

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Currently, organizations recognize the significance of Employee Participation in achieving organizational objectives. Many companies that adopt a participative management approach have experienced notable advancements in reducing operational costs, increasing profit margins, and enhancing work productivity. Employee Participation offers individuals the opportunity to shoulder job responsibilities and engage in joint decision-making for the overall well-being of the organization (Management Study Guide, MSG, 2016).

In recent times, decision-making authority in some firms is based on the level of confidence placed in specific roles. This empowers employees to make recommendations and contributions essential for attaining organizational objectives. Employee involvement has demonstrated both positive and negative impacts on organizational success. According to research conducted by Management Study Guide (2016), Employee Participation has elevated individuals' job satisfaction levels. When employees feel involved in the decision-making process, they are motivated to perform effectively, thereby contributing to the organization's goals and objectives. Employee involvement is recognized as a significant contributor to organizational success.

A study conducted by Cooke (1994) involving 841 companies in Michigan, USA, highlighted the positive impact of Employee involvement on firm performance, including increased output, improved quality, and reduced time. It plays a crucial role in enhancing organizational decision-making capabilities, attitudes toward work, employee well-being, and overall productivity in the organization (Jones, Kalmi, & Kauhanen, 2010).

In essence, employees distinguish themselves from other resources due to their ability to evaluate and question management's actions. Their commitment and cooperation need to be earned. Consequently, employees require cultivation, motivation, and encouragement not only to fulfill their responsibilities but to excel at them. This is primarily achieved through employee involvement and participation. A forward-looking business involves its employees in vital decisions that affect them, fostering trust and inclusion at all levels of decision-making (Singh, 2009; Kingir and Mesci, 2010). Employee involvement in decision-making cultivates a sense of belonging among workers and creates a conducive environment in which both management and workers contribute voluntarily to healthy industrial relations (Noah, 2008). Employee participation in decision-making serves as a motivational measure appreciated by employees, positively influencing their sense of belonging and organizational productivity (Blaim, 2010).

Employees, as individuals within an organization, bring emotional values, ethics, and needs to the workplace, which influence their attitudes and overall performance. According to McGregor's Theory X, humans inherently dislike work and must be motivated to exert adequate effort for organizational success. Participative decision-making involves allowing employees to contribute their opinions on matters related to their work in the organization.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Manufacturing firms in Nigeria, like other organizations, grapple with issues related to participative management and organizational productivity. Some manufacturing firms in Nigeria implement participatory decision-making practices, and the government has previously encouraged such participation through legislative initiatives.

Wachira (2013) explored the correlation between employee engagement and commitment in the banking industry. The study found that employee engagement and commitment could be established through factors such as job satisfaction and the employee-manager relationship. While this previous study focused on employee engagement levels and job satisfaction, the current study aims to investigate the impact of employee involvement on job performance.

Identifying gaps in knowledge and recognizing the crucial role employees play in organizations, the researcher was motivated to address these issues by examining employee participation in decision-making. The investigation will specifically focus on aspects such as employee consultation, involvement, delegation, engagement, and commitment concerning organizational productivity within the context of the 7up Bottling Company in Ilorin.

Given the significance of these problems, this study aims to determine the extent of participative decision-making practices within 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin, and assess its influence on productivity. Additionally,

the research will endeavor to identify both the benefits and challenges arising from the implementation of such participatory practices.

1.3 Research Questions

- i. What is the influence of participative decision-making on organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin?
- ii. How does employee involvement in decision-making contribute to organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin?
- iii. What impact does employee engagement have on organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin?

1.4 Research Objectives:

- i. To ascertain the impact of participative decision-making on organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin.
- ii. To identify the factors causing low employee involvement or participation in decision-making in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin.
- iii. To assess the effect of employee engagement on organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin.

1.5 Research Hypotheses:

H01. Participative decision-making has no significant impact on organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin.

H02. There is high employee involvement or participation in decision-making in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin.

H03. There is no significant effect of employee engagement on organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in delineating the advantages of the research, identifying the beneficiaries, and elucidating the nature of the benefits, as well as specifying who and how they stand to gain. This research is poised to serve as a valuable resource in the realm of literature, particularly for future studies in human resources and related fields. It facilitates robust data collection, thereby paving the way for the attainment of specific goals.

Furthermore, the study aims to contribute to the existing body of knowledge by shedding light on various decision-making techniques capable of enhancing organizational performance. This not only broadens the academic understanding of the subject but also provides practical insights for implementation in organizational settings.

Additionally, the research emphasizes the inclusion of stakeholders in the decision-making process within organizations. This inclusive approach ensures that employees feel an integral part of the decision-making machinery, fostering a sense of ownership and commitment. By involving employees in the decision-making process, the organization is better positioned to realize its predetermined goals and objectives.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This research specifically concentrates on examining the impact of employee participation in decision-making on organizational performance. The study utilizes Coca-Cola Bottling Company in Ilorin as a case study, with a specific focus on full-time workers within the organization.

1.8 Definition of Terms

Management: Coordinating work activities so that they are completed efficiently and effectively with and through other people.

Employees: Are organized person employed to work in an organization. (Davis 2001). An employees is someone hired by an employer under a contract of employment of performance work on a regular basis.

Participation: Is the act of taking part in an activity or event. It also a style of managing in which the supervisor gives the direction but decision is made by consensus participation as a management style was adopted in 1961 by RensisLikert of the University of Michigan.

Employees participation: Is a special form of delegation which the subordinate gain greater control, greater freedom of choice with respect to bridging the communication gap between the management and the workers (Noah 2008) it also soliciting for the view of the employees in decision making process.

Decision making: Is the process of selecting the alternative course of action from available alternative in order to achieve a given objective.

Organizational performance: Is the level of productivity on organization experience in the course of carrying out its functions and activities.

Effectiveness: Is the attainment of predetermined goal. It also a way of doing the right thing.

Productivity:It is an organization ability to transform input into output at the lowest possible cost (Ewulum and Unamaka 2002). It is also the rate of good which a company or worker produces and the amount produced compared with time work and money is need to produce them. So, it is a measure of the work efficiency of an individual work unit or entire organization.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual review

2.1.1 Definition of Employee Participation and Decision Making

According to Sofijanov and Chatleska (2013), employee participation is the process of involving and empowering employees on the job to channel their efforts towards achieving higher individual and organizational performance. Employee participation is further defined as the direct engagement of employees to assist an organization in fulfilling its mission statement and meeting core objectives and values by applying their own innovations, expertise, and efforts to solve problems and make decisions (Bullock & Powell, N.Y., 2015). Similarly, Westhuizen (2010:11) defines employee participation as "the entirety of forms, whether direct (personal or by the employee) or indirect (through the legislative body of the employees), by which persons, groups, or collectives safeguard their welfare or contribute to the decision-making process." Additionally, Bardwell and Claydon (2007) define employee involvement as the distribution of power between employers and employees in the decision-making process of the firm, either through direct or indirect participation. Employee participation in decision-making at the firm is also referred to as the grouping of task-related practices aimed at increasing employees' sense of participation in their workplace and their commitment to the wider organization (Busck et al., 2010; Bhatti & Nawab, 2011).

Abdulrahman (2016) examined employee participation in decision-making (PDM) and firm performance using a Descriptive Survey Design. The study, which collected data through a validated piloted questionnaire administered to 341 manufacturing firms, revealed a positive and significant relationship between employee participation in decision-making and firm performance.

Nuzhath (2014) studied employee participation and its impact on performance through a Descriptive Survey Design, utilizing questionnaires administered to team leaders in various BPOs of different companies and service sectors. The study found a significant link between employee participation in decision-making and performance within the organization.

Vrba and Brevis (2002) defined decision-making as the process of selecting the best method for solving a problem, while Irawanto (2015) investigated employee participation in decision-making in a state-owned enterprise in Indonesia, revealing a positive significant relationship between participation in decision-making and motivation.

Isichei and Godwin (2015) conducted research on decision-making and the hospitality industry in Nigeria, using a descriptive method and questionnaire to show that employee participation in decision-making had a substantial impact on hotel performance.

Dede (2019) explored employee participation in decision-making and organizational productivity, employing a Qualitative Data Collected Approach through primary data and questionnaires. The results demonstrated that employee participation in decision-making facilitated a conducive working environment, increased worker commitment and satisfaction, and ultimately boosted productivity within the organization.

Effective decision-making is crucial for managers at all levels in the organization, involving the planning, organizing, staffing, controlling, and directing of activities to achieve targeted objectives (Eromafuru, 2016). While top management typically handles strategic decisions, other organizational members make decisions relevant to their needs, emphasizing the importance of effective decision-making throughout the management process.

