

Employee Participation in Decision Making and its impact on Organizational Performance: Evidence from Government Owned Enterprises, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

*¹Ijeoma Chimaobi; *²Mbah Jacintha Chikamnele

*¹Department of Financial Management Technology, Federal University of Technology, PMB 1526, Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.

*²Department of Banking and Finance Federal Polytechnic Nekede, PMB 1036 Owerri Imo State, Nigeria.

Email: ijeomachimaobi68@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the impact of employee participation in decision making on organizational performance using Government Owned Enterprises in Port-Harcourt, River State as a case study. The population of study comprised managers and employees of the selected firm in Port-Harcourt River state. The sample for the study was given as 125. Out of the 125 questionnaires administered to the participant only 100 were returned while 25 were not returned. The study was analyzed using of tables and percentage while the three hypotheses were tested with the aid of ANOVA. The result from the research shows that employee participation in decision making has positive effect on organizational performance. This study recommends the following; Organizations are encourage to design their firm in such a way that it will boot free flow of decision making in their organization and gives room for full involvement of their employee to participate and create efficiency on organizational decision making process. Again, Firms are advised to put more mechanisms that will encourage their employees to come up with better innovative ways of achieving and promoting organizational performance, and also Firms are commended to improve the level of workers involvement in decision making between employees and employer, finally, Every firm is advised to create a straightforward understanding and notion of the concept of participative decision making to avoid conflicts of interest among the employees and the employer.

Key Words: Employee Participation, Decision Making, Organizational Structure, Employee Commitment, Centralization.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Presently, organizations have recognized the needs of Employee Participation in achieving organizational objectives. Majority of firms that employ participative management approach have recorded dramatic breakthrough in the area of operational cost, high profit margin and work productivity. Through Employee Participation, individuals are offers the chance carry job responsibility and partake in joint decision making for the whole welfare of the firm (Management Study Guide, MSG, 2016).

In some firm most recent, the power of formulating decision depends on the magnitude of confidence gains into a certain jobs. These avails an opportunity for employees to make recommendations and contributions needed to achieve organizational objectives. Employee involvement has contributed both impacts either positively or negatively on firm achievement. Research by MSG (2016) noted that, Employee Participation has promoted the level of individuals' satisfaction on the job. When people have that feeling that there are been involved on decision process of the firm the find there salve, that only can motivate them to put in their best even when the cash reward

is not fort coming they are not demoralized in making sure that organizational goal and objective is been achieved. Again Employee involvement has seen as an important contributor to organizational success. A study conducted by Cooke (1994) employing 841 companies in Michigan in United States of America noted that Employee involvement has positive impact on firm's Performance due to increased; output, quality, and time reduction. It is vital in improving; organizational decision making capability, attitude towards work, employee well-being and productivity in the organization (Jones, Kalmi, & Kauhanen, 2010).

Employee Participation has negative impact on Organizational Performance. As the name implies, it represents increased involvement, and i.e. to many people involved in the decision making process of the firm, and this in turn delay entire decision process because of a lot of disagreement among member bodies involved in the decision making process (MSG, 2016). More so, it takes time to verify the accuracy of information which may lead to delay in decision making process. However, the benefits of Employee Participation outweigh the cost since organizations have different culture and human resources; it is advisable for them to have a well understanding of each other in order to establish a decision making style and adopt the best practice required to succeed in business environment.

Heller et al. (1998) explained Employee Participation as the entirety of bodies, such as; direct (individual) or indirect (institutions) by which individuals or groups contribute to organizational objectives through self innovative mind which gears towards a better decision making processes. Through collective decision making, employees are engaged in Management by Objective (MBO) and in organizational goal setting process. This helps in improving organizational effectiveness in areas that threatens its survival. Related to this, David (2005) opined that, top management or front line managers should encourage employee Participative Decision Making in the organization to promote workforce efficiency and high productivity required to achieve business objectives.

A research carried out by Kuye and Sulaimon (2011) revealed that, an organization that encourages employee's participation in decision making do better than its competitors. The authors therefore encourage organizations to promote high employee involvement in decision making in order to improve their work performance and productivity. According to Williamson (2008) also emphasized that employee participation in decision making gives employees the avenue to improve on their skills and competency to promote the goal of the organization. Employee involvement in decision making of an organization can serve as morale that can lead to high innovation, commitment and job satisfaction in the organization.

Organizational structure has adverse effect on performance of Government Owned Enterprises, Port Harcourt, Rivers State. Organizational framework is defined as the process of in storing hierarchy in authority or decision that flows from upper management level to subordinate management level. It is designed in such a way that job assignments are shared, grouped and coordinated among firm's workers. It is designed in such way that various sub-units are arranged and interrelated with each other (Cited in, Chiekezie, Nzewi & Orogbu, 2008). In ideal situation, it is expected that organizational design promotes free flow of information required to improve organizational performance. In the case of Government Owned Enterprises, Organizational structure or designed is poorly designed and is built to meet the interest of the stakeholders. Again, Organizational structure is also arranged in such way that decision making is mostly concentrated or vested only on top management position. Top management use their powers attached to their positions to make decisions without following organizational chart (organogram). Poor design of organizational structure affects team work, information flow and work efficiency which can result to lower productivity. The above problem has cause inefficiency in the power sector and results to poor transmitting of energy or electricity, high level of corruption and high tariffs of electricity bills.

The main objective of this research is to ascertain the impact of Employee Participation in decision making on Organizational Performance in Government Owned Enterprises, Port-Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria. Drawn from the main objective, specific objective of this research is to:

- I. To determine the impact of Employee Commitment on Performance of Government Owned Enterprises Port Harcourt, Rivers State.
- II. To examine how Employee Motivation affect the Performance of Selected Organization.

III. To ascertain whether Organizational Structure affect the Performance of the Selected Organization.

2.1 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1.1 Definition of Employee Participation and Decision Making

According to Sofijanovna and Chatleska (2013) Employee involvement is a course of involving and empowering employees on the job in order to use their effort towards achieving higher individual and organizational performance. Employee Participation is also defined as a direct participation or engagement of employee to help an organization fulfill its mission statement and meet its core objectives values by applying their own innovations, expertise, and efforts towards solving problems and making decisions (Bullock & Powell, N.Y).

Similarly, Westhuizen (2010:11) also defined Employee Participation as “the entirety of forms, that is direct (personal or by the employee) or indirect (through the legislative body of the employees) by which persons, groups, collectives sheltered their welfare or throw in to the decision making process”. On the other hand, Beardwell and Claydon (2007) defined Employee involvement as the distribution of power between employer and employee in decision making of the firm, either through direct or indirect participation. In addition, employee participation also refers to employee participation in decision making at the firm (Busck et al., 2010). Employee involvement represents the grouping of task-related practices, which aim at increasing employees’ sense of participation in their work place and their obligation to the wider firm (Bhatti & Nawab 2011).

The significance of this definition lies in the fact that, it visibly brings out the two forms of employee involvement in decision making, namely direct (by employees themselves), and indirect (through their legislative body). Individuals in different organizations make decisions daily, weekly, monthly or annually either directly or indirectly depending on the desires. In most organizations, decision making ability is centralized or concentrated on the top management position to use his/her powers to promote issues that will promote organizational goal.

Employee participation in decision making has been acknowledged as a managerial tool for regain organizational performance by striving for the shared goals of employees and employers. This is actualized by allowing workers contribution in developing the mission statement, establishing policies and procedures, pay determination, promotion, and determining perks. Employee participation in decision making has become a important topic in human resource management (HRM), and is regarded as one of the driving tools of employee voice, which many management scholars have observed to be a growing management concept (UK Essays,2013).

Vrba and Brevis, (2002) also defined Decision making as the process of selecting the best method of solving a problem. Marchington (1980) argue that people no longer accept decisions without been part of the processes to enable than to influence the final outcome. Hirshman (1970), (cited in Mitchell, 1996) opine that when employees do not play a role in decision making, they often feel inhibited and having feelings of leaving the organization. Perhaps it is for this reason that modern management shows a greater need to increase their organization's effectiveness through the participative mechanism. It is now recognized that the participation of various people in decisions can have a positive impact both on the quality of the decision and on the assurance that people feel towards the decision.

Decision making entails the mapping of likely penalty of decisions, identifying the significance of human being factors, and selecting the best method of action to take” (Florence, 2011). Moorhead and Griffin, (2004) also argues that it is a method of choosing between alternatives. Related to this, Greenberg (2011) argue that both personal and group decision making is very hard and intricate to achieve, though the upshot depends on firms, where the stakes are substantial and the impact is well-known (Greenberg, 2011).

2.1.2 Employee Participation Indicators

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

a. Employee motivation

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

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

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

b. Employee Commitment

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

c. Organizational Structure

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

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

2.1.3 Employee Participation and Organizational Performance

As mentioned earlier, Employee Participation is a special form of entrustment in which the subordinate gain greater control, freedom of choice with respect to bridging the communication gap between the management bodies and employee. It refers to the degree of employee participation in organizational strategic planning activities (Noah, 2008). Beardwell and Claydon (2007) also pointed that, Employee Participation also involves the

sharing of power between management bodies and workers in decision making processes, either through direct or indirect participation. Participation in decision making encourages the involvement of manpower at all levels of an organization to analyze problems from different perspective, develop new strategies, and implements solutions in the workplace (Busck et al. 2010). It gives employees the chance to use their human capital or intellectual capital, to improve quality of decision making in the organization.

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

2.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored on Value Chain theory postulated by Michael Porter in 1985. The value chain theory links organizational activities and work performance. Decision making process is part of activities that organization performs, which represents a course of action to deal with a specific problem and to improve organizational performance in the following areas such as; problem solving ability, innovativeness and social responsiveness in business environment. This theory further explains how organization can improve quality of decision making and create superior value to promote Organizational Performance. Therefore, the success or failure of every organization depends on the quality of decisions made by such organization. Therefore, the better the quality of decisions made, the greater the organizational performance vis-à-vis. Value chain theory represent essential tool used by any organization to promote its competitiveness and create superior value.

2.3 EMPIRICAL REVIEW

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dede (2019) examined Employee Participation in Decision Making and Organizational Productivity: Case Study of Cross River State Board of Internal Revenue, Calabar. The Qualitative Data Collected Approach was employed by the researcher of this study which is the use of primary data with the help of questionnaire. The result showed that employees participate in the decision making of the organization becomes easy and creates a good working environment, increase workers commitment and satisfaction on decisions taken and also increase employee's moral since they feel recognized and part of team players in the organization and direct consequences of all these increase productivity within the organization.

Given methodological limitations of studies conducted by Rehman et al. (2012); a gap in the use of analytical tool, research objective, timing of research and geographic coverage has been identified. Similarly, Rehman et al. (2012) used this tool regression technique to test for the hypothesis and analyses data; therefore this study used this tool SPSS with the aid of Multiple Regression to test the hypothesis and analyzed data to generate result. The selected organization is Government Owned Enterprises, Port Harcourt Rivers State, Nigeria.

3.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Descriptive research survey was adopted using questionnaire. The population of this study comprises of staff and managers of Government Owned Enterprises. The total population was given as 125 staffs of the company representatives.

3.2 SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLE TECHNIQUES

A simple random sampling technique was used to generate the sample population required for the purpose of this research work. A simple random sampling is defined as a manner or situation where every element in the population is selected and given opportunity to be represented in the survey Nworhu (2001). Sample size was calculated using Yaro Yarmane's Formula stated below;

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

Where n= Total sample size

N=Total population size.

E= error term

The following department were represented in the survey; Human Resource Department, Legal Service Department, Finance and Account Department Administration Department, Production Department, Plant Operations Department, Public Relation Department, Medical Department and Education Department.

3.3 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Semi-structured questionnaire was employed in this study to gather information from the company's representatives. The questionnaire was administered to the participant using five-point likert- scale in the following; strongly agree (5), agree (4), neutral (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1) in section B of appendix 1. Again, Bio-data or personal profiles of the participants were sought out using questionnaire in section A of appendix 1.

3.4 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Both primary and secondary data were used in this study. Primary data was sourced through questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered to the managers and subordinates of the Government Owned Enterprises. Out of 125 questionnaires administered, only 100 were returned in good faith while, 25 were not returned. Secondary sources include; textbook, journal, thesis, and archival materials.

3.5 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Validity of the questionnaire was achieved through use of the design of instrument. An expert in this field was consulted to look at the questionnaire from the face value. Again feedback from participants of Government Owned Enterprises helped to improve quality of the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha estimate was used to test for the reliability of test result. When reliability result ranges between 0.6 and above such result is reliable. The result of reliability test was given the value of 0.9. This result satisfied the above condition of reliability test result and therefore indicates that the test result is valid and reliable.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | No. of Items |
|------------------|--|--------------|
| n.900 | .959 | 4 |

Source: (SPSS Version 20).

3.6 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

This research work made use of tables, percentages and ANOVA statistical technique as method of data analysis at the significant level of 95% that is at 5% error limit. Simple percentage method of data analysis was used to analyze the respondent's data; while the hypothesis was tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical technique.

The Formula is stated below:

Within treatment sum of square (SSW)

$$\sum_r \sum_c (X_{ij} - X_j)^2$$

Between treatment sum square (SSB)

$$r(X_j - X)^2$$

$$SST = SSB + SSW$$

Table 2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

| Source of variation | Sum of squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean square of error | F-statistics |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| Due to regression | $SSR = \Sigma Y^2 R^2$ | K-1 | $MSR = SSR/K$ | $F = MSR/MSE$ |
| Due to error | $SSE = SST - SSR = \Sigma Y^2(1-R)$ | N-K | $MSE = SSE / N-K-1$ | |
| Total Variation | $SST = \Sigma Y^2$ | N-1 | | Decision: If $F_{cal} > F_{tab}$, reject H_0 and accept H_A |

Source: Adapted from Nworuh (2001). Basic Research Methodology for Researchers Trainees and Trainers in Management Science (first edition), Imo State, Nigeria: Ambix Printers Nigeria.

3.6.1 Decision Rule

It helps to decide whether the observed (O_1) and the expected (e_1) frequencies used in study were so compatible to warrant a conclusion that the Null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted or not. If the computed value was greater than the critical value at the selected level of significance, then reject H_0 , which implies that observed frequencies differed significantly from expected frequencies. Again, if the computed value was less than the critical value at the selected level of significance, then accept H_0 , which implies that observed frequencies do not differ significantly from expected frequencies.

Decision is stated mathematically as: $F_{cal} > F_{tab}$, reject H_0 (null hypothesis) otherwise accept H_A (alternate hypothesis).

4.1 PRESENTATION OF RESULT AND INTERPRETATION

4.1.1: Presentation of Result

This study therefore presents the following data.

Section A:

| Sex | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------|-----------|------------|
| Male | 65 | 65% |
| Female | 35 | 35% |
| Total | 100 | 100% |

Source: (Field Survey 2016)

Figure 1: Personal Data

The figure 1 above shows that 65% of respondents are male, while the remaining 35% are female.

| Age | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 18 – 25 | 17 | 17% |
| 26 – 45 | 45 | 45% |
| 46 – 55 | 33 | 33% |
| 56 & Above | 5 | 5% |
| Total | 100 | 100% |

Source: (Field Survey 2016).

Figure 2: Age Respondent

The figure 2 above shows that 17% of the respondents are within the ages of 18-25; while 45% of them are within the age of 26-45, 33% is within the age of 46-55 and the remaining 5% are within the age of 56 and above.

| Marital status | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Married | 45 | 45% |
| Single | 55 | 55% |
| Total | 100 | 100% |

Source: (Field Survey 2016).

Figure 3: Marital Statues

The figure 3 above shows that 45% of respondents are married; while the remaining 55% are single.

| Academic qualification | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| SSCE /GCE/O'LEVEL | 20 | 20% |
| HND/First Degree | 65 | 65% |
| Masters Degree & Above | 15 | 15% |
| Others | 0 | 0% |

| | | |
|-------|-----|------|
| Total | 100 | 100% |
|-------|-----|------|

Source: (Field Survey 2016).

Figure 4: Educational Qualification of Respondent

The figure 4 above shows that 20% of the respondent are SSCE/GCE/O'LEVEL holder; while 65% of the respondent are HND/FIRST Degree holder and remaining 15% of the respondent are Masters Degree and above holder.

| Working Experience | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 – 2 | 10 | 10% |
| 2 – 5 | 38 | 38% |
| 5 – Above | 52 | 52% |
| Total | 100 | 100% |

Source: (Field Survey 2016).

Figure 5: Working Experience

The figure 5 above shows that 10% of the respondents have worked in the company for 1-2years; 38% have worked for 2-5years; while the remaining 52% have been in the company for 5years and above.

| Position | Frequency | Percentages |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Management Staff | 15 | 15% |
| Senior Staff | 35 | 35% |
| Junior Staff | 50 | 50% |
| Total | 100 | 100% |

Source: (Field Survey 2016).

Figure 6: Distributed According to Organizational Structure

The figure 6 above shows that 15% of the respondents are management staff; while 35% of the respondents are senior staff; while the remaining 50% of the respondents are junior staff.

SECTION B: GENERAL QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1: Employee Motivation

| S/N | EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION | No. of Respondent | Percentage (%) |
|-----|--|-------------------|----------------|
| 1 | I like my place of work. | 100 | 100% |
| 2 | High pay encourages me to remain in the work place | 100 | 100% |
| 3 | Management has good relationship with employee. | 99 | 99% |

| | | | |
|---|--|-----|------|
| 4 | Good working conditions motivate me to bring out my effectiveness to work. | 100 | 100% |
| 5 | Job security motives me to stay on the job without quitting. | 100 | 100% |

Source: (Field Survey, 2016).

Question 2: Employee Commitment

| S/N | EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT | Number of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|-----|---|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Employee commitment affects the performance of the organization positively. | 98 | 98% |
| 2. | Employee commitment enhances the performance of the organization. | 95 | 95% |
| 3. | Employee commitment is important to ensure favorable organizational performance. | 100 | 100% |
| 4. | Employee commitment sustains positive organizational performance overtime. | 100 | 100% |
| 5. | If employees are not committed it affects the performance of the organization negatively. | 99 | 99% |

Source: (Field Survey 2016).

Question 3: Organizational Structure

| S/N | ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE | Number of respondent | Percentage (%) |
|-----|---|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Organizational structure has a positive effect on its performance. | 100 | 100% |
| 2. | Organization's performance depends on organizational structure. | 100 | 100% |
| 3. | Assess your organization effectiveness with respect to performance. | 99 | 99% |
| 4. | Organizational structure has a negative effect on its performance. | 98 | 98% |
| 5. | Poor organizational structure causes decline in organizational performance. | 94 | 94% |

Source: (Field Survey 2016).

Question 4: Organizational Performance

| S/N | ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE COMPETITIVENESS | Number of Respondents | Percentage (%) |
|-----|---|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1. | My organization competes with people. | 100 | 100% |

| | | | |
|----|---|-----|------|
| 2. | My organization out perform more than its competitors. | 100 | 100% |
| 3. | My organization has a strong record of profitability better than rivals. | 100 | 100% |
| 4. | My firm looks like a company with strong prospect for future growth. | 100 | 100% |
| 5. | My organization offers high quality services than its competitors. | 100 | 100% |
| 6. | Organizational competitiveness lies on the skills, competency and knowledge that employees possess. | 100 | 100% |
| 7. | Organizational competitiveness leads to superior work performance. | 100 | 100% |
| 8. | Organizational Competitiveness results to high productivity. | 100 | 100% |

Source: (Field Survey, 2016).

4.2 TEST OF HYPOTHESES

The research hypothesis of Question 1, 2, 3 & 4 above were tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques to compare F_{tab} and F_{cal} values.

4.2.1 Test of Hypothesis 1

H₀: There is no significant relationship between employee motivation and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises.

H_A: There is a significant relationship between employee motivation and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises.

Level of significance: The appropriate level of significance chosen for this study is 0.05.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Table

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| Regression | 52.656 | 3 | 17.552 | 7.011 | .000 ^b |
| Residual | 240.334 | 96 | 2.503 | | |
| Total | 292.990 | 99 | | | |

Source: SPSS version 20

a. Dependent Variable :organizational performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), employee motivation, employee commitment, organizational structure.

$$F_{cal} = 0.95 (3, 96) = 2.60$$

$$T_{ab} = T_{0.975} = + 1.9867$$

Decision Rule: 1

From table 4 below, T_{cal} (2.733) is greater than T_{tab} ((+1.9867), study reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis and conclude that, there is a significant relationship between employee motivation and competitiveness of the organization.

Table 4: Result of Multiple Regression Test of the Individual Explanatory Variables

Coefficients^a

| Model | Unstandardized | | Standardized | Sig. | |
|------------|----------------|------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| | Coefficients | | Coefficients | | |
| | | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | 4.373 | 2.009 | 2.090 | 0.000 | |
| Em | 0.376 | 0.138 | 0.254 | 2.733 | 0.007 |
| Ec | 0.047 | 0.142 | -0.031 | 0.329 | 0.743 |
| Os | 0.503 | 0.143 | -0.326 | 3.520 | 0.001 |

Source: (SPSS Version 20).

a. Dependent Variable: Competitiveness (Organizational Performance)

b. Independent variable: employee motivation, employee commitment and organizational structure (Employee Participation).

4.2.2: Test of Hypothesis Two

H₀: There is no significant relationship between employee commitment and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises.

H_A: There is a significant relationship between employee commitment and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises.

Level of significance: The appropriate level of significance chosen for this study is 0.05.

Decision Rule: 2

From table 4 above, $T_{cal} (-.329)$ is less than $T_{tab} (+1.9867)$, study accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis and conclude that, there is no significant relationship between employee commitment and competitiveness of the organization.

4.2.3: Test of Hypothesis Three

H₀: There is no significant relationship between organizational structure and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises.

H_A: There is a significant relationship between organizational structure and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises.

Level of significance: The appropriate level of significance chosen for this study is 0.05.

Decision Rule 3:

From table 3.1 above, $T_{cal} (-3.520)$ is greater than $T_{tab} (-1.9867)$, study reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis and conclude that, there is a significant relationship between organizational structure and competitiveness of the organization.

4.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table 4 above of hypothesis one shows that $T_{cal} (2.733) > T_{tab} (+1.9867)$, therefore study reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_A) and conclude that there is significant relationship between employee motivation and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises.

Table 4 above of hypothesis two shows that, $T_{cal} (-.329)$ is less than $T_{tab} (+1.9867)$, study accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis and conclude that, there is no significant relationship between employee commitment and competitiveness of the organization.

Table 4 above of hypothesis three shows that, $T_{cal} (-3.520)$ is greater than $T_{tab} (-1.9867)$, study reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis and conclude that, there is a significant relationship between organizational structure and competitiveness of the organization.

5.1 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1.1 Conclusion

This study ascertained the effect of Employee Participation in decision making on Organizational Performance of Government Owned Enterprises, Port Harcourt Rivers State. The result of hypothesis one showed that $T_{cal} (2.733) > T_{tab} (+1.9867)$, therefore study reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_A) and conclude that there is significant relationship between employee motivation and competitiveness of Government Owned Enterprises. Again, the result of hypothesis two showed that, $T_{cal} (-.329)$ is less than $T_{tab} (+1.9867)$, study accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternate hypothesis and conclude that, there is no significant relationship between employee commitment and competitiveness of the organization. Result of hypothesis three showed that, $T_{cal} (3.520)$ is greater than $T_{tab} (-1.9867)$, study reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis and conclude that, there is a significant relationship between organizational structure and competitiveness of the organization. Based on findings of hypothesis 1 and 3 above, study conclude that, Employee Participation in decision making has positive effect on Organizational Performance of Government Owned Enterprises.

5.1.2 Recommendations

The result of this research is appropriate to employ in any kind of firm (both private and public) especially those for having great challenges on employee participation in decision making. Based on the conclusion, recommendations are made as follows;

- I. Organizations are encourage to design their firm in such a way that it will boot free flow of decision making in their organization and gives room for full involvement of their employee to participate and create efficiency on organizational decision making process.
- II. Firms are advised to put more mechanisms that will encourage their employees to come up with better innovative ways of achieving and promoting organizational performance.
- III. Firms are commended to improve the level of workers involvement in decision making between employees and employer.
- IV. Every firm is advised to create a straightforward understanding and notion of the concept of participative decision making to avoid conflicts of interest among the employees and the employer.

REFERENCES

- Abdulrahman A. A (2016), Employee Participation in Decision-making (PDM) and Firm Performance, [International Business Research](#) 9(7):64. ISSN 1913-9004 E-ISSN 1913-9012 Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education
- Armstrong, M. (2006). "A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice" 10th ed., London: Kogan Page.
- Beardwell, J., & Claydon, T. (2011). "Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Approach. Pearson Education.
- Busck, O, Knudsen, H., & Lind, J. (2010). "The Transformation of Employee Participation: Consequences for the Work Environment", *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 31(3), 285-305.
- Chiekezie, O. M., Nzewi, N. H., & Orogbu, O. L. (2008). "The Principles of Management" (1st ed.). Anambra State, Nigeria: First Fountain Nigeria.
- Cooke, W. N. (1994). "Employee Participation Programs, Group-Based Incentives, and Company Performance", A Union-Nonunion Comparison, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47, 594.
- Cotton, J. L. (1993). *Employee Involvement: Methods for Improving Performance and Work Attitudes*, United State of America, CA: Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- David, F. (2005). *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases (10th ed.)*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Dede C.H. (2019), employee Participation in Decision Making and Organizational Productivity: Case Study of Cross River State Board of Internal Revenue, Calabar, IIARD *International Journal of Economics and Business Management* ISSN 2489-0065 Vol. 5 No. 1 www.iiardpub.org.
- Eisenfuhr, F. (2011). Decision Making. *Academy of Management Review*, 19 (2), 312-330.
- Galbraith, J. R. (1987). Organization Design. In, J. W. Lorsch, ed., *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behavior in Organizations*, 10th ed., New Jersey: Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall.
- Heller, F. A., Pusic, E., Strauss, G., & Wilpert, B. (1998). *Organizational Participation: Myth and Reality*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S. E., & Slocum, J. (2005). *Management*, Cape Town: Oxford Edition.
- Isichei, E. E., & Godwin, U. D. (2015). Employees' Participation in Decision Making and the Hospitality Industry in Nigeria, An Investigative Study of Selected Hotels in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria, *Academic Journal of Economic Studies*, 1(4), 54–6.
- Jones, D. C., Kalmi, P., & A. Kauhanen, (2010). "The effects of general and firm-specific Training on Wages and Performance: Evidence from Banking". *Oxford Economic Papers*, 64 (1), 151-175.
- K. Bhatti , & Nawab, S. (2011). "Effect of Direct Participation on Organizational Commitment", *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2 (9).
- Kreitner, R. (2004). *Management*, 9th ed., Boson: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kuye, L. O., & Sulaimon, A. H. A. (2011). Employee Involvement in Decision Making and Firms Performance in the Manufacturing Sector in Nigeria, *Serbian Journal of Management*, 6 (1), 1 – 15.

M.S.G, Management Study Guide (2016). Advantages of Participative Management. Retrieved from: <https://www.managementstudyguide.com/participative-management-advantages-disadvantages.htm>.

Manning, G., & Curtis, K. (2009). "The Art of Leadership", 3rd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Marchington, M. (1980). Responses to Participation at Work: A Study of the Attitudes and Behaviour of Employees, Shop Stewards and Managers in a Manufacturing Company.

Mitchell, T. R. (1982). Motivation: New Directions for Theory, Research, and Practice, Academy Of Management Review, 7(1), 80-88, 1982.

Moorhead, G., & Grifcin, R. (2004). Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organisations, (7th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Nelson, D. B., & Quick, J. C. (2011). Understanding Organizational Behavior. Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Nnabuife, E. K. N. (2009). Organizational Behavior and Management Theory, Anambra State, Nigeria: Rex Charles and Patrick Limited.

Noah, Y. (2008). "A Study of Worker Participation in Management Decision Making Within Selected Establishments in Lagos", Nigeria Journal of Social Science, 17 (1) 31-39.

Nuzhath K. (2014), Employee participation and its impact on their Performance. Conference Paper 11,656 Reads DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.3044.3364

Nworuh, G. E. (2001). Basic Research Methodology for Researchers' Trainees and Trainers in Management Science, 1st ed., Owerri, Nigeria: Ambix Printers.

Porter, M. E. (1985). "Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance", New York: Free Press.

R. Bullock., & S. Powell, S. (N.Y). "What is Employee Involvement", University Consulting Alliance. Available Online and Retrieved from: <https://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/pod/leaders/orgdev/alliance/articles/EmployeeInvolvement-ScontrinoPowell.pdf>.

Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G.S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological Best Practice. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 718-804.

Sofijanovska, E., & Chatleska, V. Z. (2013). