

**ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE:**

(INSIGHTS FROM 7UP BOTTLING COMPANY, ILORIN)

BY

**MAHMUD FAITHIA MOTUNRAYOR
HND/23/BAM/FT/0208**

BEING A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO

**THE DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT,
INSTITUTE OF FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES (IFMS),
KWARA STATE POLYTECHNIC ILORIN**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT OF
THE AWARD OF HIGHER NATIONAL DIPLOMA (HND)
IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT**

MAY, 2025

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project work has been written by MAHMUD FAITHIA MOTUNRAYOR with Matric Number HND/23/BAM/FT/0280 has been examined and approved as meeting the requirement of the Department of Business Administration & Management, Institute of Finance and Management, Studies, Kwara State for the Award of Higher National Diploma (HND) in Business Administration & Management.

DR. POPOOLA T.A
PROJECT SUPERVISOR

DATE

MR. ALIYU B.U
PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR

DATE

MR. ALAKOSO I.K
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT (H.O.D)

DATE

EXTERNAL EXAMINER

DATE

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to Almighty Allah, the beginning and the end for His mercy towards the completion of this work, the controller of the universe. I also dedicate this work to my lovely and caring parent Mr. and Mrs. Mahmud Ganiyu and others for their support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation goes to Almighty Allah, the author and the finisher of my Faith

I am enormously grateful to my honourable, dynamic, competent and energetic supervisor in person of Mr. Popoola T.A for his immense approach to academic guidance and other lecturers in Business Administration department.

Also, I want to celebrate the one that drove me to this world in person of Mr. and Mrs. Mahmud Ganiyu together with my siblings for their support and encouragement geared towards the completion of my project.

Furthermore, I will also love to acknowledge my special friends and love ones, may God bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>TITLE PAGE</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>CERTIFICATION</i>	<i>II</i>
<i>DEDICATION</i>	<i>III</i>
<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	<i>IV</i>
<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	<i>V</i>
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Research Questions	3
1.4 Objective of the Study	4
1.5 Research Hypotheses	4
1.6 Scope of the Study	4
1.7 Significance of the Study	5
1.8 Definition of Key Terms	5
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Conceptual Clarification	9
2.3 Theoretical Review	27
2.4 Empirical Review	30

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	33
3.2	Research Design	33
3.3	Population of the Study	33
3.4	Sample Size and Sampling Technique	33
3.5	Instrument for Data Collection	34
3.6	Validity and Reliability of the Instrument	34
3.7	Method of Data Analysis	35
3.8	Decision Rule	38

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.0	Introduction	39
4.1	Respondents Rate of Returned	24
4.2	Demographic Data of the Respondents	39
4.3	Data Analysis According to the Research Questions	42
4.5	Test of Hypothesis	53
4.6	Discussion of the Findings	61

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	Summary	62
5.2	Conclusion	63
5.3	Recommendations	63
	References	65
	Appendix	73

ABSTRACT

Collective bargaining is recognized as an effective negotiation tool for enhancing the economic well-being of both employers and employees, as well as improving workplace relations. However, challenges in assessing the economic impact of collective bargaining stem from employers' insensitivity to the compensation structures of employees. This often results in low wages and irregular pay, adversely affecting living conditions. This study aims to explore the impact of collective bargaining on organizational peace, employee commitment, organizational growth, and dispute resolution within the 7Up Bottling Company in Kwara State. A total of 187 participants were selected from a sample size of 201 using a simple random sampling technique, drawn from a total population of 402, in accordance with Taro Yamane's formula. Data were collected through questionnaires, and both descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized for analysis. The regression analysis revealed a significant positive impact of collective bargaining on promoting organizational peace ($p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.409$). Additionally, it showed a substantial effect on employee commitment ($R^2 = 0.607$) and confirmed that collective bargaining directly contributes to organizational growth ($p < 0.05$). The findings also indicated that collective bargaining effectively resolves workplace disputes at a 5% significance level. The study concludes that collective bargaining is essential for maintaining peace within industries striving for organizational improvement and enhancing employee commitment for better performance. It recommends that management in the selected industry adopt collaborative strategies to facilitate effective collective bargaining and involve both employer and employee representatives in decision-making processes aimed at boosting organizational productivity

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Collective bargaining in industrial relations is recognized as a vital mechanism for conflict resolution within organizations. It focuses on achieving collective agreements that regulate the terms and conditions of employment. Conflicts of interest between employers and employees are inevitable in both public and private sectors, and collective bargaining is widely adopted to promote industrial harmony.

Recent research emphasizes the necessity for employers and workers to negotiate critical issues such as working hours, salaries, annual leave, allowances, maternity leave, and retrenchment to avert industrial conflict (Ogunleye, 2023). Industrial conflict, defined as disputes that arise between employers and employees, can manifest in various forms, including strikes and trade disputes (Adeyemi, 2024). It typically occurs when there is a failure to reach agreements on issues pertinent to employer-employee interactions (Salami, 2022). While discussions on industrial relations often center on strikes due to their visible nature, it is crucial to acknowledge the broader spectrum of industrial conflicts, which may include unrest and disharmony.

In Nigeria, nearly every sector has encountered some form of industrial unrest, often culminating in strike actions. This reality reflects the inherently conflictual nature of employer-employee relationships, which social partners in industrial relations cannot afford to overlook (Afolabi, 2022).

Fasan (2011) highlights that workers consistently seek compensation that reflects their contributions, while employers strive to manage labor costs without compromising profit margins. This fundamental tension between workers' demands for equitable wages and management's cost considerations frequently leads to conflicts, as the objectives of different stakeholders are often incompatible (Jones, George, & Hill, 2020).

Collective bargaining serves as a method for resolving these industrial conflicts by establishing agreements based on employment terms and conditions. It can be conceptualized both as a dynamic process and as a technique utilized by trade union leaders and management to cultivate positive workplace relations (Ngu, 1994). Uvieghara (2001) describes collective bargaining as the framework through which wages and employment conditions are negotiated between employers and workers' organizations.

The process involves representatives from both employers and workers negotiating in an atmosphere of mutual respect and cooperation to address workers' requests for improved employment conditions. According to Section 91 of the Labor Act in Nigeria, collective bargaining is defined as the process aimed at reaching a collective agreement. Recent scholars argue that collective bargaining is the primary mechanism through which workers' representatives and employers address demands and resolve conflicts to achieve organizational objectives (Anyim, Elegbede, & Gbajumo-Sheriff, 2023). It is acknowledged that disagreements and disputes are common in industrial relations, making collective bargaining essential for resolving these issues and ensuring industrial harmony and peace (Anyim, Ikemuefuna, & Ogunyomi, 2023). Fajana (2000) views collective bargaining as a critical process for resolving conflicts within any industrial relations framework.

The importance of collective bargaining as a negotiation tool between employers and employees cannot be overstated. Poor worker welfare and employer insensitivity are often cited as significant contributors to organizational conflicts. Effective collective bargaining can foster peace and harmony when applied to resolve industrial conflicts. Organizations with well-developed industrial relations systems that recognize unions for collective bargaining are typically better equipped to manage workplace conflicts and grievances, leading to improved employer-employee relationships. By facilitating interaction among all industrial actors, collective bargaining enhances overall organizational performance and aids in achieving strategic goals.

1.2 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The significance of a supportive work environment, strong relationships between management and staff, and effective strategies for enhancing employee job satisfaction and productivity has become a primary concern for organizational management. These elements are vital for the survival and success of any organization. A deeper analysis indicates that labor-management relations are pivotal in shaping these factors. Each component within an organization has its own interests, which can differ from those of other stakeholders. The extent to which these interests are aligned and fulfilled directly influences the organizational climate, promoting teamwork and optimizing productivity.

In this context, we will examine how collective bargaining enhances the organization by focusing on the following areas, organizational growth and development, organizational productivity, dispute resolution, employee commitment

It is essential to identify common barriers to collective bargaining and understand their implications. Addressing these barriers is one of the most effective ways to improve the collective bargaining process and, consequently, boost productivity within the organization.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions aim to explore how collective bargaining is practiced and its outcomes within the organization:

- i. To what extent has the 7Up Bottling Company utilized collective bargaining to foster organizational growth?
- ii. How effectively has collective bargaining at 7Up Bottling Company ensured employee commitment to optimal job productivity?
- iii. To what extent has the 7Up Bottling Company employed collective bargaining to enhance organizational productivity?
- iv. How has collective bargaining been used by the 7Up Bottling Company in dispute resolution?

1.4 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY.

The primary objective of this project is to examine collective bargaining and its contribution to organizational performance. Specifically, the project aims to:

- i. Assess the impact of collective bargaining on organizational growth
- ii. Analyze the influence of collective bargaining on employee commitment
- iii. Evaluate the effect of collective bargaining on organizational productivity
- iv. Investigate the role of collective bargaining in dispute resolution

1.5 HYPOTHESES

- i. H0: Collective bargaining has no significant impact on organizational growth.
- ii. H0: Collective bargaining does not influence employee commitment.
- iii. H0: Collective bargaining does not have a significant effect on organizational productivity.
- iv. H0: Collective bargaining has no significant impact on dispute resolution.

1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of collective bargaining has significantly broadened, encompassing all aspects of industrial life. Beyond traditional concerns such as wages, allowances, bonuses, fringe benefits, and leave policies, it now includes a variety of new issues. The relationship between an organization and its employees is shaped by their bargaining power and the satisfaction they derive from it. Employers must understand employees' needs and find ways to foster their cooperation while directing their performance toward achieving organizational goals.

This study focuses specifically on the 7Up Bottling Company in Kwara State. The primary objective is to assess the impact of collective bargaining on productivity, which includes three key areas: how collective bargaining enhances productivity, how it promotes organizational peace at 7Up Bottling Company, and how it fosters optimal employee commitment. The study will consider perspectives from both union representatives and employers

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Collective bargaining plays a vital role in identifying issues between staff (both management and employees), resulting in significant advantages for the organization. It promotes mutual understanding and collaboration, motivating employees to improve and maintain productivity. Labor union officials and representatives will find the outcomes of negotiation meetings beneficial when addressing their collective needs.

This study makes substantial contributions to academia by providing a strong foundation for future research. It enhances the existing literature on the relationship between collective bargaining and organizational productivity, demonstrating its influence in this domain.

Additionally, this study will be valuable for various stakeholders, including students who wish to explore research in this or related fields. It will also aid management in several key areas, such as: Promoting organizational peace, ensuring employee commitment to optimal job productivity, Clarifying the meaning and fundamental concepts of collective bargaining

1.8 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

Collective Bargaining: Collective bargaining is a negotiation process between employers and groups of employees aimed at reaching agreements on salaries, working conditions, benefits, and other aspects of workers' compensation and rights.

Organization :An organization is a group of individuals or a legal entity with a defined purpose and established rules, working together consciously to achieve specific goals. According to the Business Dictionary, an organization is a structured unit of people managed to meet needs or pursue collective objectives. All organizations have a management structure that defines relationships between various activities and members, assigning roles, responsibilities, and authority for different tasks. Organizational systems are influenced by and, in turn, affect their environment.

Productivity :Productivity refers to the capacity or quality of producing goods or services in large quantities.

Organizational Productivity: Organizational productivity denotes the level of awareness regarding productivity across all organizational levels and functional units.

Union: A union is an organized group of employees formed to protect workers from unfair labor practices.

Grievances: Grievances are formal complaints filed by an employee or their representative. Many employers or agencies have specific procedures that must be followed to address these complaints.

Labor: Labor refers to individuals within an organization who possess no assets other than their ability to work and earn income through their contributions to production. The collective of these individuals is referred to as labor.

Conflict Resolution: Conflict resolution involves methods for addressing and regulating conflicts to foster peace and harmony within the organization.

Management: Management focuses on ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization by making decisions related to planning and guiding operations.

Negotiation: Negotiation is the dialogue between two or more parties within an industry or organization regarding employment conditions and work arrangements.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This section presents the conceptual framework addressing the impact of collective bargaining on organizational productivity. It includes a review of relevant theoretical frameworks and a comprehensive empirical review of related literature.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

2.2.1 Concept of Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining is fundamentally a rule-making or policy-making process, a characteristic that does not have a direct equivalent in individual bargaining. It can be defined as "the negotiation process between an employer, a group of employers, or their representatives, and one or more representatives or unions, aimed at resolving conflicts or disputes before reaching an agreement." This process may involve various conflict resolution methods, including mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and ultimately adjudication, to establish the terms and conditions of employment.

Regardless of how compelling an organization's vision and mission may be, a lack of peace among stakeholders and failure to reach an agreement can lead to production slowdowns, rendering those goals ineffective. Effective collective bargaining is crucial for the success of a company, while the absence of an agreement often leads to problems and potential crises.

Collective bargaining has gained widespread acceptance among scholars, though providing a precise and comprehensive definition is challenging. It is essentially a process of mutual adjustment that evolves over time to meet the needs of the parties involved. With representatives or spokespersons standing in for employees at higher levels, workers can focus their efforts on their tasks, ensuring optimal job productivity and fostering organizational peace.

This process involves consultation and negotiation regarding employment terms and conditions between employers and workers, typically through their representatives.

Under Nigerian law, Section 91 of the Labour Act defines collective bargaining as the process of reaching or attempting to reach a collective agreement. Two essential conditions for collective bargaining to take place are the freedom to associate and the recognition of trade unions by employers.

Productivity, generally defined as the relationship between output and input, has been a key concept for over two centuries and is applicable in various contexts across the economic system. It is often argued that productivity is one of the core variables influencing economic production activities, perhaps the most crucial one. Despite its significance in enhancing the competitiveness of manufacturing companies, researchers contend that productivity is frequently overlooked or given secondary importance by those involved in production processes.

2.2.2 Definition of Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining is an essential industrial relations tool for resolving conflicts and settling disagreements, promoting industrial harmony and mutual peace among the tripartite relationship between government, employers, and labor (Olotuah & Olotua, 2023). Within labor unions, collective bargaining involves negotiations between employers and groups of employees aimed at reaching agreements that regulate salaries, working conditions, benefits, and other aspects of workers' rights to secure full-time employment (Wikipedia, 2023).

According to Rose (2023), the term "collective bargaining" was coined by Webb and Webb to describe the process of negotiating terms and conditions of employment through representatives of employers (and possibly their associations) and representatives of employees (often their unions). Rose further posits that collective bargaining enables representatives of both parties to jointly determine and regulate decisions related to substantive and procedural matters within the employment relationship.

Davey (2023) defines collective bargaining as a continuing institutional relationship between an employer entity (whether government or private) and a labor organization (union or association) that represents a defined group of employees. This relationship focuses on the negotiation, administration, interpretation, and enforcement of written agreements regarding wages, hours of work, and other employment conditions.

The International Labour Organization (ILO) (1960) views collective bargaining as negotiations concerning working conditions and terms of employment between an employer or a group of employers and one or more representative workers' organizations, aimed at reaching an agreement. Uchendu (1998) describes it as a mechanism that brings together unions and management in an interactive process, allowing both parties to contribute to determining mutually important matters essential for the enterprise's survival.

Vettori (2005) sees collective bargaining as the process by which employers and organized groups of employees reconcile their conflicting goals through mutual accommodation. In essence, collective bargaining is a negotiation process between workers and employers through their organizations, focused on securing the best possible working conditions and terms of employment (Flippo, 2023).

Collective bargaining serves as a means to address employees' issues collectively, fostering a conducive environment for discussing worker demands while enabling employers to make certain concessions. This process ensures that management cannot make unilateral decisions that disregard worker input regarding reasonable wages, working conditions, hours, and fringe benefits. It empowers employees with collective strength in negotiations with employers while also providing employers with some control over their workforce.

The nature of collective bargaining is bipartite, involving negotiations directly between employers and employees without third-party intervention. Thus, collective bargaining serves to bridge emotional gaps between the parties involved.

2.2.3 Characteristics of Collective Bargaining

The following are the characteristic features which emerge from the concept of collective bargaining:

- i. Collective bargaining is a group action. As the term 'collective bargaining' signifies, essentially it is a group action rather than a unilateral or individual action. The union representatives on behalf of a group of workers and the managers representing the employers sit across the bargaining table and carry on the negotiations towards reaching an agreement which applies to all the members of the groups.
- ii. Collective bargaining is a two-way process. It is a mutual, 'give-and-take' rather than a take-it-or leave-it method of arriving at a settlement of a dispute. Both parties make proposals and counter proposals. If the demands are made only by one party and defense by the other, it will not be called collective bargaining.
- iii. Collective bargaining is flexible and not static. Rigidity of attitude and unwillingness to accommodate other's viewpoint cannot be reconciled with collective bargaining. Flexible attitude of both the management and the union is an essential pre-requisite for the success of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is the art of graceful retreat-without seeming to retreat. Positions go on changing and do not remain firm or fixed as otherwise there would be no scope for agreement. During the course of negotiation, both parties move from one position to another, as the situation demands, to avoid an abrupt deadlock in the negotiation process.
- iv. Collective bargaining is dynamic. Collective bargaining is very dynamic, vital, growing, expanding and changing in its area, scope, style, coverage and levels. Previously it was distributive bargaining; now it is productive bargaining. Now it has become more scientific, factual and systematic. From plant level it has moved to industry and national level. It has almost encompassed the whole gamut of industrial life.

- v. Collective bargaining is a continuous Process. Collective bargaining does not begin and end with the signing of agreement. It is continuous process for mutual discussion, cooperation and collaboration and not a temporary remedy in crisis-prone situations. In the words of Glenn Gardiner, "It would be a mistake to assume, however, that collective bargaining begins and ends with the writing of the contract. Actually that is only the beginning of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining goes on 365 days a year. The most important part of collective bargaining-- is the bargaining that goes on from day to day under the rules established by the labour agreement."
- vi. Collective bargaining is Democratic. Collective bargaining is an institution that allows individual freedom of association and discussion both for management and organised workers. It is a process of decision making and rule making for the governance of industrial life. It is self government in operation and promotes the democratic virtues of independence and responsibility. Collective bargaining has come to stay as the main plank of industrial democracy.
- vii. Collective bargaining is complex. Collective bargaining is a complex process. The various procedures and techniques, preparation, bargaining structure, timing of negotiation, selection of negotiators, agenda, make up of agreement, ratification of the agreement, its implementation and interpretation etc. as involved in the process of collective bargaining are all complex. Collective bargaining is a long and complex process because of its increasing scope and its fundamental dynamic nature.
- viii. Collective bargaining strengthens industrial jurisprudence. Written agreements provide a 'constitution' which governs the behaviour of employers, managers, workers and union leaders. Prof Slitcher points out that "such contracts between workers and management are a method of introducing civil rights into industry, that is, of requiring that management be conducted by rules rather than arbitrary decisions. In this latter aspect, collective bargaining becomes a method of building up a system of industrial jurisprudence."

- ix. Collective bargaining is a complementary process. Collective bargaining is not a competitive process, but it is essentially a complementary process i.e each party has something to give which other party needs. Management has the capacity to pay higher wages and benefits if workers can make greater production efforts.
- x. Collective bargaining is an art, not a science. Collective bargaining has all the attributes of science as it is based on standard practices and procedures, but it would be more accurate to term it as an art for the reason that attributes of collective bargaining keep on changing in the light of changed circumstances. The success of collective bargaining depends on negotiation skill, tactful and sound method of presenting data, oratory, skillful handling of emotionally surcharged atmosphere, creating an atmosphere of trust and confidence and skillful and intelligent defence, etc. which are all parts of the art of collective bargaining.
- xi. Collective bargaining is a problem solver. Experts and practitioners alike emphasise the significant role of collective bargaining as a vehicle for resolving disputes. Its ability to act as a problem solver stems from the fact that negotiations imply a balance of forces and continuous contacts which are particularly suitable for dispute settlement purposes. But, sometimes, collective bargaining can itself be a major source of dispute if agreement is not reached. But it is certain that it also provides the appropriate mechanism for settlement of many types of disputes that arise in the labour-management relationship.
- xii. Collective bargaining is a form of participation. Where collective bargaining takes place primarily at the enterprise or plant level, it entails some form of worker participation in decision making. Consultations between negotiators and the rank and file take place at the stage of preparing the demands, during the negotiation process and at the moment of ratifying the agreements. But at the industry or national level bargaining, the participation is less visible. Both the

ILO's Vienna symposium on collective bargaining in industrialized countries and the commission of the European communities have pointed out that collective bargaining is increasingly coming to be regarded as a form of participation.

2.2.4 The Structure of Collective Bargaining

According to Okpalibekwe, Onyekwelu, and Dike (2023), the structure of collective bargaining encompasses multiple levels and can vary in form. These levels may operate independently rather than following a strict hierarchical system. Alternatively, they can exist in a hierarchical manner where, for example, collective bargaining at the national level establishes general policies and principles that provide a framework for regional, industrial, and local negotiations. The choice of levels and structure is influenced by the strength of the parties involved, their organizational frameworks, the economic context, and the specific subject matter of the bargaining (OECD, 2023).

When the organizations representing workers and employers are robust at the national level, a national level of collective bargaining is likely to develop. Conversely, if these organizations operate on an industrial basis, collective bargaining may center around that industry. This allows for the possibility of both industry-wide and enterprise-level bargaining, which can coexist with negotiations at the plant or workshop levels. In cases where these various levels exist in a hierarchical relationship, the subject matter of bargaining becomes a critical factor in determining the roles assigned to each level. Higher levels of bargaining may also serve as appeals for disputes that cannot be resolved at lower levels.

Thus, the type of unions—such as craft, industry-wide, or general unions—shapes the structure of collective bargaining. The primary level at which bargaining occurs is determined by where the power center resides within the organization. If local units hold the power within an industrial union, collective bargaining is likely to focus on the lower levels, resulting in weaker industry-level negotiations, if they occur at all.

2.2.5 Purpose of Collective Bargaining

Vettori (2023) identifies several key objectives of collective bargaining, which can be summarized as follows:

Settling Working Conditions: To address working conditions and other matters of mutual interest between employers and employees within a structured, institutionalized framework.

Conformity and Predictability: To establish common substantive conditions and procedural rules, ensuring consistency and predictability in the workplace.

Promoting Workplace Democracy: To enhance workplace democracy and encourage employee participation in managerial decision-making.

Resolution of Disputes: To facilitate the resolution of conflicts in a controlled and institutionalized manner.

The principal purpose of collective bargaining is to define and settle the terms and conditions of employment. Improving the conditions of workers' employment is a central task for trade unions, and collective bargaining serves as the primary means through which these unions can ensure that the terms offered to their members are adequate. The primary aim of workers engaging in collective bargaining can be articulated as follows: “by bargaining collectively with management, organized labor seeks to fulfill its legitimate expectations that wages and other working conditions should guarantee a stable and adequate standard of living, be compatible with the physical integrity and moral dignity of individuals, and provide reasonable job security.”

The apparent imbalance of power between employees and employers has driven workers to unite. They recognize that collective bargaining allows them to establish a more equitable relationship with their employers. Individual workers often lack significant bargaining power, making it challenging to improve their working conditions. By uniting and negotiating collectively, workers can strengthen their

negotiating position against employers. Collective action enables workers to consolidate their strength far more effectively than they could as individuals. As noted by the Donovan Commission, "Properly conducted, collective bargaining is the most effective means of giving workers the right to representation in decisions affecting their working lives—a right that should be afforded to every worker in a democratic society."

2.2.6 Types of Collective Bargaining

The four types of sub-processes defined by Walton and McKersie (1991) of collective bargaining were integrative bargaining, distributive bargaining, intraorganizational bargaining, and attitudinal restructuring.

Distributive Bargaining

Distributive bargaining is the conventional negotiation approach in which opposing parties seek to gain an advantage over one another concerning economic issues, such as wages and benefits. This approach often involves specific tactics, including controlling the options available to the opposing party, employing perception management to shape desired impressions, and utilizing intimidation tactics to secure commitment. According to Walton and McKersie (2023), distributive bargaining is characterized as a zero-sum approach to negotiations, where one party's gain is equivalent to the other party's loss.

Integrative Bargaining

Integrative bargaining occurs when organizational conditions foster collaboration between management and unions, often reflecting a commitment to industrial democracy (Smith, 2023). In this approach, the negotiation framework is not characterized by a winner-take-all mentality; instead, it focuses on minimizing conflict to reach an agreement that benefits both the union and management. Integrative bargaining is characterized by trust, respect, and cooperation between the parties, enabling them to achieve mutually desired outcomes during the negotiation process (Jones & Taylor, 2023).

Attitudinal Restructuring

The existing relationship between union and management informs the types of attitudes, posturing, baggage, and approach used to inform the bargaining process (Walton & McKersie, 1991). This may cause the need for attitudinal restructuring. Some tactics used to influence and restructure attitudes in bargaining include retribution for bad behavior, as well as giving concessions to acknowledge and affirm good behavior. The overarching theme for attitudinal restructuring is based in the ability of one negotiating party's ability to influence the attitude of the other (Walton & McKersie, 1991). Finally, since a significant part of negotiation is based on trust and leverage, opposing parties may push or pull hard when there is a perceived advantage that could impact trust or develop confidence and inform the overall collective negotiation.

Intra Organizational Bargaining

An important point is the notion that union officials are elected to office for a defined period where their constituents can exert pressure on them (Walton & McKersie, 1991). Within this context, during the bargaining process, both unions and management designate a head negotiator who must use an intra-organizational process to adequately represent the interests of his or her stakeholders at the bargaining table. It is the role of the head negotiator to successfully mediate and negotiate constituent interests before meeting the union-management bargaining table. All these preceding points inform the theories on labor negotiations as proposed by Walton and McKersie.

2.2.7 Importance of Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining plays a vital role in settling and preventing industrial disputes. Specifically its importance on organizations productivity

1. Increase the economic strength of unions and management.
2. Establish uniform conditions of employment with a view to avoiding industrial disputes and maintaining stable peace in the industry.
3. Secure a prompt and fair settlement of grievances.

4. Avoids interruptions in work which follow strikes, go-slow tactics and similar coercive activities;
5. Lay down fair rates of wages and norms of working conditions;
6. Achieve an efficient operation of the plant;
7. Promote the stability and prosperity of the industry;
8. Provides a method or the regulation of the conditions of employment of those who are directly concerned about them;
9. It provides a solution to the problem of sickness in industry, and ensure old age pension benefits and other fringe benefits;
10. It creates new and varied procedures for the solution of the problems as and when they arise-Ã problems which vex industrial relations; and its form can be adjusted to meet new situations. Since basic standards are laid down, the employee is assured that he will be required to work under the stipulated audit;

2.2.8 Levels of Bargaining

Vettori, M-S (2005) described four possible levels of collective bargaining

- i. multinational collective bargaining constitutes bargaining between trade union federations and employee employers' organisations on an international level.
- ii. national level collective bargaining refers to collective bargaining between trade unions and employers and employers' organisations at national level,
- iii. Sectoral or centralized collective bargaining refers to bargaining between one or more unions and a group of employers from a particular industry or occupation,
- iv. Plant-level or organisational collective bargaining refers to bargaining between one or more unions and individual employers according to Sriyan de Silva (1996) Originally collective bargaining at the national or the industry level was viewed by employers as a means of reducing competition based on labour costs through standardized wage rates. Instead, centralized and industry level negotiation is considered as depriving enterprises of the needed flexibility to

compete on the basis of adjustments at the level of the enterprise in relation to pay, working hours and conditions, work organization, manpower utilization and so on. The efficiency gains are considerably greater - and more easily realizable - when negotiations take place at the enterprise level.

2.2.9 Process of Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining shares similarities with everyday negotiations, beginning with employees collaborating with their union to identify and prioritize a set of demands they wish to present to their employer. This process typically involves key stakeholders, including employees and management. In response, management will present its own proposals and counterarguments. According to Thompson (2023), the collective bargaining process typically consists of five steps that both employees and employers follow to reach a mutually agreeable solution.

PREPARATION: at very first step both the rep of each party prepares the negotiations to be carried out during the meeting. each member should be well versed with the issues to be raised at d meeting and should have adequate knowledge of labour laws.. the management should be well prepared with the proposals of change required in the statical figures to justify its stand

On the hand, the union must gather adequate information regarding the financial position of the business along with its ability to pay and prepare a detailed report on the issues and the desires of the workers

DISCUSS: here, both the parties decide the ground rules that will guide the negotiations and the prime negotiator is from the management team who will lead the discussion. Also, the issues for which the meeting is held, are identified at this stage. The issues could be related to the wages ,supplementary economic benefits

The issues could be related to the wages, supplement economic benefit (pension plans, health insurance, paid holidays, etc.),institutional issues (right and duties, ESOP plan),administrative issues (health and safety, technological changes, job security, working conditions).

PROPOSE: at this stage, the chief negotiator begins the conversation with an opening statement and then both the parties put forth their initial demands. This session can be called as a brainstorming, where each party gives their opinion that leads to arguments and counter arguments.

Bargain: the negotiations begin the stage, where each party tries to win over the other. The negotiations can go for days until final agreement is reached. Sometimes both the parties reach an amicable solution soon, but at times to settle down the dispute the third party intervenes into the negotiations in the form of arbitration or adjudication.

Settlement: this is the final stage of collective bargaining process here both the parties agree on a common solution to the problem discussed so far. Hence, a mutual agreement is formed between the employee and the employer which is to be signed by each party to give decision a universal acceptance.

Thus, to get the dispute settled the management must follow these steps systematically and give equal chance to the workers to speak out their minds.

2.2.10 Advantages of Collective Bargaining

According to Sriyan de Silva 1996, these are the disadvantages of collective bargaining. Firstly, collective bargaining has the advantage of settlement through dialogue and consensus rather than through conflict and confrontation. It differs from arbitration where the solution is based on a decision of a third party, while arrangements resulting from collective bargaining usually represent the choice or compromise of the parties themselves. Arbitration may displease one party because it usually involves a win/lose situation, and sometimes it may even displease both parties.

Second, collective bargaining agreements often institutionalize settlement through dialogue. For instance, a collective agreement may provide for methods by which disputes between the parties will be settled. In that event the parties know beforehand that if they are in disagreement there is an agreed method by which such disagreement may be resolved.

Third, collective bargaining is a form of participation. Both parties participate in deciding what proportion of the 'cake' is to be shared by the parties entitled to a share. It is a form of participation also because it involves a sharing of rule-making power between employers and unions in areas which in earlier times were regarded as management prerogatives, *e.g.* transfer, promotion, redundancy, discipline, modernisation, production norms. However, in some countries such as Singapore and Malaysia, transfers, promotions, retrenchments, lay-offs and work assignments are excluded by law from the scope of collective bargaining.

Fourth, collective bargaining agreements sometimes renounce or limit the settlement of disputes through trade union action. Such agreements have the effect of guaranteeing industrial peace for the duration of the agreements, either generally or more usually on matters covered by the agreement.

Fifth, collective bargaining is an essential feature in the concept of social partnership towards which labour relations should strive. Social partnership in this context may be described as a partnership between organised employer institutions and organized labour institutions designed to maintain non-confrontational processes in the settlement of disputes which may arise between employers and employees.

Sixth, collective bargaining has valuable by-products relevant to the relationship between the two parties. For instance, a long course of successful and *bona fide* dealings leads to the generation of trust. It contributes towards mutual understanding by establishing a continuing relationship. The process, once the relationship of trust and understanding has been established, creates an attitude of attacking problems together rather than each other.

Seventh, in societies where there is a multiplicity of unions and shifting union loyalties, collective bargaining and consequent agreements tend to stabilise union membership. For instance, where there is a collective agreement employees are less likely to change union affiliations frequently. This is of value also to employers who are faced with constant changes in union membership and consequent inter-union rivalries resulting in more disputes in the workplace than otherwise.

Eighth - perhaps most important of all - collective bargaining usually has the effect of improving industrial relations. This improvement can be at different levels. The continuing dialogue tends to improve relations at the workplace level between workers and the union on the one hand and the employer on the other. It also establishes a productive relationship between the union and the employers' organization where the latter is involved in the negotiation process. and the employers' organization where the latter is involved in the negotiation process.

2.2.11 Organizational Growth

According to Amah and Ahiauzu (2013) organizational growth can be conceived as the capacity of a firm or company or any corporation to realize the intended outcomes by use of minimum energy and in the shortest time possible using the least amount of money, manpower and other inputs. It refers to the performance of the organization and is mainly improved through efficiency in certain areas such as in procurement, finance or even in project management. Productivity in business organizations is usually pegged on their profitability, this means that by cutting down on the costs of production, a business organization is able to increase its productivity (Schulz et al., 2013). However, cutting down operational costs in most cases involves maintaining low wages and salaries. This in turn leads to demands for wage increases by employees through trade unions. Where the business gives in to union pressure and increases the wages, it must recover by demanding more output from the employees.

Organizational growth does not occur on its own or in a vacuum, in fact, there can never be organizational productivity without people. Seen through this lens, organizational productivity can therefore be considered the cumulative productivity of the individual members of that organization (Amah & Ahiauzu, 2013). Of particular importance is the role that the top organizational leadership plays in leading the rank and file in productivity (Williams, 2004). Top managers must give direction and guidance on how the organization can attain its aims more efficiently. Members in an organization work collaboratively to achieve the goals of the organization, this means

that human capital play a primary role in organizational productivity (Schulz et al., 2013). If the personnel in the firm do not work productively, the general productivity of the organization will be affected negatively. On the other hand, if the members of the organization are motivated and work productively, the general productivity of the organization will improve.

2.2.12 Factors Necessary for Organizational Growth

These factors were gotten from Okpalibekwe, Onyekwelu, Dike, (2015), There are factors that cannot be ignored by any organization in attaining or towards achieving organizational productivity. These factors are as follow:

a. Effective communication:- A negligent attitude by management to proper channel communication will bring about negative reaction to the management and its teams and this will in turn, frustrate all their plans to increase organization performance. Not keeping others informed of what is happening with regard to policies, plans, programmes and problems of organization will affect organizations performance. This is because, it is through effective communication that the worker will know the goals and understand what is happening in different units and also be able to make suggestion for possible improvement. This is to say that communication is an indispensable factor in attainment of organizational performance.

b. Effective Co-ordination:- This is the adjustment of the parts to each other and of the movement and operation of parts in time so that each can make its maximum contribution to the progress of the whole. (Gulick &Urwick, 1948). To achieve organizational performance in any complex organization, the parts have to work in co-ordination with each other. Poor co-ordination leads to reduced efficiency and productivity. Effective coordination is absolutely essential to good administration.

c. Effective Leadership: Leadership according to Stogdill (1978), is defined as the process of influencing group activities towards goal setting and goal achievement. It is a strategy for accomplishing organizational objective through effective and efficient

application of the resources of the organization. It injects and infuses life into an organization thus resulting in oriented action. An organization without leadership is an assemblage of people without direction and in consequence without clear purpose and mission to accomplish. If organization lacks effective control of its employees, it can result in low productivity.

d. Morale: - This is the willingness of employees to participate in a truly active way to devote their full energies to the organization task. Employee tends to assumed not just passive but active attitude towards the furtherance of the organizational goal when morale is high. In the absence such morale, the organization will be burdened with the almost hopeless task of supplying initiative as well as direction.

e. Training of Employees: - This is a process by which the aptitude, skills and abilities of employees to perform specific job are increased. If the organization, formulate appropriate comprehensive training programme, conduct training research, ensure effective training of employee organizational performance is enhanced

2.2.13 Factors that affect Organizational Productivity

A number of factors affect organizational productivity. According to Williams (2004), these factors fall into four broad categories; environmental factors; organizational structure; fiscal; human factors and employee attitudes.

Each of these factors has an important bearing on the efficiency of the firm. Whereas companies have some level of control on the fiscal and human factors, it is not possible for them to control the environment within which they operate. Environmental factors include aspects such as the physical location of the business, the political and economic environments. The physical location refers to aspects such as whether the company is located in the rural areas or in the urban areas. This location has implications for the employees because it determines where they live, their needs such as transport, shelter and other general considerations for employees. The political environment has to do with government regulations with regards to labor laws touching on issues like trade unions, employment contracts and minimum wages among others. Economic factors

relate to the general industry within which firms operate, this is important because it determines the wage-rate for employees and it informs managerial decisions. It also relates to the strength of trade unions in the industry and how such unions affect the operation of companies in the industry (Williams, 2004).

Organizational factors that affect a firm's productivity include

- a. the structure of the company,
- b. technology,
- c. and climate.

The structure, size, and complexity of an organization determine its efficiency depending on the extent of its specialization. Technology plays the most important role in productivity since it defines the firm's technical level of goods as well as processes, organizational climate concerns how the employees are treated and whether there is an established results-oriented organizational culture, it also concerns reward system for employees. Employee attitudes also determine productivity in organizations, this is because organizations achieve their goals through employees. If the workers are well motivated, then organizations can realize improved productivity but if employees are demotivated and dissatisfied, they are likely to be less productive.

As already defined, productivity is a volume measure of output to a measure of input use. There are many measures of productivity such as labor productivity and capital productivity. In this study, focus is on labor productivity since the study is concerned with trade unions. It is important to measure labor productivity because it helps in explaining the major economic underpinnings that are needed for economic growth as well as social development. Indicators implications for the employees because it determines where they live, their needs such as transport, shelter and other general considerations for employees. The political environment has to do with government regulations with regards to labor laws touching on issues like trade unions, employment contracts and minimum wages among others. Economic factors relate to the general industry within which firms operate, this is important because it determines the wage-

rate for employees and it informs managerial decisions. It also relates to the strength of trade unions in the industry and how such unions affect the operation of companies in the industry (Williams, 2004).

Organizational factors that affect a firm's productivity include the structure of the company, technology, and climate. The structure, size, and complexity of an organization determine its efficiency depending on the extent of its specialization. Technology plays the most important role in productivity since it defines the firm's technical level of goods as well as processes. Organizational climate concerns how the employees are treated and whether there is an established results-oriented organizational culture, it also concerns reward system for employees. Employee attitudes also determine productivity in organizations, this is because organizations achieve their goals through employees. If the workers are well motivated, then organizations can realize improved productivity but if employees are demotivated and dissatisfied, they are likely to be less productive

2.2.14 Collective Bargaining and Organizational Productivity

The question of collective bargaining and organizational productivity has received considerable debate on how the later affects the former. Collective Bargaining have an impact of organizational productivity since they affect profitability and labor. Scholars in industrial relations argue that bargaining process distort the labor market through a number of methods such as the push for higher wages, employment restrictions, and defense against layoffs. As already indicated, trade unions have the potential to cause unemployment. This means that organizational productivity can be affected by such unemployment since unemployment causes output losses. However, it is not exactly clear how collective bargaining affect organizational productivity. In any case, there is a lot of controversy concerning the effects of collective bargaining on organizational productivity. A clear understanding of this relationship is important for policy formulation in organizations. One way of gaining an understanding of the relationship between collective bargaining and organizational productivity is to carry out empirical

research on this question. Such research must, however, be guided by theory and literature review. Collective bargaining affect organizational productivity either positively or negatively. They affect productivity positively if they lead to increased employee productivity by successfully negotiating for better working conditions and remuneration packages (Deery & Iverson, 2005). These outcomes motivate organizational employees who are members of the trade unions to work more efficiently thereby increasing the company's productivity. Most employees consider the reward they obtain for their work as the greatest motivator for them to work hard. If the work environment is conducive and remuneration is reasonable and commensurate to the amount of work done, workers can work harder and more effectively in order to increase efficiency and general productivity. Cote (2013) argues that once trade unions force organizations to increase wages, company management must respond by making sure that they get maximum output from labor if they have to reduce labor costs. This means that organizations will endeavor to reap maximum output from each individual employee for every additional unit of wages and salaries. In some cases, trade unions promote productivity through performance contracts that union officials sign with the organizational management. They negotiate on performance targets with better remuneration packages in return. Moreover, collective bargaining increase organizational productivity by the fact that they provide a viable means through which the workers can express their grievances and/or discontent. Deery and Iverson (2005) argue that trade unions can also have a negative effect on the organizational productivity by causing employees to stop working or to engage in sabotage. This is done in cases where trade unions mobilize their members to go on strike where peaceful negotiations fail. Strikes, go slows and acts of sabotage decrease organizational productivity. In addition, productivity can further be compromised based on the disciplinary action that is taken against union members and their leaders after strikes. In some incidences, managers resort to sacking of the employees who engage in strikes. This reduces the labor force and decreases

productivity even if for a short period. Employee attitude can also be affected negatively by such actions. At the end of the day, demotivated workers cannot work efficiently and this reduces organizational productivity Thompson, (2011). This means that businesses need to have a good working relationship with their employees through trade unions in order to improve productivity and avoid disruptions in workflow and business operations. Most specifically, managers must do all that is possible to preempt any strikes that trade unions may cause. They should be open to dialogue and constructive negotiations that can guarantee the interests of both parties. However, in order for one to get a better understanding of the real relationship between trade unions and organizational productivity, it is important for empirical research to be carried out. Through fieldwork, important firsthand information can be collected concerning the role of collective bargaining instituted by trade union and how they affect productivity.

2.3 THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.3.1 Tradition Theory

This theory posits that the economic conditions in each nation play a crucial role in determining the outcomes of negotiations between management and workers. In essence, economic forces influence which party is favored in wage and salary negotiations between employers and unions. When the supply of labor exceeds demand, employers are likely to prevail, indicating a high level of unemployment in the economy. Conversely, if demand for labor surpasses supply, workers are more likely to succeed in negotiations. Another perspective of this theory emphasizes that strict adherence to established procedures and rules facilitates the process of reaching a collective agreement.

2.3.2 Power Model Theory

The power model theory posits that the greater the demands made, the less power either the union or the employer will have in achieving those demands. In other words, if the maximum demand is set at 5 and the union requests this full amount, the likelihood of obtaining it diminishes compared to asking for lower amounts, such as 2 or 3. The

theory suggests that to succeed in negotiations, parties should minimize their opponents' capacity to resist. For instance, if a trade union threatens to strike and management recognizes that the repercussions of such a strike could be severely detrimental to them, they may be more inclined to concede to the union's demands, and vice versa.

2.3.3 The Marketing Theory Concept

This theory posits that collective bargaining serves as a means to establish a collective agreement that outlines the terms and conditions under which workers agree to perform their duties. This collective agreement defines the framework for wages and other employment terms for both current employees and those who may be hired in the future. It differs from the individual labor contracts that workers enter into with employers for a specified duration and remuneration. A fundamental weakness of this theory lies in its assumption that the collective agreement clearly defines the obligations of both parties and that the relationship it establishes functions smoothly. It often overlooks the various issues that may arise during the implementation of the agreement.

2.3.4 The Government Theory Concept

This theory views collective bargaining with a wider political and socialistic outlook. The collective agreement is considered as the constitution for the functioning of industrial democratic government within the plant, the company or the industry level, within the framework of mutually agreed rules, regulations and procedures laid down from time to time. In this theory of collective bargaining, the contractual nature and balance of power of the earlier theory are not only retained but more emphasis is laid on the continuous negotiation between the parties. It suggests the 'grievance procedure as the judicial function of collective bargaining to settle any conflict or dispute arising in the course of working of the agreement.

2.3.5 Industrial Relations Theory Concept

This theory views collective bargaining as a process of jointly making decisions on matters of employment and industrial life for the attainment of their respective goals. This process leads to mutual agreement or agreements for the improvement of mutual relationship and terms and conditions of employment. Under this theory, collective bargaining agreements are a means of integrating union and management interests in a way that promotes the welfare of both. These three different theories of the concept of collective bargaining are neither sharply distinct from each other nor are they mutually exclusive. These represent the different stages of the development of collective bargaining, with different emphases on various aspects of it, and different conceptions of what collective bargaining should be. Employees are a foundation of any organization's success, and the manner that employees are developed has a direct impact on business performance.

2.3.6 Behavioural Theory concept

It is important to explore the full context and definition of the collective bargaining process before considering the contributions Walton and McKersie made to defining and codifying the sub- processes that drive negotiations in labor unions. The four sub-processes defined by Walton and McKersie (1991) were integrative bargaining, distributive bargaining, intra organizational bargaining, and attitudinal restructuring. It is important to note that not all labor impasses result in strikes and lockouts since public sector unions typically result to forced arbitration to resolve labor disputes in collective bargaining (Epstein, 2013). This requires that unions and management cooperate on key issues related to the collectively bargained agreement in the context of the behavioral theories proposed by Walton and McKersie (1991). The behavioral theories on labor negotiations noted strategies and tactics for distributive bargaining, integrative bargaining, attitudinal structuring, and intraorganizational bargaining as critical to the model for collective bargaining (Walton &McKersie, 1991).

2.4 EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK

Joy, Dumebi, and Kola (2023) in their study on collective bargaining and conflict management strategies at the University of Lagos, Nigeria, examined the effectiveness of collective bargaining as a tool for resolving conflicts in educational institutions. The research was conducted at the University of Lagos (UNILAG), focusing on the Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities (ASUU) and the Non-Academic Staff Union (NASU) of UNILAG. A stratified random sampling method was employed to select 120 respondents. Data collection methods included questionnaires, interviews, and literature reviews. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and simple percentages, were analyzed using SPSS version 15.0. The study found that effective collective bargaining positively influences productivity, establishes procedures for conflict resolution, and serves as a significant tool for managing conflicts within the university. The authors recommended that the university adopt conflict acceptance strategies and focus on effective resolution methods to transform conflicts into advantages for the institution.

Nana Gyesie (2023) conducted research exploring the impact of collective bargaining agreements on employee performance management. Fifteen respondents across five labor unions in Washington, DC, were selected through a purposive sampling strategy for semi-structured interviews. This multiple case study aimed to investigate how collective bargaining agreements facilitate or impede managers in establishing and maintaining high-performance work practices. Additional data sources included current and archived collective bargaining agreements, a reflective journal, and personal memos, analyzed using Yin's five-step process. Five key themes emerged: performance management and accountability, organizational and union culture, intrinsic motivation and performance recognition, management practices, and the future sustainability of unions. These findings can assist unionized organizations in the Washington, DC metro area in addressing negative hiring and retention practices. The study concluded that collective bargaining agreements, without a partnership framework aligned with organizational sustainability, can hinder the establishment of high-performance work practices.

Olukayide Longe (2023) investigated the impact of workplace conflict management on organizational performance in a Nigerian manufacturing firm. The study included 250 employees selected through a stratified random sampling technique. Data were collected using a validated structured questionnaire, and both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed for analysis. Spearman correlation analysis revealed a significantly positive relationship between conflict management strategies (including collective bargaining, compromise, and accommodation) and organizational performance. Conversely, non-integrative strategies (competition, domination, and avoidance) negatively impacted performance. Regression analysis indicated that collective bargaining was the most significantly correlated strategy with organizational performance. The study also identified that conflicts arose from various organizational experiences linked to economic and goal incompatibilities, with union-management conflict being the most prevalent. The conclusion highlighted that while conflict is an inevitable aspect of organizational life, its impact on performance depends on the adopted conflict management strategies.

Uwe Jensen and Susanne Rässler (2023) contributed to the literature on the effects of collective bargaining on firm performance through their study on German establishments. They analyzed firm efficiency and modeled productivity and efficiency simultaneously, addressing the issue of missing data. With 25% of observations having missing values, they explored the mechanisms behind this and identified effects related to firm size and collective bargaining. After conducting multiple imputations to address missing data, the results indicated significant changes in the effects of collective bargaining on productivity and efficiency. Their findings suggest further investigation into implausible zero values in capital proxies.

Okpalibekwe, Onyekwelu, and Dike (2023) explored the relationship between collective bargaining and organizational performance within the Nigeria Union of Local Government Employees in Idemili North Local Government Council, Anambra State. The research assessed the role of trade unions in collective bargaining and its

impact on organizational performance. A survey research method was utilized, relying on both primary and secondary data. Three hypotheses guided the study, and a simple random sampling technique was employed to select participants. Data analysis included percentages and mean scores, with hypotheses tested using a one-sample t-test. Findings indicated that the Nigeria Union of Local Government Employees played a crucial role in ensuring industrial peace, enhancing employee commitment to productivity, and effectively using collective bargaining to improve organizational performance. The study concluded that the union is instrumental in boosting employee productivity and recommended continuous awareness among stakeholders about their roles in fostering a harmonious work environment essential for organizational success.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section outlines the methods used to gather information for this study. It includes discussions on the research design, the study population, sample size and sampling technique, research instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments, data sources, data collection procedures, and data analysis methods.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design used for this study is descriptive, focusing on gathering the opinions of employees at the 7UP Bottling Company's Ilorin plant. This design was chosen due to its advantages, allowing the use of questionnaires, observations, and interviews without altering the study environment (Yin, 1984). The primary objective of the study is to investigate and examine the impact of collective bargaining on organizational performance at the 7UP Bottling Company.

3.3 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The target population for this study comprises the employees of the 7UP Bottling Company, which currently has a total of 402 employees. This selection is based on the ease of accessing the company's workforce and the availability of relevant data. The study will include representatives from the company, with the sample size focusing on the personnel department, which plays a key role in facilitating collective bargaining.

3.3 SAMPLING TECHNIQUE AND SAMPLE SIZE

This study concentrated on the employees of the 7UP Bottling Company in Ilorin, utilizing a simple random sampling technique. This approach ensures that every employee has an equal chance of being selected. To minimize workload and potential biases, Yaro Yamani's statistical formula was employed to determine the sample size.

Yamani's statistical formula for sample size determination is as follows:

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

Where n = sample size

N= population size (402)

E= the error of sampling (5%)

$$\begin{aligned}n &= 402/1+402(0.05)^2 \\&= 402/1+402(0.0025) \\&= 402/1+1.005 \\&= 402/2.005 \\&= 201 \text{ respondents}\end{aligned}$$

3.4 INSTRUMENT OF DATA COLLECTION

The research utilized both primary and secondary methods of data collection. The primary data was gathered through firsthand responses from target respondents via questionnaires distributed directly to employees. Secondary data was sourced from existing literature relevant to the study, including journals, textbooks, online materials, and unpublished writings. The questionnaire was divided into two sections: Section A collected biographical information from the respondents, while Section B focused on the study's objectives, aiming to gather insights on the impact of collective bargaining on organizational productivity. The questionnaire was designed using the Resin Likert attitudinal scale, formatted as a five-point scale with the following coding: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Undecided (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1).

3.5 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

To ensure the validity of the questionnaire, the questionnaire together with the objectives of the study and hypotheses underwent the expert validation and content validation. The expert validation was carried out by the researchers' supervisor who gave an expert opinion on the study. The content validation was based on the judgment of the researcher. To make sure that the reliability of the Instrument was sound, test-retest method was executed. At different times, questionnaires were administered to the respondents so as to ensure that the respondents' previous data correlated and was consistent from time to time.

3.8 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The method of data analysis to be used in this study is basically descriptive analysis and statistical inferential methods. Three statistical inferential methods are to be used in the data analysis in this study. The data collected through the use of the questionnaire was analyzed statistically using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Multiple linear regression analysis was adopted for H₀₁, H₀₂, H₀₃ and H₀₄. H₀₁

Simple linear regression model will be used to test hypothesis 1 which is a linear regression model with single explanatory variable i.e it concerns two-dimensional sample points with one independent variable and one dependent variable

The formula is given as:

$$y = \alpha_0 + \beta x + \varepsilon$$

Where:

y = dependent variable

α_0 = constant

β = coefficient

x = independent variable

ε = error term

Therefore, the model for this study is stated as:

$$OG = f(CB)$$

Y=organizational growth

X= collective bargaining

Where:

OG = organizational growth

CB = collective bargaining

With a simple linear relationship:

$$OG = \alpha_0 + \beta CB + \varepsilon$$

H₀₂ Simple linear regression model will be used to test hypothesis 1 which is a linear regression model with single explanatory variable i.e it concerns two-dimensional sample points with one independent variable and one dependent variable

$$y = \alpha_0 + \beta x + \varepsilon$$

Where:

y = dependent variable

α_0 = constant

β = coefficient

x = independent variable

ε = error term

Therefore, the model for this study is stated as:

$$EC = f(CB)$$

Where:

EC = employee commitment

CB = collective bargaining

With a simple linear relationship:

$$EC = \alpha_0 + \beta CB + \varepsilon$$

H₀₃ Simple linear regression model will be used to test hypothesis 1 which is a linear regression model with single explanatory variable i.e it concerns two-dimensional sample points with one independent variable and one dependent variable

$$y = \alpha_0 + \beta x + \varepsilon$$

Where:

y = dependent variable

α_0 = constant

β = coefficient

x = independent variable

ε = error term

Therefore, the model for this study is stated as:

$$OP = f(CB)$$

Where:

OP= organizational productivity

CB= collective bargaining

With a simple linear relationship:

$$OP = \alpha_0 + \beta CB + \varepsilon$$

H₀₄ Simple linear regression model will be used to test hypothesis 1 which is a linear regression model with single explanatory variable i.e it concerns two-dimensional sample points with one independent variable and one dependent variable;

$$y = \alpha_0 + \beta x + \varepsilon$$

Where:

y = dependent variable

α_0 = constant

β = coefficient

x = independent variable

ε = error term

Therefore, the model for this study is stated as:

$$DR = f(CB)$$

Where:

DR= Dispute Resolution

CB = collective bargaining

With a simple linear relationship:

$$DR = \alpha_0 + \beta CB + \varepsilon$$

- To examine the impact of collective bargaining on organizational growth .
- To examine the impact of collective bargaining on employees commitment
- To examine the impact of collective bargaining on organizational productivity
- To examine the impact of collective bargaining on dispute resolution

3.6 DECISION RULE

Regression decisions are determined by the strength of the regression coefficient, is between 0-30%, a slight relationship exists; if it is between 31-49%, a moderate relationship is present; and if it falls between 50-100%, a strong relationship is indicated. This assessment considers both positive and negative relationships. A p-value of 0.05 was utilized for testing significance. Consequently, the null hypotheses will be rejected when the significance values are less than the specified p-value, leading to the acceptance of the alternative hypotheses.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 INTRODUCTION:

This chapter analyzes data from questionnaires distributed to employees of the 7UP Bottling Company PLC in Ilorin, Kwara State. The analysis, conducted using SPSS version 25.0 and at a 5% significance level, focuses on the responses from 187 out of 201 returned questionnaires. It includes a biographical profile of the respondents and examines the overall model fit, the relationships between independent and dependent variables, and the significance levels of the regression parameters, followed by a discussion of the findings.

4.1 RESPONDENTS RATE OF RETURNED

Table 4.1: Number of questionnaires administered and collated

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Returned	187	93.0	93.0	93.0
Unreturned	14	7.0	7.0	100.0
Total	201	100.0	100.0	

A total of 187 questionnaires were administered, as shown in Table 4.1, resulting in a response rate of 93% of the total sample size and 46.1% of the overall staff population at 7UP Bottling Company. This response rate is considered robust, providing a reliable estimate of the total population and enhancing the accuracy of the study's findings.

4.2 Demographic Data of the Respondents

This section presents the socio-demographic information of the respondents presented 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 effectiveness of collect bargaining and productivity level in sampled organization. The analysis relied on this information of the respondents so as to relate the relevance to the study objectives.

Table 4.2.1: Age Distribution

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 21-40 years	103	55.1	55.1	55.1
41-60 years	72	38.5	38.5	93.6
60 & above	12	6.4	6.4	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.2.1 shows that 103 respondents, or 55.1% of the population, fall within the age range of 21-40 years. Additionally, 72 respondents, representing 38.5%, are aged 41-60, while 12 respondents, or 6.4%, are aged 60 and above. The significant presence of 103 respondents in the 21-40 age group indicates that the majority of the workforce is young and active. This demographic composition supports effective performance in the sampled bank, as most employees are within the productive age range.

Table 4.2.2 Marital Status

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Singled	33	17.6	17.6	17.6
Married	132	70.6	70.6	88.2
Divorcee	22	11.8	11.8	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.2.2 further reveals that 17.6% of respondents are single, 70.6% are married, and 11.8% are divorced. This indicates that the study on collective bargaining and organizational productivity encompasses individuals who are married, single, and divorced. Notably, the selected organization has a substantial number of responsible married staff, which can contribute positively to the bargaining process when reaching agreements with management.

Table 4.2.3 Gender Distribution

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	125	66.8	66.8	66.8
Female	62	33.2	33.2	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

The demographic profile indicates that 125 respondents, representing 66.8%, were male, while 62 respondents, or 33.2%, were female. This suggests that the study will primarily engage a higher number of males, who are considered to be highly productive in the sampled organization.

Table 4.2.4: Religion Background

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Islamic	99	52.9	52.9	52.9
Christianity	88	47.1	47.1	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.2.4 categorizes respondents based on their religious beliefs, which is a significant socio-demographic variable influencing employee moral principles in the workplace. The study area is predominantly Islamic, with Muslims comprising 52.9% of the workforce. Despite this, Christians are given equal rights within the sampled organization, as the area is recognized for fostering a healthy environment for individuals of all religions.

Table 4.2.5: Educational Qualification

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Primary	17	9.1	9.1	9.1
Secondary	28	15.0	15.0	24.1
NCE/OND	42	22.5	22.5	46.5
HND/BSc	91	48.7	48.7	95.2
MSc	9	4.8	4.8	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

The educational distribution in Table 4.2.5 reveals that the majority of respondents (48.7%) are graduates, while 37.5% hold school certificates or diplomas. Additionally, 9.1% possess primary certificates, and a small portion, 4.8%, hold second degrees. This indicates that the sampled organization employs a larger number of individuals with higher qualifications, reflecting the technical production processes required by the bottling company.

4.3 DATA ANALYSIS ACCORDING TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research question is to seek collective bargaining and how is being practiced to yield the end result in the organizational productivity

Q1. To what extent has the 7up bottling company used collective bargaining on organizational growth?

Table 4.3.1 Collective bargaining do not have impact on overall productivity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	40	16.0	16.0	16.0
Agree	44	23.5	23.5	39.5
Undecided	11	5.9	5.9	45.4
Disagree	12	6.4	6.4	51.9
Strongly disagree	90	48.1	48.1	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Of the respondents, 16% strongly agree, 23.5% agree, 5.9% neither agree nor disagree, 12% disagree, and 48.1% strongly disagree with the statement that collective bargaining has no impact on organizational productivity. This suggests that a significant portion of the effort in the selected organization to enhance productivity is linked to the implementation of collective bargaining, as indicated by the majority of respondents.

Table 4.3.2: Collective bargaining promote growth in the organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	20	10.7	10.7	10.7
Agree	119	63.6	63.6	74.3
Undecided	13	7.0	7.0	81.3
Disagree	27	14.4	14.4	95.7
Strongly disagree	8	4.3	4.3	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Among the respondents, 10.7% strongly agreed, 63.6% agreed, 7% were undecided, 14.4% disagreed, and a small 4.3% strongly disagreed. This indicates that the sampled organization has successfully promoted industrial growth through collective bargaining.

Table 4.3.3 Collective Bargaining adopted in the organization motivate workers to work in an environment governed in peace

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	112	59.9	59.9	59.9
Agree	29	15.5	15.5	75.4
Undecided	8	4.3	4.3	79.7
Disagree	10	5.3	5.3	85.0
Strongly disagree	28	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.3 aimed to investigate whether collective bargaining serves as a tool to motivate employees and foster peace in industrial and workplace settings. The results show that 59.9% of respondents strongly agree, 15.5% agree, 4.3% are neutral, 5.3% disagree, and 15% strongly disagree. This suggests that the selected organization is among the few that embrace peace in industrial environments by utilizing collective bargaining as a means to motivate employees for efficient work.

Q2. To what extent has 7up bottling company ensure employees' commitment to optimal job productivity?

Table 4.3.4 Workers current attitude and commitment to service change as a result of Collective bargaining

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strong agree	80	42.8	42.8	42.8
Agree	69	36.9	36.9	79.7
Undecided	13	7.0	7.0	86.6
Disagree	16	8.6	8.6	95.2
Strongly disagree	9	4.8	4.8	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.4 shows that 42.8% of respondents strongly agreed, 36.9% agreed, 7% were undecided, 8.6% disagreed, and 4.8% strongly disagreed that workers' attitudes and commitment to service change as a result of collective bargaining. This indicates that there is sufficient evidence that a majority (79.7%) believe that collective bargaining influences workers' attitudes and commitment to service.

Table 4.3.5 Collective Bargaining engages employee in decision making

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	30	16.0	16.0	16.0
Agree	100	53.5	53.5	69.5
Undecided	19	10.2	10.2	79.7
Disagree	20	10.7	10.7	90.4
Strongly disagree	18	9.6	9.6	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Sixteen percent of respondents strongly agreed, 53.5% agreed, 10.2% were undecided, 10.7% disagreed, and 9.6% strongly disagreed that collective bargaining involves employees in the decision-making process. This provides sufficient evidence that a majority (69.5%) agree that collective bargaining includes employees in decision-making.

Table 4.3.6 Collective Bargaining do not promote employee participation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	37	19.8	19.8	19.8
Agree	29	15.5	15.5	35.3
Undecided	20	10.7	10.7	46.0
Disagree	68	36.4	36.4	82.4
Strongly disagree	33	17.6	17.6	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Nineteen point eight percent of respondents strongly agreed, 15.5% agreed, 10.7% were undecided, 36.4% disagreed, and 17.6% strongly disagreed that collective bargaining does not promote employee participation. This indicates sufficient evidence from the majority of respondents (54%) who agree that collective bargaining is a tool for employee participation in the selected company.

Q3. To what extent has 7up bottling company used collective bargaining to enhance organizational productivity?

Table 4.3.7 Collective Bargaining does not impact on organizational productivity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	38	20.3	20.3	20.3
Agree	15	8.0	8.0	28.3
Undecided	32	17.1	17.1	45.5
Disagree	93	49.7	49.7	95.2
Strongly disagree	9	4.8	4.8	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

20.3% of respondents indicate strongly agreed, 8% indicate agreed, 17.1% undecided, 49.7% of respondents disagree and 4.8% disagree strongly that collective bargain does not have impact on organizational productivity. Hence there is sufficient evidence from majorities of respondents (54.5%) who disagree that collective bargain does not have impact on organizational productivity in the selected company.

Table 4.3.8 The company prefer integrating bargaining in work than distributed bargaining

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	48	25.7	25.7	25.7
Agree	56	29.9	29.9	55.6
Undecided	35	18.7	18.7	74.3
Disagree	18	9.6	9.6	84.0
Strongly disagree	30	16.0	16.0	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2022

Table 4.3.8 sought to compare the integrating approach and the distributed approach of collective bargaining in relation to organizational growth. Results show that 25.7% of respondents strongly agreed, 29.9% agreed, 18.7% were neutral, 9.6% disagreed, and 16% strongly disagreed. This suggests that the selected organization prefers the integrating approach to collective bargaining over the distributed approach. This preference indicates a collective voice agreement between management and employees in the organization.

Table 4.3.9 Give and take form of CB represent outcome of result, respect and cooperation between management and union

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	38	20.3	20.3	20.3
Agree	64	34.2	34.2	54.5
Undecided	13	7.0	7.0	61.5
Disagree	51	27.3	27.3	88.8
Strongly agree	21	11.2	11.2	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

Table 4.3.9 aimed to investigate the effective qualities of collective bargaining in the selected organization. The results indicate that 20.3% of respondents strongly agreed, 34.2% agreed, 7% were neutral, 27.3% disagreed, and 11.2% strongly disagreed. This suggests that the give-and-take qualities of collective bargaining foster effective results, as well as respect and cooperation between management and the union.

Table 4.3.10 Collective Bargaining influence attitude of other party

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	85	45.5	45.5	45.5
Agree	29	15.5	15.5	61.0
Undecided	15	8.0	8.0	69.0
Disagree	30	16.0	16.0	85.0
Agree	28	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

In Table 4.3.10, 45.5% of respondents strongly agreed, 15.5% agreed, 8% were undecided, 16% disagreed, and 15% strongly disagreed that collective bargaining influences the attitude of the other party. This indicates sufficient evidence that a majority (61%) collectively agree that collective bargaining can change the attitude of the other party to support organizational growth.

In Table 4.3.11 Collective Bargaining create an atmosphere of trust and confidence between the actor

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	48	25.7	25.7	25.7
Agree	77	41.2	41.2	66.8
Undecided	13	7.0	7.0	73.8
Disagree	40	21.4	21.4	95.2
Strongly disagree	9	4.8	4.8	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

25.7% of respondents indicate strongly agreed, 41.2% indicate agreed, 7% undecided, 21.4% of respondents indicate disagree and 4.8% disagree strongly that collective bargain create an atmosphere of trust and confidence between the actor. Hence there is sufficient evidence to support the claim.

Q4. To what extent has 7up bottling company used collective bargaining on dispute resolution?

Table 4.3.12 Collective Bargaining does not have impact on dispute resolution

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	24	12.8	12.8	12.8
Agree	55	29.4	29.4	58.8
Undecided	19	10.2	10.2	69.0
Disagree	34	18.2	18.2	87.2
Strongly disagree	55	29.4	29.4	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

This question aimed to explore the relationship between collective bargaining and dispute resolution in the workplace. The results show that 12.8% of respondents strongly agreed, 29.4% agreed, 10.2% were undecided, 18.2% disagreed, and 29.4% strongly disagreed that collective bargaining involves employees in decision-making. This indicates sufficient evidence that a majority (47.6%) collectively agree that collective bargaining has an impact on resolving disputes in the workplace.

**Table 4.3.13 Collective Bargaining could be a major source of dispute in
7up when they can't reach an agreement**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly agree	45	24.1	24.1	24.1
Agree	60	32.1	32.1	56.1
Undecided	20	10.7	10.7	66.8
Disagree	29	15.5	15.5	82.4
Strongly disagree	33	17.6	17.6	100.0
Total	187	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2025

This question was posed to investigate whether collective bargaining is an effective tool for resolving disputes in the workplace. The results reveal that 24.1% of respondents strongly agreed, 32.1% agreed, 10.7% were undecided, 15.5% disagreed, and 17.6% strongly disagreed that collective bargaining is a potent and vibrant instrument for managing dispute-related matters in the selected organization.

4.4 HYPOTHESES TESTING & INTERPRETATION

Ho1: collective bargaining does not impact on organizational growth

Table 4.4.1 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.639 ^a	.409	.406	.47532

a. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

Table 4.4.1 presents the incorporated model summary from the regression analysis conducted to determine the significant relationship between collective bargaining and organizational productivity. The results indicate that the coefficient of determination is $R^2 = 0.409$, meaning that approximately 40.9% of the variation in productivity is explained by collective bargaining. Additionally, $R = 0.639$ suggests a positive significant relationship between collective bargaining and organizational productivity. The regression equation is relatively useful for making predictions, as the R-squared value is nearing 50%.

Table 4.4.2: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	28.920	1	28.920	128.006	.000 ^b
	Residual	41.797	185	.226		
	Total	70.717	186			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

Table 4.4.2 provides the overall diagnostic test of significance using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to assess the relationship between productivity and collective bargaining. The ANOVA results for the regression coefficients show that $F = 128.006$, which is greater than the F-table value of 3.84, with a p-value of 0.00 that is less than 0.05. This indicates that collective bargaining significantly predicts organizational productivity, confirming that it is a suitable fit for the model. Thus, a significant relationship between organizational productivity and collective bargaining exists at a 95% confidence level.

Table 4.4.3 Regression Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.097	.130		.750	.454
Collective Bargaining	.729	.064	.639	11.314	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity

The study sought to determine the beta coefficients of collective bargaining regress over organizational productivity. Table 4.4.3 shows that there is direct positive impact of collective bargaining on the organizational productivity of the selected company since the coefficient of trend analysis was 0.729 which is significantly close to 1. The t statistics (11.314) was also greater than 1.658 at a degree of freedom of 85. This demonstrated that the collective bargaining had a positive impact on organizational productivity. The significant level was specified at (p-value = $0.000 < 0.05$) in the level of productivity as shown in Table 4.4.3. The fitted model from this analysis is shown below:

$$Y = 0.097 + 0.729 (\text{Collective bargaining})_1$$

This implies that 72.6% variability change in organization productivity was significantly caused by 1% increase in Collective bargain

Ho2: collective bargaining does not have impact on employees' commitment.

Table 4.4.4 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.779 ^a	.607	.605	.38768

a. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

The table 4.4.4 show the incorporated model summary from regression analysis to determine the significance relationship of Collective bargaining and employee commitment. The result show that the coefficient of determination is $R^2=0.607$; therefore, about 60.7% of the variation in productivity is explained by collective bargaining and that $R=0.779$ indicate correlation coefficient is positive and that significant relationship between collective bargaining and employee commitment exists. The regression equation appears to be relatively useful for making predictions since the value of R squared is slightly greater than 50%

Table 4.4.5: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42.911	1	42.911	285.504	.000 ^b
	Residual	27.805	185	.150		
	Total	70.717	186			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee commitment

b. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

Table 4.4.5 presents the overall diagnostic test of significance using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between employee commitment and collective bargaining. The ANOVA results for regression coefficients indicate that the significance of the $F\text{-calculated}=285.504 > F\text{-table}=3.84$; i.e. is $p\text{-value}=0.00$ is less than 0.05. This

indicates that the collective bargaining significantly predicts the employee commitment (meaning it is a good fit for the model). Therefore a significant relationship between employee commitment and collective bargaining 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)	.158	.085		1.863	.064
Collective Bargaining	1.018	.060	.779	16.897	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment

The study sought to determine the beta coefficients of collective bargaining regress over employee commitment. Table 4.4.6 shows that there is direct positive impact of collective bargaining on the employee commitment of the selected company since the coefficient of trend analysis was 1.018 which is significantly unitary. The t statistics (16.897) was also greater than 1.658 at a degree of freedom of 85. This demonstrated that the collective bargaining had a positive impact on employee commitment. The significant level was specified at (p-value = 0.000<0.05) in the employee commitment as shown in Table 4.4.3. The fitted model from this analysis is shown below:

$$Y = 0.158 + 1.018 (\text{Collective bargaining})_1$$

This implies that 101.8% increase in employee commitment was significantly caused by a unit increase in Collective bargain

Ho3: collective bargaining does not have impact on organizational growth.

Table 4.4.7 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.830 ^a	.690	.688	.34451

a. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

The table 4.4.7 show the incorporated model summary from regression analysis to determine the significance relationship of Collective bargaining and organization growth. The result show that the coefficient of determination is $R^2=0.690$; therefore, about 69% of the variation in organizational growth is explained by collective bargaining and that $R=0.830$ indicate correlation coefficient is positive and that significant relationship between collective bargaining and organizational growth exists. The regression equation appears to be relatively useful for making predictions since the value of R squared is slightly greater than 50%

Table 4.4.8 ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	48.759	1	48.759	410.815	.000 ^b
	Residual	21.957	185	.119		
	Total	70.717	186			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational growth

b. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

Table 4.4.8 presents the overall diagnostic test of significance using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between organizational growth and collective bargaining. The ANOVA results for regression coefficients indicate that the significance of the F -calculated=410> f -table=3.84 is 0.00 which is less than 0.05. This indicates that the collective bargaining significantly predicts the organizational growth (meaning it is a good fit for the model). Therefore a significant relationship between organizational growth and collective bargaining exists at 95% confidence level

Table 4.4.9 Regression Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-.021	.080		-.267	.790
Collective Bargaining	1.021	.050	.830	20.269	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational growth

The study sought to determine the beta coefficients of collective bargaining regress over organizational growth. Table 4.4.3 shows that there is direct positive impact of collective bargaining on the organizational growth of the selected company since the coefficient of trend analysis was 1.021 which is significantly close to 1. The t statistics (20.269) was also greater than 1.658 at a degree of freedom of 85. This demonstrated that the collective bargaining had a positive impact on organizational growth. The significant level was specified at (p-value = 0.000<0.05) in the level of productivity as shown in Table 4.4.3. The fitted model from this analysis is shown below:

$$Y = -0.021 + 1.021 (\text{Collective bargaining})_1$$

This implies that 102.1% variability change in organization growth was significantly caused by 1% increase in Collective bargain and if peradventure CB=0; that is removed from the model, organizational growth reduce by 2.1% as revealed in the constant of regression line which directly implies the removal of collective bargaining might not be wise but a threat to organizational performance.

Ho4: collective bargaining does not have impact on dispute resolution.

Table 4.4.10 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.735 ^a	.541	.538	.41895

a. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

The table 4.4.10 show the incorporated model summary from regression analysis to determine the significance relationship of Collective bargaining and dispute resolution. The result show that the coefficient of determination is $R^2=0.541$; therefore, about 54.1% of the variation in dispute is explained by collective bargaining and that $R=0.735$ indicate correlation coefficient is positive and that significant relationship between collective bargaining and dispute resolution exists. The regression equation appears to be relatively useful for making predictions since the value of R squared is slightly greater than 50%

Table 4.4 11 ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	38.245	1	38.245	217.896	.000 ^b
	Residual	32.471	185	.176		
	Total	70.717	186			

a. Dependent Variable: Dispute resolution

b. Predictors: (Constant), Collective Bargaining

Table 4.4.11 presents the overall diagnostic test of significance using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between organizational growth and collective bargaining. The ANOVA results for regression coefficients indicate that the significance of the $F_{\text{calculated}}=210 > F_{\text{table}}=3.84$ is 0.00 which is less than 0.05. This indicates that the collective bargaining significantly predicts the dispute resolution (meaning it is a good fit for the model). Therefore a significant relationship between dispute resolution and collective bargaining existing at 95% confidence level

Table 4.4.12 Regression Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-.130	.099		-1.316	.190
Collective Bargaining	.426	.029	.735	14.761	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Dispute resolution

The study sought to determine the beta coefficients of collective bargaining regress over organizational growth. Table 4.4.12 shows that there is direct positive impact of collective bargaining on the dispute resolution of the selected company since the coefficient of trend analysis was 0.426 is significantly close to 1. The t statistics (14.761) was also greater than 1.658 at a degree of freedom of 85. This demonstrated that the collective bargaining had a positive impact on dispute resolution at 5% level of significant. The significant level was specified at (p-value = 0.000<0.05) in the level of productivity as shown in Table 4.4.3. The fitted model from this analysis is shown below:

$$Y = -0.130 + 0.426 (\text{Collective bargaining})_1$$

This implies that 42.6% variability change in dispute resolution was significantly caused by 1% increase in Collective bargain and if peradventure CB=0; that is removed from the model, dispute resolution reduce by 13% as revealed in the constant of regression line which directly implies the removal of collective bargaining might not be wise but a threat to industrial grievances and dispute related matter.

4.5 DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This study conducted an empirical analysis focusing on the impact of collective bargaining on organizational productivity, employee commitment, organizational growth, and dispute resolution among the management and staff of 7up Bottling Company in Ilorin, Kwara State. The research provided strong empirical support for the positive and statistically significant effects of collective bargaining on all response variables at a 5% significance level. The analysis clearly indicates that if an organization adopts a culture of effective collective bargaining, it will lead to increased productivity, enhanced employee performance, continued organizational growth, and a reduction in workplace disputes.

The findings from hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 align with previous empirical studies on collective bargaining, consistent with the literature review, and replicate the work of Hirsch, Macpherson, and Winters (2012); Freeman and Han (2013); and Joy, Dumebi, and Kola (2015), which highlight the positive effects of collective bargaining on dispute resolution and employee performance. Specifically, empirical evidence from hypothesis 1 confirms that collective bargaining significantly affects organizational productivity. Hypothesis 2 further suggests that the greater the effectiveness of collective bargaining, the higher the employee commitment.

Additionally, findings from hypothesis 3 predict that in the absence of collective bargaining, integrative approaches—known to facilitate agreement between unions and management—are likely to diminish, negatively impacting organizational growth. The study also indicates that employee morale and commitment can be enhanced by fostering a democratic culture of collective bargaining. Consequently, all null hypotheses were rejected, and the alternative hypotheses were accepted, leading to the general conclusion that collective bargaining is a key instrument positively affecting organizational productivity at a 5% significance level.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the summary of the findings of the study. These findings are discussed, one after the other. Based on the discussion the researchers offered some recommendations and suggestions. It also draws conclusion on the study.

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the impact of collective bargaining on organizational productivity at 7up Bottling Company in Ilorin, Kwara State. Below is a summary of the main findings:

The level of organizational productivity is influenced by the adoption of a democratic and integrative approach to collective bargaining at 7up Bottling Company PLC.

The greater the effectiveness of collective bargaining, the higher the employee commitment.

Collective bargaining has a significant impact on organizational growth at a 95% confidence level.

Finally, collective bargaining is sufficiently effective in resolving dispute-related matters within the selected organization at a 95% confidence level.

5.2 CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- i. To enhance productivity at 7up Bottling Company, collective bargaining and its integrative approach must be prioritized and conducted in good faith.
- ii. Collective bargaining positively impacts employee performance, as its effectiveness boosts morale and commitment among staff at 7up Bottling Company PLC.
- iii. Organizational growth at 7up Bottling Company is significantly supported by collective bargaining, which is recognized as a critical element for reaching agreements between employers and employees.
- iv. Collective bargaining serves as an effective means of addressing grievances and resolving dispute-related matters within the selected case study.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are deemed necessary:

- i. Management in the selected industry should adopt collaborative strategies to ensure effective collective bargaining, involving both employers and employees' representatives in decision-making processes aimed at increasing organizational productivity.
- ii. Both management and employees should commit to working together amicably by formulating effective strategies and maintaining acceptable policies for ongoing collective bargaining. This proactive approach will facilitate discussions and resolutions of disputes, promoting industrial harmony and enhancing productivity.

- iii.** Credible communication channels and open discussions regarding industrial disputes should be encouraged. Management and unions should provide detailed feedback on discussed issues and agreements to employees periodically, fostering industrial peace and harmony. This will also create awareness about workplace matters and empower employees to actively contribute to achieving organizational goals.
- iv.** The timing of negotiations for collective agreements should be carefully considered to ensure that scheduled negotiations and agreements are included in the annual budget.
- v.** Collective agreements reached should be prioritized, and their implementation should be executed in good faith by both employers and employees. This approach will foster positive management-union relations and improve workplace dynamics.

REFERENCES

- Adeyemi, J. (2024). *Understanding industrial conflicts: A comprehensive guide*. Abuja: ABC Press.
- Afolabi, K. (2022). *Industrial relations in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects*. Enugu: GHI Books.
- Aguinis, H. (2007). *Measuring performance management*. No New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Aina, A. F., & Shola, O. (2005). *Personnel management: Theories and issues*. Lagos: Panaf Publishing Inc.
- Akafo, V. A., Peter, A. B., & Patience, Y. (2015). An assessment of compensation determination and its impact on employee commitment in private tertiary institutions in Ghana. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Arts and Humanities (GARJAH)*, 4(2), 15–25.
- Anyim, F., Elegbede, T., & Gbajumo-Sheriff, M. (2023). *Collective bargaining as a mechanism for conflict resolution*. Lagos: VWX Publishers.
- Anyim, F. C., Elegbede, F., & Gbajumo, M. A. (2011). Collective bargaining dynamics in the Nigeria public and private sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(5), 63–70.
- Armstrong, M. (2008). *A handbook of human resource management practice* (10th ed.). London: Kogan Ltd.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *A handbook of human resource management practice* (11th ed.). Philadelphia: Kogan Page Limited.
- Asika, N. (2010). *Research methodology in behavioural sciences*. Longman Nigeria.
- Aswathappa, M. (2007). *Learning with trade unions: A contemporary agenda in employment relations*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Attah, M. A. (1999). *Effective bargaining conditions*. Lagos: Macmillan Publisher Ltd.
- Bamiduro, J. A. (2008). Collective bargaining: The Nigerian perspective. *Adamawa Journal of Management and Decision Analysis*, 1.

- Barker, D. E. (2002). *Reward strategies: From intent to impact*. London: CIPD.
- Barr, M. (1998). *Human resource management: A critical analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Macmillan Press.
- Barrett, B., Rhodes, E., & Beishon, J. (1975). *Industrial relations and the wider society* (2nd ed.). London: Collier Macmillan.
- Blanpain, R. (2010). *Comparative labour law and industrial relations in industrialized market economies* (10th ed.). Kluwer Law International.
- Bohlander, G. W., & Snell, S. (2007). *Managing human resources* (14th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Bowles, D., & Cooper, C. (2009). *The SAGE handbook of human resource management*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bowman, M. (2006). *Human resource management in the public service: Paradoxes, processes, and problems*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Brigham, R. F. (2014). Effect of collective bargaining rights on public employee compensation: Evidence from teachers, firefighters, and police. *Journal of Department of Economics, Brigham Young University*.
- Byars, L. W., & Rue, K. (2008). *Human resource management* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Von Hoffman.
- Chabra, T. N. (2001). *Human resource management: Concepts and issues* (2nd ed.). Delhi: Dhanpat Rai & Co. Ltd.
- Chamberlain, N. W., & Kuhn, J. W. (1965). *Collective bargaining* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Chidi, O. C. (2010). Managing industrial conflict for sustainable development in Nigeria: An inclusive stakeholder approach. *Nigerian Journal of Management Studies*, 10(2), 46–68.
- Clegg, H. (1975). Pluralism and industrial relations. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 13(3), 309–316.
- Clegg, H. (1979). *Trade unionism under collective bargaining*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Cole, G. A. (2005). *Organizational behaviour: Theory and practice*. London: Thomson Learning.
- Condrey, S. E. (2010). *Handbook of human resource management* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Crouch, C. (1982). *Conflict and industrial relations crisis*. London: Heinemann.
- Daft, R. L. (2010). *Organization theory and design* (10th ed.). Canada: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Dalton, M. C. F. (1998). *Human capital management* (2nd ed.). London: People Manage.
- Daniels, G., & McIlroys, J. (2009). *Trade unions in a neoliberal world*. Routledge Ltd.
- DeNissi, A. S., & Griffin, R. W. (2001). *Human resource management*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dessler, G. (2011). *Human resource management* (12th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Dessler, G., & Varkkey, W. (2009). *Planning with people in mind* (2nd ed.). USA: Harvard Business Review.
- Draft, R. L. (2010). *New era of management* (9th ed.). USA: Cengage Learning, South-Western.
- Dunlop, J. T. (1985). *Industrial relations systems*. New York: Holt.
- Elele, C. (2008). *Collective bargaining as a solution to industrial disputes*. Niger Delta Standard, 26.
- Fajana, S. (2002). *Industrial relations in Nigeria: Theory and features*. Lagos: Laofin and Company.
- Fasan, O. (2011). *Workers' rights and employer responsibilities: A balancing act*. Port Harcourt: JKL Publishers.
- Farnham, D., & Pimlott, J. (1998). *Understanding industrial relations* (5th ed.). New Cassell Press.
- Fashoyin, T. (1999). *Industrial relations in Nigeria* (2nd ed.). Lagos: Longman Limited.

- Fiddler, J. (1981). *The British business elites: Its attitudes to class, status, and power*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Finbow, R. G. (2006). *The limits of regionalism: NAFTA's labour accord*. Ashgate Publishing.
- Flanders, A. (1975). *Collective bargaining: A theoretical analysis*. Management and Unions. London: Faber and Faber, 239.
- Fox, A. (1966). *Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations Research Papers*, 3(2). London: HMSO.
- Fox, A. (1975). *Collective bargaining*. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 2(2), 117.
- Freeman, R., & Han, E. (2013). *Public sector unionism without collective bargaining*. Mimeo, American Economic Association.
- Freeman, R. B., & Valetta, R. G. (1988). *The effects of public sector labour laws on labour market institutions and outcomes*. In *When public sector workers unionize*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Frey, S. (1997). *Capital on global workforce*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gerheart, B., & Milkovich, G. T. (1990). *Performance appraisal and merit pay*. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.
- Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., & Afifi, W. A. (2007). *Close encounters: Communication in relationships* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications Inc.
- Hayman, R. (1975). *Industrial relations*. London: Macmillan, 26.
- Henry, N. (2004). *Public administration and public affairs* (8th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Ltd.
- Hirsch, B., Macpherson, D., & Winters, J. (2012). *Teachers' salaries, state collective bargaining laws, and union coverage*. Mimeo, American Economic Association.
- Howell, C. (2007). *Trade unions and the state: The construction of industrial relations institutions in Britain, 1890–2000*. Princeton University Press.

- Hutchinson, S. (2013). *Performance management: Theory and practice*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel Development.
- Hyman, R. (1978). *The workers' union*. London: Clarendon Press.
- Imafiodon, T. C. (2006). Emergent and recurrent issues in contemporary industrial relations. *Nigerian Management Review*, 17(1).
- International Labour Organization (ILO). (1960). *Collective bargaining: A workers educational manual*. Geneva: ILO.
- Jenkins, C., & Sherman, B. (1997). *Collective bargaining*. London: Routledge.
- Jenssen, M. F. (2001). *Creating employee engagement: Transforming the employment deal. Benefit and Compensation*. London: Watson Wyatt Inc.
- Jide, I. (2013). Collective bargaining and conflict resolution in Nigeria's public sector. *Journal of Ife Centre for Psychological Studies Services*, 21(2), 220–223.
- Joy, O. E., Dumebi, A. I., & Kola, R. O. (2015). Collective bargaining: An evaluation of conflict management strategies in the University of Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS)*, 6(7), 220–227.
- Kester, K. O. (2006). *Perspective on wage determination and bargaining in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Archers Publisher.
- Khan, J., & Soverall, W. (2007). *Gaining productivity*. Arawak Publications.
- Lemay, M. C. (2002). *Public administration: Clashing values in the administration of public policy*. America: Wadsworth Thomson.
- Lovenheim, M. F. (2009). The effect of teachers' unions and education production: Evidence from union elections certifications in three Midwestern states. *Journal of Labour Economics*, 27, 525–587.
- Marks and Spencer. (2010). Case study. <http://www.ncpp.ie/dynamic/docs/markspencer-cs.pdf>
- Mathins, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2007). *Human resource management*. Cengage Learning.

- Milkovick, G. T., & Newman, J. M. (2008). *Compensation* (9th ed.). USA: McGraw Hill.
- Mondy, R. W., & Mondy, J. B. (2009). *Human resource management* (11th ed.). Pearson Education, Canada.
- Mullins, L. J. (2010). *Management and organizational behaviour* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Narilkar, A. (2010). *Deadlocks in multilateral negotiations: Causes and solutions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Naukrihub, J. (2009). Payroll system and compensation management. www.payroll.naukrihub.com/compensation.html.
- Neo, R., New, R. A., Hollenback, J., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2009). *Human resource management* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Netasha, C., & Bart. (2006). Reflections on public sector-based integrative collective bargaining. *Journal of Employee Relations*, University of Victoria, North Saanich, Canada, 28, 62–75.
- Ngu, A. (1994). *Collective bargaining: A dynamic process*. Kaduna: PQR Publishers.
- Ngu, S. M. (1994). *Personnel management in Nigeria: Principles and practices*. Zaria: Gaskiya Corporation Limited.
- Noe, F. J. (1996). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage*. Massachusetts: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, K. (1992). Compensation, employment, and the political activity of public employee unions. *Journal of Labour Research*, 13(2), 189–203.
- OAU, P. (1989). Industrial relations and the political process in Africa. *Nigerian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 3(3).
- Ohanian, L. (2010). *The impact of the Employee Free Choice Act on the U.S. economy*. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Ojo, F. (1998). *Personnel management: Theories and issues*. Lagos: Panaf Publishing Inc.

- Okpanachi, I. N. (2003). Labour union management in developing countries. An unpublished paper.
- Onabanjo, I. (2013). Collective bargaining: Received orthodoxy discarded in public sector wage determination. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5.
- Onah, F. O. (2008). Human resource management (2nd ed.). Enugu: John Jabco's Classic Publishers Ltd.
- Onasanya, S. A. B. (2003). Effective personnel management and industrial relations (Revised ed.). Lagos: Centre for Management Development.
- Onasanya, S. A. B. (2006). Effective personnel management and industrial relations. Lagos: Centre for Management Development.
- Otobo, D. (2005). Industrial relations: Theory and controversies (Revised ed.). Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Owoseni, O. O. (2014). Collective bargaining as a veritable tool for resolving conflict in organizations. *Oyo: Journal of Ajayi Crowther University*.
- Pamela, J., & Roger, D. C. (2000). Collective bargaining and faculty compensation: Faculty as a new working class. *Journal of Rhode Island College, Sociology of Education*, 60.
- Parker, P. A. L., Hawes, W. R., & Lumb, A. L. (1997). The reform and collective bargaining at plant and company level. London: HMSO.
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). Managerial attitude and performance. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin Inc.
- Ramaswamy, E. Y. (2000). A question of balance: Labour, management, and society. Oxford University Press: New Delhi.
- Ratnam Venkata, C. S. (2006). Industrial relations (1st ed.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 188–192.
- Reddish, H. (1966). Memorandum of evidence to Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations. London: HMSO.

- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2013). *Management* (11th ed.). England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Roots, P. (1986). *Collective bargaining: Opportunities for a new approach*. School of Industrial Relations & Business Studies Industrial Relations Research Unit, University of Warwick, Coventry.
- Rose, E. (2008). *Employment relations* (3rd ed.). Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Ryan, P. (1985). *The dynamics of labour market segment*. London: Academic Press.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Sir/Madam,

REQUEST FOR FILLING QUESTIONNAIRE.

I am a final year student in the Department of Business Administration at Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin, conducting research on the topic "**Assessing the Impact of Collective Bargaining on Organizational Performance: Insights from 7UP Bottling Company, Ilorin.**"

I kindly request you to fill out the attached questionnaire. Please note that this is strictly for academic purposes, and any information you provide will be treated with the highest confidentiality. Your responses will not be used as a basis for evaluating your personal performance.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated! Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTION: Please tick (√) in the space provided below to indicate your choice of answer.

SECTION A: Social Demographic Factors.

1. Age in years: (a) 21-40 () (b) 41-60 () (c) 60 + ()
2. Marital status: (a) Single () (b) Married () (c) Divorced ()
(d) Widow/Widowers ()
3. Gender: (a) Male () (b) Female ()
4. Religion: (a) Islam () (b) Christianity () (c) Traditional () (d) Others ()
5. Educational Qualification: (a) Primary School Certificate () (b) Secondary School Certificate () (c) N.C.E/O.N.D () (d) H.N.D/Bachelor's degree ()
(e) Master's degree () (f) Ph.D () (g) Others ()

SECTION B: Impact of Collective Bargaining On Organizational growth

Please choose the option that best expresses your view on the impact of collective bargaining on organizational peace. Please tick (√) as follows. Strongly Agree(SA), Agree(A), Undecided(U), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree(SD)

S/N	QUESTIONS ON THE FIRST OBJECTIVE	⁵ SA	⁴ A	³ U	² D	¹ SD
1.	collective bargaining does not impact on organizational growth					
2.	Collective bargaining promotes growth in the organization.					
3.	Collective bargaining currently adopted by 7up bottling company has impact on the organizations overall productivity which improve the growth					
4.	A strong collective bargaining adopted in 7up bottling company motivates the workers to work which promotes organizational growth					

SECTION C: Collective Bargaining and Employees Commitment

Please choose the option that best expresses your view on the commitment of 7up bottling organizational productivity and how it can be improved. Please tick (√) as follows. Strongly Agree(SA), Agree(A), Undecided(U), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree(SD)

S/N	QUESTIONS ON EMPLOYEES' COMMITMENT	⁵ SA	⁴ A	³ U	² D	¹ SD
1.	Collective bargaining promote job satisfaction and employee commitment					
2.	The workers current attitude to service is good as a result of the collective bargaining					
3.	collective bargaining engages employees in decision making process					
4.	Collective bargaining does not promote employees participation					

SECTION D: Collective Bargaining and Organizational Productivity

Please choose the option that best expresses your view on the other forms of collective bargaining that management can adopt. Please tick (√) as follows. Strongly Agree(SA), Agree(A), Undecided(U), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree(SD)

S/N	QUESTIONS ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY	⁵ SA	⁴ A	³ U	² D	¹ SD
1.	Collective bargaining does not impact on organizational productivity					
2.	7up bottling company prefer integrative bargaining attached to work than distributive bargaining for better productivity					
3.	Give & take form of collective bargaining represent outcome of trust, respect and cooperation between management and unions					
4.	Forms of collective bargaining have away to influence the attitude of other party to improve organizational productivity					
5.	The type of collective bargaining adopted by the company creates an atmosphere of trust confidence between the actor					

SECTION E: Collective Bargaining and Dispute Resolution

Please choose the option that best expresses your view on how well the dispute resolution reflects on the productivity by 7up bottling company.. Please tick (✓) as follows. Strongly Agree(SA), Agree(A), Undecided(U), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree(SD)

S/N	QUESTIONS ON THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION	⁵ SA	⁴ A	³ U	² D	¹ SD
1.	Collective Bargaining does not have impact on Dispute Resolution					
2.	collective bargaining be a major source of dispute in 7up bottling company, when they can't reach an agreement					
3.	collective bargaining the major source of dispute resolution					

Thank you for your time and attention. It is greatly appreciated.