results have shown that communication has a very strong positive and significant effect on organisational efficiency. In fact, 78.4% of the variation in organisational efficiency is caused by communication. It is clear from the results that open communication, proper feedback and interaction of management and staff and labour unions improves greatly the level of efficiency and performance of the organisation. Therefore, it can be concluded that the leadership style, the relationship of employees and the communication are important dimensions of workplace grievance resolution that have considerable influence on the performance of organisations. In light of the findings made above, it is suggested that management adopts the participative and transformational leadership styles that will make possible employee participation in decision making, prompt grievance handling, and efficient supervision in order to increase the productivity of organisation and its performance in general. It would be useful for management to develop good communication channels in order to promote feedback and proper dialogue and exchange of information between employers and employees as well as labour unions in order to improve the organisational efficiency. However, the study was conducted in a single organisation, and the data were obtained through self-reported questionnaires, which may be subject to response bias. Further studies could adopt longitudinal research designs and include organisations from different sectors to validate and extend the present findings.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*(5), 422–436.

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic

Ahmed, T., Khan, M. S., Thitivesa, D., Siraphatthada, Y., & Phumdara, T. (2020). Impact of employees' engagement and knowledge sharing on organizational performance: Study of HR challenges in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Human Systems Management, 39*(4), 589–601.

Al Doghan, M. A., & Zakariya, A. (2023). Human resource economics: Impact of social and economic factors on employer–employee relationship. *International Journal of Economics and Finance Studies, 15*(1), 490–509.

Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 63*(3), 308–323.

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (16th ed.). Kogan Page.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2022). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership: Cases on transactional and transformational leadership*. Psychology Press.

Azmy, A. (2023). The roles of organizational commitment, emotional intelligence, and job satisfaction for improving employee performance at a construction company. *Binus Business Review, 14*(3), 307–319.

Brest, P. (2020). The outcomes movement in philanthropy and the nonprofit sector. In W. W. Powell & P. Bromley (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (3rd ed., pp. 381–408). Stanford University Press.

Brhane, H., & Zewdie, S. (2018). A literature review on the effects of employee relation on improving employee performance. *International Journal in Management and Social Science, 6*(4), 66–76.

Bryson, A., Forth, J., & Stokes, L. (2017). Does employees' subjective well-being affect workplace performance? *Human Relations, 70*(8), 1017–1037.

Chalmers, S. (2016). Ethical fairness in financial services complaint handling. *International Journal of Bank Marketing, 34*(4), 570–586.

Costello, K. (2024). United Kingdom legal influence and Irish unfair dismissals law. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations, 40*(2).

Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 63–82.

Gasparri, S., & Tassinari, A. (2020). "Smart" industrial relations in the making? Insights from analysis of union responses to digitalization in Italy. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations, 75*(4), 796–817.

Geary, J., & Signoretti, A. (2022). The role of socio-economic embeddedness in promoting cooperation in the workplace: Evidence from family-owned Italian firms. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 43*(4), 1630–1652.

Harrison, J., & Wielga, M. (2023). Grievance mechanisms in multi-stakeholder initiatives: Providing effective remedy for human rights violations? *Business and Human Rights Journal, 8*(1), 43–65.

Hartadi, A., & Sujoko, S. (2025). The importance of improving employee performance through optimizing job training, work motivation and work ethic: A literature review. *Jurnal Orientasi Bisnis dan Entrepreneurship, 6*(1), 10–23.

Hodorogea, V., & Căşvean, T. M. (2021). Rethinking the communication with the unions members in the new context. *Lumen Proceedings, 17*, 308–317.

Igbinoba, E. E., Osibanjo, A. O., & Salau, O. P. (2022). Crystalising grievance management strategies and performance of selected manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 21*(S3), 1–16.

Khuwaja, U., Ahmed, K., Abid, G., & Adeel, A. (2020). Leadership and employee attitudes: The mediating role of perception of organizational politics. *Cogent Business & Management, 7*(1), Article 1720066.

Kochan, T. A., Fine, J. R., Bronfenbrenner, K., Naidu, S., Barnes, J., Diaz-Linhart, Y., ... Twiss, D. (2023). An overview of US workers' current organizing efforts and collective actions. *Work and Occupations, 50*(3), 335–350.

Maiwada, A. A., & Oshionebo, B. (2024). *Exploring the potential of internal communication and employee relations for effective staff performance in Nigeria Customs Service*. *Human Resources Management and Services, 6*(4).

Marginson, P. (2015). The changing nature of collective employment relations. *Employee Relations, 37*(6), 645–657.

Mikkelsen, E. N., & Humle, D. M. (2020). Dynamics of overt and covert conflict in organizations: The power of organizational identity. *Group & Organization Management, 45*(6), 768–807.

Miner, J. B. (2015). *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Mohammed, U. D., Yusuf, M. O., Sanni, I. M., Ifeyinwa, T. N., Bature, N. U., & Kazeem, A. O. (2014). The relationship between leadership styles and employees' performance in organizations: A study of selected business organizations in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria. *Leadership, 6*(22), 1–11.

Mohi Ud Din, Q., & Zhang, L. (2025). Leadership impact on innovation: A sequential mediation of trust and safety. *Work, 80*(4), 1990–2004.

Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., Nagesh, P., Bharath, S., & Vignesh, K. M. (2024). Leadership theories and styles: A systematic literature review and narrative synthesis. *Human Resources Management and Services, 6*(3), Article 3477.

Neall, A. M., Li, Y., & Tuckey, M. R. (2021). Organizational justice and workplace bullying: Lessons learned from externally referred complaints and investigations. *Societies, 11*(4), Article 143.

Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Nosike, C. J., Nosike, O. S., & Agagwuncha, U. C. (2023). Effect of employee grievance on performance of higher institution: A study of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria. *Journal of the Management Sciences, 60*(5), 159–170.

Obiekwe, O., & Eke, N. U. (2019). Impact of employee grievance management on organizational performance. *International Journal of Economics and Business Management, 5*(1), 1–10.

Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2019). Defining a grievance: A theoretical examination of an old issue. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management, 9*(1).

Pande, S., & Hossain, N. (2022). *Grievance redress mechanisms in the public sector: A literature review*. Open Government Partnership & Accountability Research Center.

Racabi, G. (2022). Abolish the employer prerogative, unleash work law. *Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, 43*, 79–126.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Sharma, N. (2021). Grievance adversely affects organizational relations and productivity. *Journal for Innovative Development in Pharmaceutical and Technical Science (JIDPTS), 4*(3).

Tao, Y., He, J., Wang, Y. F., & Ke, H. (2021). Strategic leadership: A bibliometric analysis on current status and emerging trends. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership, 10*(4), 422–437.

Thakur, D. J., Verma, P., & Sharma, D. (2019). Influence of leadership style: A review. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, 28*(20), 945–952.

Uchendu, O., Omomo, K. O., & Esiri, A. E. (2024). Strengthening workforce stability by mediating labor disputes successfully. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Development, 20*(11), 998–1010.

Wilton, N. (2019). *An introduction to human resource management* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Yertas, M. (2024). The role of training and continuous development in improving employee productivity and its impact on company financial performance. *Atestasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi, 7*(2), 1362–1379.

Yukl, G., & Gardner, W. L. (2020). *Leadership in organizations* (9th ed.). Pearson.