The significance of employee participation in decision-making is underscored as a process of sharing information, advice, and suggestions among members of an organization. It allows employees to have a voice in

shaping decisions that affect them, signifying a sharing process between managers and employees, with the latter exerting upward control over management decisions (Eromafuru, 2016). The recognition of employee participation as a managerial tool contributes to organizational performance by aligning the shared goals of employees and employers, allowing workers to contribute to the development of mission statements, policies, procedures, pay determinations, promotions, and perks (UK Essays, 2013). The growing emphasis on employee participation in decision-making reflects its role as a driving force behind employee voice, a concept increasingly acknowledged in management scholarship.

2.1.2 Employee Participation Indicators

Employee Participation is apprehensive with mutual decision making in the organization between employee and employer. It shows how businesses can advance their performance by engaging employee interest and dedication (Cotton, 1993). Employee participation indicators include the following; employee motivation, organizational structure and employee commitment

a. Employee motivation

By definition, motivation is as an internal or external driving moral that produces individual readiness to execute an action to an extreme (Nnabuike, 2009). According to the researcher, the driving force comes from an individual who motivates him/her to begin an action until the task is completed or achieved. On the other hand, Motivation has to do with why individuals behave the manner they do. It is an important organizational process because employees carry out a lot of tasks which in turn influences organizational productivity.

Armstrong (2009) motivation is concerned with the strength, behaviors and factors that sway people to behave in certain ways. In the author argument he says that motivation encompasses the goal individual set to achieve and the way individual choose their goals in the organization. Motivating people is about getting them to move in the direction you want them to go in order to achieve a desired result. Employees are motivated when they know that a path of action is likely to lead to the accomplishment of a goal and a valued reward.

Motivation, regardless of explanation is an essential driver used by employees. In fact, according to Mitchell (1982, p.81) motivation is so essential that it is often recognized as a “psychological process that causes the arousal, direction, and persistence of deliberately actions that are goal directed”.

b. Employee Commitment

Employee Commitment is defined as a state of psychology or sense of duty that characterizes employee relationship on carrying out work task (Manning & Curtis, 2009). It refers to an oath or guarantee that binds employee with others on accomplishing work task. Employee commitment is very important because of its requirement in increasing the standard task of organizational performances. It showed the extent to which employee's visualized with organizational mission statement and encourage it efficiently.

c. Organizational Structure

Organizational structure is described as a system that shows hierarchical power that flows from upper management level to subordinate management level. It is a structure by which tasks or coursework are shared, allocated and harmonized among firm's associate. Put differently, it is a way in which different sub-units are arranged and interrelate with each other (Chiekezie, Nzewi&Orogbu, 2008). Organizational structure also refers to the official and managerial arrangement between personnel and groups as regards to the dividing of tasks, responsibilities and power within the firm (Galbraith, 1987; Greenberg, 2011).

Organizations exist to achieve its setting goals. These goals are classified into tasks or function required for the task and it is usually grouped into departments. Most departments in some firms are grouped into; marketing, sales, human resource, manufacturing, advertising, among others. Within each department, even more distinctions are found between the jobs people perform. Departments are linked to form the organizational structure. The organization's structure gives it the form to fulfill its function in the environment (Nelson & Quick, 2011).

2.1.3 Challenges of Employee Participation in decision making

According to Lawler (1992), just as it is true with total quality management, there is no single authority source or theory to support employee involvement as a management approach. It has a long history dating back to early research work which was done on democratic leadership in work organizations. That research work, which started in 1930s, emphasized the consequences of employees being involved in decision making. It shows that

under certain conditions employees are more committed to decisions and that better decisions are made if they are involved. Before implementing an empowerment program, you should understand the positive and negative consequences of employee empowerment.

Employees that are allowed to make their own daily operating decisions can alter the way their jobs are performed to create a more efficient workplace. When employees are allowed to innovate the way, their jobs are performed they can create cost and time-saving processes that benefit the company. One of the negative consequences of empowerment is departmental segmentation. Work groups or individuals that are allowed to deal with their own daily work issues can become indignant of co-workers or other departments, according to the Management Study Guide website empowered employees and work groups to feel as though they no longer need to take direction from management. This creates a company consisting of individuals or work groups achieving their own goals without much direction from the company.

A management team is put in place by a company to use company policies and procedures to guide the staff toward completing performance goals. When you empower your employees to look after their own daily tasks, there is a risk of failure. The empowered employees may not feel that they need to reach out to management for guidance, or the employees could be performing work tasks in an unsatisfactory manner without realizing it because they have no manager to keep them focused. Management should monitor employee performance and step in to assist employees that are falling short of their goals before productivity is significantly affected; some of the challenges facing employee participation in decision making are;

a) Manager-Employee Boundary; Potential challenge of encouraging employee involvement is the risk that the line of distinction between the management level and employee level becomes blurred. Though managers may value employee involvement, a disciplined structure with clear reporting lines has long been vital to stability in organizations. Allowing employees to share ideas and make decisions without having them push the envelope and try to take on responsibilities that are reserved for management levels is a real risk (Manning & Curtis, 2009).

b) Community Complexity; More lines of communication and the potential for inconsistent decision making are disadvantages with employee involvement systems. When more employees have input and decision-making ability, more communication is necessary to make certain that decisions are consistent across the organization. This consistency is critical to brand recognition and consistency. Managers may have a hard time monitoring decisions and activities with employee involvement to protect against negative consequences and to restrict the potential for chaos (Ewulum and Unamaka 2012).

c) Education level; Different employees at different levels have different education level Employees with higher education levels tend to participate more in decision making due to the confidence they have and knowledge about work related rights whereas less educated employees are ignorant and less confident (Kaplan & Norton, 2015).

d) Job experience; When an employee takes more time in an organization they tend to know and learn more of employees' rights and responsibilities in an organization hence enabling them to effectively participate in decision making whereas new employees with no experience have that fear of participating in decision making due to lack of enough exposure (Isichei and Godwin, 2015).

2.1.4 Measures to the challenges of employee participation in decision making

A common misconception by management is that participation in decision making involves simply asking employees to participate or make suggestions. In order for good decisions to be made by employees during decision making process, effective programs must be undertaken to ensure efficient and effective decision. In order to achieve effective participatory decision making by employees, managers need to approach the method of employee's participation in decision making with an open mind. With this mechanism, even though not all suggestions or ideas will be agreed upon, it however paves way for creativity and innovation. Employees should also be willing to participate in decision making process.

Employees will only be able to make the right decisions if they have acquired the right skills and knowledge concerning those decisions to be made. Management or managers who want to practice participatory decision making must provide employees with the necessary training, information or knowledge so they can make effective and efficient decisions. It is known that employees may not participate in decision making process because they lack the necessary skills or knowledge. Most researchers such as Colombo and Stanca, Sepulveda (2015) and Konings and Vanormelingen (2009) shows that training is a fundamental and effectual instrument in successful accomplishment of the firm's goals and objectives resulting in higher productivity. Helms (2006) explains that through training, development opportunities and information sharing, employees can acquire the conceptual skills needed to become effective managers and also increases the commitment of employees to the organization and the decisions they make. Pashiardis (1994) in the article "Teacher Participation in decision making" notes that for participation in decision making to be successfully implemented, policy has to be changed to support this approach. He further added that time, resources, participatory involvement and support will determine the effectiveness of participation and recommends training to enable members participate effectively. There must stakeholders support before action is required as appropriate in emergency situations.

There should be a systemic balance of cultural, ideological and labor relations environment by ensuring there is no conflict of interest whatsoever that has the tendency to create fear and distrust among the employees of a given organization. In this employee participation in decision making will be enhanced. There is need to ensure that employees feel that their jobs are not at risk when they express their opinions, which should be based on a cordial working relationship with respect to employees right in the organization. Many employers tend to threaten their employee's positions when they discuss about the challenges of the organization hence hindering their participation in decision making.

A well structured human resource policy that seeks to recognize performance and encourage improve performance. This policy can help lay structures to be undertaken by employees to participate in decision making without fear or threat from their employers. There should be strategic organizational measures imbedded in the leadership style that creates team spirit, group cohesiveness and teamwork. These can help leaders guide the employees on the procedures to be undertaken in participating in decision making for the organization. There should be a manufacturing strategy that is conducive to participation. Decision making process should be systematic, strategic and structured for easy implementation. Employees must be integrated in the organization, their job must provide a sense of excitement, and they must see management as working in their interest so as to propel favorable disposition to work, in ensuring efficiency is improved the participation of employees should not just be partial but holistic to give them a sense of belonging. Finally, management must make it a part of its standard policy to ensure all staff opinions, suggestions, view are subjected to their merit and accepted where applicable.

2.1.5 Organizational Performance

Jones and George (2009) define organizational performance as the measure of how a manager utilizes the resources of the organization efficiently and effectively to accomplish the goals of the organization as well as satisfy its stakeholders. When managers are dedicated and skillful in carrying out specific roles, it helps to make things happen. Managers influence performance by defining objectives, recognizing and minimizing obstacles to the achievement of these objectives, and effectively planning, organizing, leading and controlling all available resources to attain high levels of performance (Duening & Ivancevich, 2003). Moses (2009) outlined some indices of organizational performance. They include: Profit, Performance, Sales and Market Share, Customer Service and Achievement of goals. Most common indexes of organizational performance are return on assets. It is calculated by dividing the annual profit by the average asset over the year. Duening and Ivancevich (2003) define Performance as the relationship between real inputs and real outputs; a measure of how well resources are combined and utilized to produce a result desired by management.

Although many indices of workplace Performance disregard the goals of the Organization, Moses (2009) believes it is also very important. This is because in a focal year, an Organization might want to invest in expensive technology that can enhance Performance in the future. The Profit of the particular year might be

negligible yet the Organization may have fulfilled its objectives. Organizational Performance comprises the actual output or results of an organization as measured against its intended outputs. Organizational performance encompasses three specific areas of firm outcomes: financial performance, product market performance and shareholders returns. The notion of organizational performance is affiliated to the endurance and success of an organization. In recent years, many organizations have attempted to manage organizational performance using the balance score card methodology where performance is tracked and measured in multiple dimension such as financial performance (shareholders return, customer service, social responsibility, corporate citizenship etc.).

A balance score card proposed by (Kaplan & Norton, 2012) is used to measure the organization performance. Performance is a comprehensive measure that can include performance, quality, consistency, and so on. On the other side, performance indicators may also involve (criterion-based) results, behaviors and (normative) relative measures, concepts of education and training and instruments, involving management development and leadership training for developing attitudes of performance management and essential skills (Richard, 2002). Balance Scorecard is the one of most critical tool which provides help or frame work to ensure that the strategy is translated into rational set of Chukwuemeka Int. J. Business & Law Research 8(3):79-88, 2020 83 performance measurement (Kaplan & Norton, 2012). The performance measurement system assists in enhancing organization association to achieve goals and objectives in a successful manner.

(Ittner&Larcker, 2008) The strategic planning that is based on development of objectives assist organization to emphasize on non-financial or intangible assets. The quality, performance and services associated with customers have financial features. The financial and non financial reward management systems are made possible through the measurement and evaluation of performance measurement system (Kaplan & Norton, 2012). According to (Chavan, (2009), and Johnsen, (2001) said that an essential element of the Balance Scorecard technique is the feedback and learning part, where an organization is able to measure, where organization is building its strategic capability, in the scenario of its current performance, and possible dynamic business situations. This data makes the leadership capable to analyze whether the organization is on right track and if there is need of any change. If there is need of change, the need has to be in the definition of the objectives, the path of the journey, or to rebuild the initiatives developed to enhance the capability.

2.1.6 Employee Participation and Organizational Performance

As mentioned earlier, Employee Participation is a special form of entrustment in which the subordinate gain greater control, freedom of choice with respect to bridging the communication gap between the management bodies and employee. It refers to the degree of employee participation in organizational strategic planning activities (Noah, 2008). Beardwell and Claydon (2007) also pointed that, Employee Participation also involves the sharing of power between management bodies and workers in decision making processes, either through direct or indirect participation. Participation in decision making encourages the involvement of manpower at all levels of an organization to analyze problems from different perspective, develop new strategies, and implements solutions in the workplace (Busck et al. 2010). It gives employees the chance to use their human capital or intellectual capital, to improve quality of decision making in the organization.

Organizational Performance is described as outcome of input as a result of setting a goals and objective of an organization by upholding mission statement as guarding principle to achieving the stated goals. (Richard et al. 2009). It consists of three specific areas of an organizational outcomes: (a) financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on investment); (b) product market performance (sales, market share); and (c) shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added).

Participative decision making helps to enhance organizational performance in the organization, both employers and employees needs to be actively involved in decision making in the organization so as for the organization to witness increased performance in the organization, effective and efficient utilization of resources is key when the employer and employee involves in participative decision making.

Employee involvement is key to the success of any organization when the employees are being carried along in the decision making of an organization they won't act against the will of such organization. Employees being involved in decision making will reduce conflict in the organization i.e. while being involved in decision making any decision that will affect them negatively will be rejected and this will give room for industrial harmony and will promote peace in the organization.

Employees will be willing to perform well so as the organization should achieve its organizational goals and objectives, but only when they are engaged when employee engagement is taken and seen as a key priority in the organizations the goals and objectives of the organization will be achieved effectively and efficiently.

Employee participation is key to the success of any organization, for any organization or establishment to have very good performance it has to make sure employee are involved the decision making process this will give a sense of being carried along to the employee, and with this the employee will perform at a very high level, not only being carried along but also being engaged before and after making the decision, when employee are properly involved in decision making process the organizational performance will be very high and this will lead to effective and efficient achievement of the organizational goals and objectives.

2.2 Theoretical review

2.2.1 Management by Objective (MBO)

Management by objectives (MBO) is a process of agreeing upon objectives within an organization so that management and employees agree to the objectives and understand what they are (Drucker, 1964). Managers must avoid the 'activity trap' of being busy with day to day activities; they must remain focused on their purpose. Drucker "management by objectives" (MBO) has been implemented to great effect in many organizations. Recognizing that objectives for MBO must be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-specific) is essential to success (Drucker, 1964). According to Drucker, managers should adopt the goal of lower-level management, senior managers when the organization established the organization goal, they must be effectively broken down into various departments, as well as the individual sub goals, the manager under sub-targets in the right lower for assessment of performance management by objectives is the essence of the value-oriented, management by objective makes the whole company, each department, each person can have in advance a clear quantifiable targets, things they can check the evaluation, and afterwards they can reward and punishment honored to achieve a comprehensive, fair and interactive Management.

MBO is designed to improve the management process and maximize the effectiveness of the members of individual teams (Drucker, 1964).

MBO is meant to help the employee assess and prioritize efforts to make certain those efforts are focused on the bottom line and organizational values. The process also helps the team understand what the organization does not value and what it may not need to do any more. (Drucker, 1964).

2.2.2 Equity theory

Equity theory is concerned with the perceptions people have about how they are treated as compared to others. Equity theory proposes that a person's motivation is based on what he or she considers being fair when compared to others (Redmond, 2010). As noted by Gogia (2010), when applied to the workplace, equity theory focuses on an employee's work-compensation relationship as well as that employee's attempt to minimize any sense of unfairness that might result. When compared to other people, individuals want to be compensated fairly for their contributions. A person's beliefs in regards to what is fair and what is not fair can affect his motivation, attitude and behavior. Employees who feel unfairly treated may be compelled to seek for better opportunities elsewhere.

2.2.3 Expectancy theory

Expectancy theory provides an explanation of why individuals choose one behavioral option over others. The basic idea behind the theory is that people will be motivated because they believe that their decision will lead to their desired outcome (Redmond, 2010). Expectancy theory proposes that work motivation is dependent upon the perceived association between performance and outcomes and individuals modify their behavior based on their calculation of anticipated outcomes (Chen & Fang, 2008). This theory is built upon the idea that motivation comes from a person believing they will get what they want in the form of performance or rewards. The theory states that individuals have different sets of goals and can be motivated if they believe that:

- (i) There is a positive correlation between efforts and performance.
- (ii) Favorable performance will result in a desirable reward.
- (iii) The reward will satisfy an important need.

The desire to satisfy the need is strong enough to make the effort worthwhile (Lawler, Porter & Vroom, 2009). Thus, employees who feel their expectations are not being met may be compelled to seek for better opportunities elsewhere, where they feel their expectations would be met.

Therefore, for the purpose of this study the management by objective theory will be adopted because this allows for the employer and employee to set goals and objectives together and this gives room for employees to be actively involved in decision making in the organization by doing so the organization will experience productivity because the employee will be willing to work and ensure effective utilization of resources so as the organization to achieve its goals and objectives.

2.3 Empirical Review

Numerous researchers have researched on the relationship between Employee Participation in decision making and Organizational Performance. This has created both positive and negative point of view in the literature. Some of these researches conducted from different part of the world including Nigeria are reviewed below:

Irawanto (2015), examined employee participation in decision-making: evidence from a state-owned enterprise in Indonesia. The researcher employed descriptive statistics which data source was through primary with the aid of questionnaire. The study was subjected into multi regression analysis using SPSS software. The result from the research showed that there is a positive significant relationship between participation in decision making and motivation in state owned enterprise in Indonesia.

Similarly, Ojokuku and Sajuyigbe, (2014), studied the Effect of Employee Participation in Decision Making on Performance of Selected Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Lagos, Nigeria. This study made use of primary data which was obtained with the help of structured questionnaire. Total number of one hundred and fifty-six (156) questionnaire were administered to the selected small and medium scale enterprises in Lagos Nigeria, 127 went to the employees and the remaining 29 went to the owners of the businesses. The study used Product-moment Correlation and Simple Regression as the mode of analysis. The study revealed that employee participation in decision making have highly influence on the impact of organizational performance of the SMEs.

Isichei and Godwin, (2015) conducted on a research on Decision making and the hospitality industry in Nigeria, a study of selected hotels in the federal capital territory in Abuja. The study adopted descriptive method and data were sourced through primary means with the help of questionnaire. It used Multiple Regression method of analysis to generate result. The findings from the result showed that employee participation in decision making had great impact on the performance of hotels in Nigeria.

Abdulrahman (2016) examined Employee Participation in Decision-making (PDM) and Firm Performance. The study employed Descriptive Survey Design; and its data were collected through validated piloted questionnaire which were administered through mail to Three Hundred and Forty-One (341) manufacturing firm. The result of the study revealed that there is a positive significant relationship that exist employee participation in decision making and firm performance.

Nuzhath (2014) studied Employee participation and its impact on their Performance. The researched employed Descriptive Survey Design; the data were sourced through questionnaire which was administered to employees (team leaders) of the BPOs of different companies and service sectors. The findings in different BPOs revealed that an excellent performance of the organization and employer-employee relation depends highly on employee participation in decision making. Based on that, the study conducted stated clearly that there is greater significant link between employee participation in decision making and their performance towards the

Organization.

Dede (2019) examined Employee Participation in Decision Making and Organizational Productivity: Case Study of Cross River State Board of Internal Revenue, Calabar. The Qualitative Data Collected Approach was employed by the researcher of this study which is the use of primary data with the help of questionnaire. The

result showed that employees participate in the decision making of the organization becomes easy and creates a good working environment, increase worker's commitment and satisfaction on decisions taken and also increase employee's moral since they feel recognized and part of team players in the organization and direct consequences of all these increase productivities within the organization.

2.4 Research Gap

This review various research on employee participation in decision making on organizational performance. This study would attempt to fill in the gap where previous scholars have not touched. There haven't been comprehensive studies on employee participation in decision making on organizational performance. Also the researcher aims to investigate the impact of participative decision making, employee involvement and employee engagement on decision making in the organization and how they affect organizational performances.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the method and procedure that will be adopted in carrying out this study. It comprise the research design, area of study, population of the study, sample size and sampling techniques, sources of data, research instrument, validation of the instrument, reliability of the instrument, procedure for data collection and method for data analysis

3.1 Research Design

The design that will be adopted for this study is descriptive research design of survey type. The researcher will describe the characteristics of population under study. This research design is considered appropriate for this study because it will allow the researcher to collect personal and general information for the purpose of explaining the **Effect of employee participation in decision making on organizational performance (A case study of 7up bottling company, Ilorin.)**

3.3 Population of the Study

The population for this study shall consist of all full time staffs (255) either male or female in the **7up bottling company, Ilorin** branch who is willing and able to participate in the study.

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The sample size and technique that will be used for this study will be the Taro Yamane sampling techniques.

The formula state thus:
$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N \times (e)^2}$$

n= the sample size

N= the population size

e= the acceptable sample error

$$n = \frac{255}{1 + 255 \times (0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{255}{1 + 255 \times (0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{255}{1 + 0.6375}$$

$$n = \frac{255}{1.6375}$$

$$n = 155.7252$$

$$n = 156$$

3.5 Sources of Data

Primary data will be employed. The Primary data assisted in addressing the specific objectives set out in the study. The data will be collected with the help of questionnaire. The questionnaire will comprise of close ended questions.

3.6 Research Instrument

This study will utilize a researcher-designed questionnaire with structured items to examine the impact of employee participation in decision-making on organizational performance. The questionnaire comprises two sections, labeled as A and B. Section A will center on collecting demographic data from the respondents, while Section B will contain items related to the effect of employee participation in decision-making on organizational performance. The questionnaire will employ a four-point Likert scale, encompassing response options such as "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree" for the items inquired.

3.7 Reliability of the Instrument:

To determine the reliability of the instrument, the researcher will use the Cronbach Alpha (α) to measure the constructs. However, if the Cronbach Alpha value exceeds 0.60, then the instrument is deemed reliable for the study.

3.8 Procedures for Data Collection

A letter of introduction will be obtained by the researcher from the Department, signed by the Head of Department, Industrial Relations and Personnel Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Ilorin. This will enable the researcher to gain access to the respondents for the purpose of instrument administration and data collection. The data collection technique that will be used in gathering information on this research is the Questionnaire. Questionnaire is a primary source of data. The researcher will make sure that the questionnaires were collected immediately to avoid loss of the instrument.

3.9 Method of Data Analysis

The data collected for this study will be subjected to appropriate statistical analysis. Section A will be analyzed using descriptive statistics of frequency and percentage, while inferential statistics will be used.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presented the statistical analyses and all technicalities used to validate the results and findings for the study in effect of employee participative decision making on organizational productivity in 7upBottling Company Ilorin. The inferential statistics was used to test the stated null hypotheses using Regression analysis while descriptive analysis was used to answer the already stipulated research questions using relative frequencies tables, mean, standard deviation and percentage analysis techniques. The feedback of the quantitative data analysis were coded and reported by SPSS, while hypotheses testing was done using the statistical tools already stated in the previous chapter of the study. Furthermore, to determine whether the fixed or random quantitative data approach should be adopted, this study carried out a fixed redundant test which established that there is nexus between the employee participative and the organizational productivity.

4.2 Demographic Profile

This section presents the socio-demographic information of the respondents in frequencies tables and percentages. The study found it crucial to provide evidence of demographic data since it was deemed that such information was a clear indicator of factors that may influence employee participative in decision making and organizational productivity in 7upbottling Company Ilorin. The analysis relied on this demographic profile so as to made proper justification for its relevance in gathering the objective responses of the study.

Table 4.2.1 Gender distribution

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Male | 99 | 63.5 | 63.5 | 63.5 |
| Female | 57 | 36.5 | 36.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

The male respondents were the majorities representing 63.5% of the total staff strength of the selected company while the female minority is 36.5%. This is an indication that both genders were involved in this study and thus the finding of the study did not suffer from gender bias. However, the selected company passed the minimum 30% constitution gender rule in favour of female in production industry

Table 4.2.2 Age distribution

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 25-34 years | 76 | 48.8 | 48.8 | 48.8 |
| 35-44 years | 71 | 45.8 | 45.8 | 94.6 |
| 45 years & above | 9 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

76 respondents representing 48.8% were between the age group between 25-45 years, 71 respondents representing 45.8% were between the age group of 35-44 years, while 9 respondents represent 5.4% were the age group of 45 years and above. This directly implies that the active workforce of the selected company cut across different age group but mostly in the age bracket 25-34 years. This age differences enhance efficiency and job satisfaction among peer in selected company.

Table 4.2.3: Marital status

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Singled | 116 | 74.4 | 74.4 | 74.4 |
| Married | 20 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 87.2 |
| Divorced | 13 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 95.2 |
| Separated | 7 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

The Marital status distribution of respondents as presented in Table 4.2.3 shows that 116 out of the 156 respondents are singled which representing 74.4% of respondents, 12.8% of respondents are married, 13 respondents representing 8% are divorcees, while 7 respondents represent 4.8% are separated. By implication it means that the study cut across all the marital status which means the industrial policy of the case study favour the singled majorities. This enhances objective responses of the study.

Table 4.2.4 Educational Qualification

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SSCE/NECO/GCE | 11 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| OND | 15 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 16.6 |
| BSc/HND | 27 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 33.9 |
| M.Sc | 63 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 74.3 |
| Ph.D | 40 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

The educational profile indicates 6.7% of respondents are holders of high school certificate, 15 respondents representing 9.9% are diploma holders, 27 respondents representing 17.3% are degree holders, 63 respondents representing 40.4% are master's degree holders while 40 respondents representing 25.7% are holders of Ph.D. This directly implies that the selected company has a good record of high numbers of educated staff who have procedural knowledge of employee participative in decision making.

Table 4.2.5: Department

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Quality Control | 49 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.1 |
| Marketing | 52 | 33.7 | 33.7 | 64.8 |
| Production | 55 | 35.2 | 35.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.2.5 aimed to illustrate the distribution of staff across various departments at 7UP Bottling Company, highlighting the roles prioritized by employees in the quality control, marketing, and production units. Among the respondents, 49 individuals, accounting for 31.1%, were affiliated with the quality control department. The marketing staff constituted 52 respondents, representing 33.7%, while the production staff comprised 55 respondents, making up 35.2% of the total. This indicates that the study involved participants from all departments, ensuring a comprehensive representation of opinions across various units. This approach promotes fairness and allows for a diverse range of perspectives on the discussed topic.

SECTION B: Perceptions of Respondents on Participative Decision Making and Organizational Performance

Thus, perceptions of respondents on organizational performance were score from agreed (5) to disagree (1) on a five-point likert scale, with 5 signifying the maximum scoring in organizational performance. The mean-ranking is equal to the proportion of respondents who agreed as par a construct in employee participation resulting to organizational performance. The statistic column actually shows the values obtained from the frequencies, using the dataset produced by the bootstrapping algorithms. The parametric mean $\mu=4.2391$ was found between the pendulum of bootstrap confidence interval for the mean $4.1130 < \mu < 4.3574$ and the standard error ($s.e=0.0583$), suggested that typically the respondents agreed that participatory decision making fosters collaboration, which leads to improved organizational performance.. Also, respondents equally revealed that employee retention leads to improved employee performance, and this helps achieve improved organizational performance on weighted average mean $\mu=4.2870$ found between the pendulum of bootstrap confidence interval for the mean $4.1643 < \mu < 4.4096$ and the standard error mean $=0.0599$. The parametric mean score $\mu=4.0913$ that employee participation breaks down communication barriers, resulting in improved organizational performance was found between the pendulum of $3.9528 < \mu < 4.2130$ and the standard error is 0.0673 . Productivity and quality increase as a result of employee participation, which contributes to improved organizational performance has an opinion sample mean $\mu=4.3348$, found between pendulum of $4.2295 < \mu < 4.4565$ and the standard error is 0.0565 while the mean score $\mu=3.9783$ on the perception of effective employee engagement leads to high organizational performance was found between $3.8286 < \mu < 4.1140$, with a standard error of 0.0781 .

This invariably means that all standard error are too small and that the views of respondents on the average are not affected by chance. However, these mean scores are affected by outliers because some standard deviations spread out, meaning that the consistency is higher in the respondents' opinion that the productivity and quality increase as a result of employee participation, which contributes to improved organizational performance, due to lower standard deviation ($sd=0.88958$) compared to other constructs in the mean ranking test. Based on this result, the mean ranking score of the five statements are above the cut-off point of 3.00, suggesting that survey participants do anticipate the possibility that Productivity and quality of work increase as a result of employee participation, which contributes to improved organizational performance in selected company. Therefore, this is sensitive to further investigate the dimensions of employee participative decision making that in actual sense affects organizational performance among employees of 7up company in this model. This was evidently shown in the answer to the research questions in percentage analysis further explained in table 4.3 below:

4.3 Section B: Data Analysis According to the Research Questions

RQ1: What is the effect of participative decision making on organizational performance in 7up bottling company Ilorin?

Table 4.3.1 Participative decision making helps a company gain employee retention

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 49 | 31.7 | 31.7 | 31.7 |
| A | 6 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 67.3 |
| U | 12 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 75.0 |
| D | 16 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 85.6 |
| SD | 23 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

55 respondents representing 67.3% indicate that participative decision making helps a company gain employee retention, 12 respondents representing 7.7% were neither agreed nor disagree while 39 respondents representing 25% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (67.3%) that participative decision making helps company gain employee retention.

Table 4.3.2 Participative decision making promotes collaboration

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 63 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 40.4 |
| A | 46 | 29.8 | 29.8 | 70.2 |
| U | 14 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 78.8 |
| D | 25 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 95.2 |
| SD | 8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.2 revealed that participative decision making promotes collaboration. 63 respondents representing 40.4% agreed strongly on the statement, 46 respondents representing 29.8% agreed, 14 respondents representing 8.7% neither agree nor disagree, 25 respondents representing 16.3% disagree, while 8 respondents representing 4.8% strongly disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence from the opinion of majorities (70.2%) claiming that participative decision making promotes

Table 4.3.3 Increased team morale is achieved through a participative decision making

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 26 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.3 |
| A | 79 | 51.0 | 51.0 | 67.3 |
| U | 15 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 76.9 |
| D | 24 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 92.3 |
| SD | 12 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.3 show that 26 respondents representing 16.3% agreed strongly that increased team morale is achieved through a participative decision making. 79 respondents representing 51% agreed on the statement, 15 respondents representing 9.6% claimed neither neither agree nor disagree, 24 respondents representing 15.4% disagree while 12 respondents representing 7.7% indicate strongly disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the clam of majorities (67.3%) that increased team morale is achieved through a participative decision making in the workplace.

Table 4.3.4 When people participate in a planning process, they are certainly more likely to be committed to the plan

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 23 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 14.4 |
| A | 75 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 62.5 |
| U | 18 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 75.0 |
| D | 23 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 89.4 |
| SD | 17 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.4 provides ratings that when people participate in a planning process, they are certainly more likely to be committed to the plan. 45 respondents representing 14.4% agreed strongly that when people participate in a planning process, they are certainly more likely to be committed to the plan, 75 respondents representing 48.1% agreed on the claim, 18 respondents representing 12.5% neither agree nor disagree 23 respondents representing 14.4% disagree while 17 respondents claimed extremely disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to support the opinion of majorities (62.5%) claiming that when people participate in a planning process, they are certainly more likely to be committed to the plan

Table 4.3.5 A firm or organization can uncover creative solutions as a result of participative decision making

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 43 | 27.9 | 27.9 | 27.9 |
| A | 48 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 58.7 |
| U | 24 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 74.0 |
| D | 14 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 82.7 |
| S | 27 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.5, show that 91 respondents representing 58.7% indicate that a firm or organization can uncover creative solutions as a result of participative decision making. Forty-eight (48) respondents representing 15.4% were neither agreed nor disagree while 41 respondents representing 26% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (58.7%) who agreed that the organization can uncover creative solutions as a result of participative decision making

RQ2: How would employee involvement in decision making contribute to organizational performance in 7up bottling company, Ilorin?

Table 4.3.6 Product quality can be achieved when employees are involved in decision making

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 39 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| A | 66 | 42.3 | 42.3 | 67.3 |
| U | 16 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 77.9 |
| D | 24 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 93.3 |
| SD | 11 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.6 reveal that 105 respondents representing 67.3% indicate that product quality can be achieved when employees are involved in decision making, 16 respondents representing 10.6% were neither agreed nor disagree while 35 respondents representing 22.1% disagree on the claim that product quality can be achieved when employees are involved in decision making. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the

opinion of majorities (67.3%) who agreed that the product quality can be achieved when employees are involved in decision making

Table 4.3.7 Employee involvement leads to high productivity

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 76 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 |
| A | 36 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 72.1 |
| U | 11 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 78.8 |
| D | 13 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 87.5 |
| SD | 20 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.7 show that 112 respondents representing 72.1% indicate that employee involvement leads to high productivity in the workplace, 11 respondents representing 6.7% were neither agreed nor disagree while 33 respondents representing 21.2% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (72.1%) who agreed that employee involvement leads to high productivity

Table 4.3.8 Employee participation in decision making leads to reduction and efficient use of resources

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 34 | 22.1 | 22.1 | 22.1 |
| A | 63 | 40.4 | 40.4 | 62.5 |
| U | 14 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 71.2 |
| D | 21 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 84.6 |
| SD | 24 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.8 shows that 97 respondents representing 62.5% agreed that employee participation in decision making leads to reduction and efficient use of resources, 14 respondents representing 8.7% were neither agreed nor disagree while 45 respondents representing 28.9% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (62.5%) who agreed that employee participation in decision making leads to reduction and efficient use of resources.

Table 4.3.9 Companies build a stronger community through employee participation

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 84 | 53.9 | 53.9 | 53.9 |
| A | 18 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 65.4 |
| U | 18 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 76.9 |
| D | 40 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 89.0 |
| SD | 16 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.9 shows that 102 respondents representing 65.4% indicate that companies build a stronger community through employee participation, 18 respondents representing 11.5% were neither agreed nor disagree while 56 respondents representing 35.6% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (65.4 %) that companies build a stronger community through employee participation

Table 4.3.10Effective communication is benefited or achieved through mutual participation in decision-making

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 38 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| A | 51 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 56.7 |
| U | 25 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 83.0 |
| D | 25 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 99.3 |
| SD | 17 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.10 shows that 89 respondents representing 56.7% agreed that effective communication is benefited or achieved through mutual participation in decision-making, 25 respondents representing 16.3% were neither agreed nor disagree while 42 respondents representing 27% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (56.7%) who agreed that effective communication is benefited or achieved through mutual participation in decision-making in 7upNigeria Plc.

RQ3: What is the effect of employee engagement on organizational performance In 7up bottling company Ilorin?

Table 4.3.11 Adoption of incentive and reward strategies in your organization has helped employees to be more engaged in their work.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 35 | 22.1 | 22.1 | 22.1 |
| A | 54 | 41.1 | 41.1 | 63.2 |
| U | 8 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 68.3 |
| D | 28 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 86.5 |
| SD | 21 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.11 show that 89 respondents representing 63.2% agreed that adoption of incentive and reward strategies in your organization has helped employees to be more engaged in their work, 8 respondents representing 11.5% were neither agreed nor disagree while 49 respondents representing 31.8% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (56.7%) that there is strong adoption of incentive and reward strategies in your organization which has helped employees to be more engaged in their work.

Table 4.3.12There is an effective leadership role that consequently improves employee engagement in your organization.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 38 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| A | 46 | 29.8 | 29.8 | 53.8 |
| U | 23 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 68.3 |
| D | 28 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 86.5 |
| SD | 21 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.12 show that 84 respondents representing 53.8% agreed that there is an effective leadership role that consequently improves employee engagement in your organization, 23 respondents representing 14.4% were neither agreed nor disagree while 49 respondents representing 31.8% disagree on the claim. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (53.8%) that there is an effective leadership role that consequently improves employee engagement in your organization.

Table 4.3.13Effective and efficient employee engagement leads to high organizational productivity

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 24 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 15.4 |
| A | 60 | 38.5 | 38.5 | 53.8 |
| U | 33 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 75.0 |
| D | 24 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 90.4 |
| SD | 15 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.13 revealed that 84 respondents representing 53.8% indicate that effective and efficient employee engagement leads to high organizational productivity, 33 respondents representing 21.2% neither agreed nor disagree while 39 respondents representing 25% disagree. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (53.8%) that effective and efficient employee engagement leads to high organizational productivity

Table 4.3.14Training and career development helps employees in an organization to build more confidence in their work.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 15 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 |
| A | 75 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 57.7 |
| U | 24 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 73.1 |
| D | 31 | 20.2 | 20.2 | 93.3 |
| SD | 11 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 312 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.14 shows that 90 respondents representing 57.7% indicate that training and career development helps employees in an organization to build more confidence in their work, 24 respondents representing 15.4% neither agreed nor disagree while 42 respondents representing 26.9% disagree. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (57.7%) that training and career development helps employees in an organization to build more confidence in their work.

Table 4.3.15. An employee's level of engagement is influenced by his or her perception of how attractive and meaningful a job is.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid SA | 33 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| A | 72 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 67.3 |
| U | 40 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 79.8 |
| D | 22 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 94.2 |

| | | | | |
|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| SD | 9 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 156 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.15 show that 105 respondents representing 67.3% indicate by agreed on a team of workmates with different educational level affects organizational productivity, 20 respondents representing 12.5% were neither agreed nor disagree while 31 respondents representing 20.2% disagree on the statement. This implies there is sufficient evidence to concede in the opinion of majorities (67.3%) that an employee's level of engagement is influenced by his or her perception of how attractive and meaningful a job is.

4.4 Hypothesis Testing and Interpretation

H₀₁: Participative decision making does not have an impact on organizational performance in 7up bottling company Ilorin.

Table 4.4.1 Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .953 ^a | .908 | .905 | .42690 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Participative Decision

Participative decision is regressed over organizational performance in the model summary above. Table 4.4.1, show the coefficient of correlation, R=0.953 which indicates direct positive relationship between the explanatory variable (Participative Decision) and the dependent variable (Organizational Performance). The R-square=0.908 which is just so close to adjusted-R square (0.905) implies that the participative decision is a good predictor of organizational performance simply because the difference is negligible (i.e. 0.003). This directly implies that the 90.8% of organizational performance is explained by a unit change in participative decision making in the selected organization, and the remaining 9.2% was attributed to other factors not accounted by this model.

Table 4.4.2: ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 102.862 | 1 | 102.862 | 1512.676 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 10.388 | 154 | .068 | | |
| | Total | 113.250 | 155 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Participative Decision

The ANOVA table 4.4.3, indicates the overall significant level between participative decision making and organizational performance. Hence, it was follows that the ratio of regression sum of square (102.862) over the total sum of square (113.250) produces the same result as the R-square (0.908) which implies that the model account for most of the variation in the outcome variable in organizational performance. Hence, the p-value=0.000 and F-calculated (1512.676>3.84) fall outside the rejection region which means that there is significance relationship between participative decision making and organizational performance at 5% level of significant.

Table 4.4.3: Regression Coefficients^a

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-------|------|------|--------|------|
| 1 | (Constant) | -.392 | .115 | | -3.409 | .001 |
| | Participative Decision | .635 | .076 | .953 | 8.355 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Table 4.4.3 revealed that participative decision is contributing to organizational performance ($\beta=0.635$, $t=8.355>1.64$; $p=0.00<0.05$) at 5% level of significant. The significant increase of participative decision by 1% will cause increase in organizational performance by 63.5% in selected organization. Therefore, participative decision is a significant factors in the model at 95% confidence level. This directly implies there is significant impact of participative decision making on organizational performance at 5% level. In other word, if participative decision making is zero, then the organizational performance will drop by 39.2% (i.e. Participative decision=0); this repressive effect on organizational performance is significant as shown in the vector error correction ($c=-0.392$). This aligned with the findings of Ojokuku and Sajuyigbe, (2014), that employee participation in decision making have highly influence on the impact of organizational performance

H₀₂: There is high employee involvement or participation in decision-making in 7up bottling company Ilorin.

Table 4.4.4: Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .891 ^a | .794 | .791 | .64259 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Involvement

The result in the model summary table 4.4.4 indicates $R^2=0.794$ which is the coefficient of determination of employee involvement regressed over participative decision making. This explained about 79.4% variance in participative decision making for a unit increase in employee involvement, while the remaining 20.6% could be due to the effect of stochastic error duly affected extraneous variables not accounted in this model. The adjusted R-square (0.791) which value was just so close to R-square (0.794) depicts the fact that if the model is sampled from the population rather than the sample it will account for a negligible difference of 0.3% variation in the outcome. Therefore, the model fitness is good, and the $R=0.891$, implies the relationship between employee involvement and participative decision is strongly exists as the correlation coefficient, R approaches +1.

Table 4.4.5: ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 272.819 | 1 | 272.819 | 594.376 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 70.610 | 154 | 0.459 | | |
| | Total | 343.429 | 155 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Participative Decision

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Involvement

Table 4.4.5 presents the overall diagnostic test of significant of the relationship between employee involvement and organizational performance using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The ANOVA results for regression coefficients indicate the significant relationship between employee involvement and participative decision making is significant, as indicated in the, $F\text{-test}=594.376>F\text{-table}=3.84$ at a degree of freedom of (1, 154); i.e. $P\text{-value}=0.00$ is less than 0.05. This indicates that the gender inequality significantly predict the participative decision making in selected organization (meaning it is a good fit for the model). Therefore, a significant relationship between employee involvement and participative decision making exists at 95% confidence level.

Table 4.4.6: Regression Coefficients^a

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|

| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
|---|----------------------|-------|------------|------|--------|------|
| 1 | (Constant) | -.450 | .165 | | -2.727 | .000 |
| | Employee Involvement | .587 | .041 | .891 | 14.317 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Participative Decision

From regression table 4.4.6, the result show that employee involvement ($\beta=0.587$), has positive significant effect on participative decision making in the selected organization, and that 58.7% increase in participative decision is caused by 1% increase in employee involvement. Though, employee involvement can cause repressive effect by 45% if remove from the model. That is, if (employee involvement=0) it would cause about 45% decrease in participative decision making in selected organization. This result implies that the selected organization is sensitive to the use of employee involvement which has high significant influence on participative decision making at 7up bottling plc, as revealed in the vector-error correction (i.e., constant=c=0) in table 4.4.6 above. Therefore, it is not decision-wise to ignored the employee involvement in participative decision making from the model. Hence, the null hypothesis 2 is equally rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted by posited that there is high significant effect of employee involvement on participative decision making at 5% level. This finding commensurate with the previous work of Nuzhath (2014) and Dede (2019) that that there is greater significant link between employee participation in decision making and their performance towards the Organization.

H₀₃: There is no significant effect of employee engagement on organizational performance in 7up bottling company Ilorin.

Table 4.4.7: Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .663 ^a | .440 | .439 | .57610 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement

To assess the influence of employee engagement on organizational performance, simple linear regression analysis was carried out. The model summary in table above indicates the value of the correlation coefficient $R = .663$ and the adjusted R - square = .439 which is just so close to R - square = .440 depict the fact if the model were derived from the population rather than a sample it would account for approximately 0.1% less variance in the outcome. Thus, the Organizational Performance is explained by employee engagement in the value of the R -square, which indicates that 44% improvement in organizational performance is accounted specifically by the engagement of employee in decision making of the selected company and not more than 56% explained by other factors not included in this model. These factors include business environment, industrial policy, reward system, etc.

Table 4.4.8: ANOVA^a

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 24.360 | 1 | 24.360 | 121.194 | .000 ^b |
| | Residual | 30.978 | 154 | .201 | | |
| | Total | 55.338 | 155 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement

ANOVAs table in table 4.4.8 tested whether the model is significant better at predicting the organizational effectiveness than mean raking in previous analysis. Specifically, the F-ratio (121.194) represents the ratio of the improvement in prediction that the results from fitting the model (labeled 'Regression=24.360' in the table), relative to the inaccuracy that still exists in the model (labeled 'Residual=30.978' in the table). And by dividing the regression sum of square value by the Total sum of square in the table, indicating a significant relationship

by returning the value of $R^2=0.440$, and the fact that the employee engagement has significant improvement in the ability to predict the organizational performance. However, the significant value of P (0.000) is smaller than (0.05) which means that the independent variable (employee engagement) has direct positive relationship with the dependent variable (Organizational performance). Hence, it is posited that there is significant relationship between employee engagement and organizational performance at 5% level of significant.

Table 4.4.9: Regression Coefficients^a

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 (Constant) | -.381 | .150 | | -2.495 | .000 |
| Employee Engagement | .702 | .162 | .663 | 4.333 | .001 |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Based on the R-square explained in the model summary above, that employee engagement explain 44% of the variance of the dependent variable “Organizational Performance”. Using non- standardized weight of regression, simple regression of equation was fitted for the model below:

$$\hat{Y} = -0.381 + 0.702x_1$$

From the equation above, the Organizational Performance is equal to the sum of non-standardized regression coefficients with the average of using the appropriate method and non-standardized weight constant. From the regression analysis results, the employee engagement is statistically meaningful for the model. With regression coefficient ($\beta=0.702$) is positive, this means the rise in employee engagement will have even rise the organizational performance. According to the results, the statistical test for regression coefficient control the same result is taken ($t_1 = 17.825$ and $p=0.001<0.05$), this coefficient shows that employee engagement have a huge contribution for the model in order to improve Organizational Performance at 5% level of significant. However, if the selected company ignored the engagement practice of employee, it is likely for the organizational performance to decrease by 38.1% and this might affect the the decision goals of the organization as shown in the vector-error correction of the constant of regression line ($c=-0.381$) in the model. Therefore, the null hypothesis 3 is rejected and alternate hypothesis was accepted by posited that there is significant effect of employee engagement on organizational performance at 95% confidence level. This finding agreed with previous finding of Isichei and Godwin, (2015), that employee participation in decision making had great impact on the organizational performance

4.5 Discussion of Findings

Research findings indicate that participative decision-making significantly contributes to organizational performance ($\beta=0.635$, $t=8.355>1.64$; $p=0.00<0.05$) at a 5% level of significance. A 1% increase in participative decision-making leads to a 63.5% increase in organizational performance within the selected organization. Thus, participative decision-making is a significant factor in the model at a 95% confidence level. This implies that there is a substantial impact of participative decision-making on organizational performance at a 5% level. In other words, if participative decision-making is absent (i.e., participative decision=0), organizational performance will decrease by 39.2% (repressive effect) as indicated by the vector error correction ($c=-0.392$). These findings align with the research conducted by Ojokuku and Sajuyigbe (2014), which highlights the influential role of employee participation in decision-making on organizational performance.

Similarly, employee involvement ($\beta=0.587$) has a positive and significant effect on participative decision-making within the selected organization. A 1% increase in employee involvement results in a 58.7% increase in participative decision-making. On the other hand, if employee involvement is removed from the model (i.e., employee involvement=0), it can lead to a repressive effect of 45% on participative decision-making. Thus, the selected organization demonstrates sensitivity towards the use of employee involvement, which has a highly significant influence on participative decision-making at 7upbottling plc, as indicated by the vector error correction (constant= $c=0$) in Table 4.4.6. Hence, it is not advisable to disregard employee involvement in

participative decision-making within the model. Therefore, the null hypothesis 2 is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted, suggesting a highly significant effect of employee involvement on participative decision-making at a 5% level. This finding is consistent with the previous works of Nuzhath (2014) and Dede (2019), which highlight the strong link between employee participation in decision-making and their performance within the organization.

Lastly, an increase in employee engagement is likely to result in an increase in organizational performance. According to the results of hypothesis 3, the statistical test for the regression coefficient confirms this finding ($t_1=17.825$ and $p=0.001<0.05$). This coefficient indicates that employee engagement significantly contributes to the model, thereby improving organizational performance at a 5% level of significance. However, if the selected company neglects employee engagement practices, it could potentially lead to a 38.1% decrease in organizational performance, which may impact the organization's decision-making goals, as indicated by the vector error correction of the constant in the regression line ($c=-0.381$) in the model. Therefore, the null hypothesis 3 is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted, suggesting a significant effect of employee engagement on organizational performance at a 95% confidence level. This finding is supported by previous research conducted by Isichei and Godwin (2015), which highlights the significant impact of employee participation in decision-making on organizational performance.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.2 Summary

The empirical findings demonstrate the presence of nonfinancial motivational factors related to fairness in participative decision-making, employee involvement, and employee engagement in decision making, which are used to assess organizational performance. A total of 156 questionnaires were collected, resulting in a response rate of 61% from a population of 255, which is considered acceptable in research as it exceeds the 60% rule of thumb. The findings consistently indicate that employee participation enhances productivity and work quality, leading to improved organizational performance. This is supported by a lower standard deviation ($sd=0.88958$) compared to other constructs in the mean ranking test for perceptions of organizational performance.

Furthermore, the study reveals that motivation in the form of participative decision-making, employee involvement, and increased engagement are likely to have a positive impact on organizational performance, as well as on the achievement of set goals within the selected organization. Conversely, the removal of fairness, equity, and expectations that guide employees in participative decision-making, employee involvement, and increased engagement is expected to reduce overall performance in the case study model.

To summarize the main findings of the study:

- i. Participative decision-making significantly impacts organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company at a 5% level of significance.
- ii. There is a high level of employee involvement or participation in decision-making in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin, at a 5% level of significance.
- iii. There is a significant effect of employee engagement on organizational performance in 7up Bottling Company, Ilorin, at a 95% confidence level.

5.3 Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive understanding of the equity and expectant behavioral theory within a bottling company, using a regression model to address the current issues related to participative decision-making, employee involvement, and employee engagement in the context of HRM. The study emphasizes the importance of effectively managing human resources to maintain a favorable level of employee participation and engagement. The findings of the study establish a direct impact of employee participation on organizational performance, supported by regression analysis. The role of management is crucial in ensuring equity and managing employee behavior by promoting their involvement and engagement in decision-making processes. The study concludes that a participative workforce ultimately leads to improvements in organizational performance. Therefore, effective workforce management becomes an essential approach to address job-related issues and enhance employee engagement through decision-making processes. Thus, this study holds significant importance in sustainable organizational development and contributes to the field of organizational behavioral studies.

The study demonstrates a strong positive relationship between participative decision-making and organizational performance. Moreover, it concludes that the selected company demonstrates effective practices in managing workforce issues through collective and participative decision-making, as well as increased employee engagement, resulting in improved performance. Conversely, the study highlights the detrimental effects of eliminating participative decision-making, which are stronger than the positive effects. Companies with limited participation and decreased employee engagement often experience lower performance, reduced teamwork and productivity, lack of cohesion, and increased challenges in decision-making.

In summary, this study underscores the significance of equitable and participative decision-making processes, employee engagement, and effective workforce management in driving organizational performance. It emphasizes the negative consequences of disregarding employee involvement and engagement, highlighting the importance of fostering a participative work environment to promote overall success within the organization.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations can be drawn:

- i. Management in the bottling company should review the industrial policy to fully implement participative decision-making processes. This will help maintain a fair and equitable system that does not compromise organizational performance. By involving employees in decision-making, the organization can benefit from their diverse perspectives and experiences, leading to better outcomes.
 - ii. The company should establish mechanisms for resolving workforce-related issues through employee involvement in dialogues. This approach can serve as a useful tool to reduce negativity and foster a positive work environment. By actively engaging employees in discussions and problem-solving, the organization can address concerns and improve overall employee satisfaction and productivity.
 - iii. The organization should make deliberate efforts to overcome job mismatches and enhance talent development by increasing employee engagement. By providing opportunities for employees to utilize their skills and abilities, the organization can improve efficiency and performance. This can be achieved through initiatives such as training programs, career development opportunities, and recognition of employee contributions.
- By implementing these recommendations, the bottling company can create a culture of participation, fairness, and employee engagement, resulting in improved organizational efficiency and performance.

REFERENCES

- Afams, J. (2013). Managing People in Organization, Contemporary theory and practice. Cultural Human Resources Council 2012. Managing employee performance. (Access, 12.5.2021).
- Aguinis, M.A. and Pierce, D. (2008). Performance Management: Key Strategies and Practical Guidelines: University Press London, UK. Vol.5, No. 3, pp. 11-19
- Aguinis, M.A., Gottfredson, N and Joo L., (2011)," Human Resources Development Review according to Identity, Integration, Achievement and Adaptation Model", *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Science*, 2(2).
- Armstrong, M. (1994). Performance Management: Key Strategies and Practical Guidelines: London, UK. Vol. 5, No 3, pp. 23-29
- Armstrong, M. (2002). Employee rewards 3rd Ed. Cromwell Press.
- Armstrong, M 2006. A hand book of human resource management practice 10th Ed: Kogan page Limited. Vol. 1. No. 2. pp. 3-10
- Armstrong .M. (1994). Why performance management doesn't work. *People Dynamics*, 18(7), 24-25.
- Armstrong M. (1998). Employee performance management: policies and practices in multinational corporations, *Performance Management Systems: A Global Perspective*, (Ed). 18(7), 24-25.
- Arnold R.A and Feldman A. (1982). Career Development and Performance Management Practice. *Journal of Contemporary Studies of Human Resource Management*. 2(1), 8-33
- Andrew May. (2001). The Human Value of the Enterprise.
- Arumugam, G.M. (2001). Why performance management doesn't work. *People Dynamics*, 18(7), 24-25.
- Aguinis, M.A. (2011). Feedback Effectiveness: Can 360 degree Appraisals Be Improved, 129-139.
- Atkinson, Edward, E., and Baron M, 2003. Performance Management Practices. A textbook of Managerial Economics. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Press. Vol.4. No.7, pp. 100-120
- Ayers G.(2015). Performance Management and Employee rewards 3rd Ed. *Journal of Business Management and Economic*. University of Waterloo. Cromwell Press. Vol. 5 (2), pp. 33-41
- Bartol D., and Srivastava, P (2002)," Human Resources Development Review according to Identity, Integration, Achievement and Adaptation Model", *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Science*, 2(2). 1-20
- Bevan L.L and Thompson, G (1991). Benchmarking the HR practices of an engineering institute with public sector industry for performance enhancement. *International Journal of Training and Development*. 9 (1),6-20.
- Brewster, A. (2015). Rediscovering performance management: systems, learning and integration, *Measuring Business Excellence*, Vol.14, No.1, 109-133.
- Briscoe, DB. & Claus, LM.(2018). Employee performance management: policies and practices in multinational corporations, *Performance Management Systems: A Global Perspective*, (Ed). 18(7), 24-25.
- Chandhana& David, (2015), The New Performance Evaluation Methodology and its Integration with Management Systems. *The TQM Magazine*, 15(1), 25-29.

- Coens D., & Jenkins, M. (2002). Performance Management Characteristics in Multi-national Organizational. *Journal of International Relational and Economics. University of Canada Ontario. Vol.7. No. 2. 75-81*
- Costello S. (1994), "Organizational Development", A Resource Guide for Departmental Managers and HR Professionals, Newfoundland and Labrador. Vol.3. No 2, pp 71-99
- Christopher G & Jaime M, (2004).,Behavioural factors for the successful implementation and use of performance management systems ,Management Decision Volume 41.
- Deadrick, D. L. & Gardner, D. G. (1997), Distribution Ratings of Performance Levels and Variability: An Examination of Rating Validity in a Field Setting, *Group & Organization Management Journal* 39 (4).
- Heneman, V. Evans A.N and Devi, V. R. (1988). Training and Development – A Jump Starter for Employee Performance and Organizational Effectiveness. *International Journal of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(2). 77-3630.
- Evans, G. 2000. Measure for performance. Professional management review.
- Edward, E. 2003. Treat People Right. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Press.
- Festing A, Carol, N., and Evans, G. (2012). Measure for performance. Professional management review. Volume 7. No. 3, 22-29
- Guest, D.E. (1997),Human Resource Management: The Workers Verdict. *Human Resource Management*,Journal 9(1), 114-125
- Fletcher,C. (2001),Performance appraisal and management:The developing research agenda,Journal of Occupation and OrgarnizationPsychology,Volume 74.
- Gichuki J. (2014). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through the effective management of people. *Academy of management executives*, 9: pp55-71
- Gold, D.(1969), "Statistical Tests and Substantive Significance "American Sociologist, 4(1): 42–46.
- Guest, D.E. (1999),Human Resource Management: The Workers Verdict. *Human Resource Management*,Journal 9.
- Gungor, P. (2011). The Relationship between Reward Management System and. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1510–1520. Retrieved from [http:// www.sciencedirect. Com](http://www.sciencedirect.Com)
- Ghorparde J. 2000. Managing Five Paradoxes of 360 degree Feedback. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14. Harvard Business Review on Appraising Employee Performance. 2005, 112-114.
- Grant S. (2008), Human Performance Appraisal: *Journal of Resources Development*,Press Amberst. Vol. 2. No. 5, pp 43-57
- Islam M. & Rasad, T. International,(2006), "Benefits Of Human Resource Development", *Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences*, 5(9). 44-50
- Kluger R & DeNisi, C.M. (1996). Employee involvement, climate and organizational effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*. 44 (4), 471-488).
- Huselid O.N (1995). Management by objectives. London: Management Publications. HR Variables, (Last Access 23.5.2021.) <http://www.motivation-index.com/hr-variables/employee-satisfaction/>
- Klemm, P., Sanderson R,W&Luffman, V 1991 ,Human Performance Appraisal: Resources Development ,Press Amberst. Vol. 1. No 2, pp. 65-73

- Locke & Latham, 1990 " Fundamentals Of Human Resource Management", Fourth Edition, Published by McGraw-Hill/Irwin, a business unit of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., the Americas, New York. Vol. 4. No 7, pp. 21-50
- Locke M.T, and Latham, B.A. (2000),.Organisationalbehaviour and Performance management. (5th Ed). Boston. Irwin/McGraw-Hill. 4(1), 123-132
- Michel, A. & Angela, B. 1998. Performance Management.Mondy, W.R. Sharplin, A. Holmes, R.E.&Flippo, E.B.1986. Management concepts and practices. (3rd Ed). USA.
- Mobley, F. (1977). Managing Five Paradoxes of 360 degree Feedback. Academy of Management Executive, 14. Harvard Business Review on Appraising Employee Performance. 2005, 112-114.
- Obiora, N. (2014)). Performance Management Employee Engagement. *Journal of Finance and Management Science. Univrsity Press Lagos.* 2(1), 8-33
- Mukhopadhyay, Javier Lerch&Mangal, 1994. Labour Productivity and Performance Management. Harvard business Review 01/2013, Vol. 1. No. 2, pp142-147.
- Peter, B. & John, P. 2008. Strategy and Human Resource Management. 2 nd edition.
- Neely et al (2005),The evolution of performance measurement research: Developments in the last decade and research agenda for the next. International Journal of Operation and Production Management Vol 25.
- O' Donnell D. & O' Brien, M. (1999), Performance Management: A Framework for Management Control Systems Research. Management accounting research, 10, 363-382.
- Ravi C.G and Sarawathy A.B (2018). A study on the concept of Performance Manangement in Industry. International Journal of Management and Educational Technology. Volume 9, Issue 1, January 2018. www.ijame.com/
- Robert, S.Kaplan, DavidP.Norton. 2001. The strategy focused organization: Harvard Business School Press. Sara E. 2011. Assistant HR Manager. Wärsilä. Interview 10.6.2012
- Sheridan R. (1992), Human Resources Management in New Zealand. Auckland. Pearson Education New Zealand Limited. Vol.1 No. 1. 18-30
- Salaman M, Mahmood S and Habab B.L (2005) The knowledge work of general managers.Journal of General Management V.3 No.1. 25-40
- Savardi L. (2010) Measuring Performance Management in the Concept of Human Resource Management. *Journal of Enterprise Management, Ontario University, Canadian Press*, 4(3), 5-29
- Sharif, A.M. (2002),Benchmarking Performance Management Systems. Benchmarking An International Journal, 9(1), 62-85.
- Stevens, B.P and Joyce,T.(2000),“Building a Balanced Performance Management System” SAM management system” SAM Management Journal,Vol.8.
- Taylor M..and Sharif, A.M. (2002),Benchmarking Performance Management Systems. Benchmarking An International Journal, 9(1), 62-85.
- Tesema M, Soeters ,J.(2006),Challenges and Prospects of HRM in Developing Countries:Testing the HRM-Performance Link in Eritrean Civil Service, Intl. J. Hum. Res. Manag.,17(1): 86-105. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, vol.12, pp.1092.

Varma, A, Budhwar, P.S. &DeNisi, A.(2008). Performance Management Systems: A Global Perspective. New York; Routledge vol.7 (4), pp.473.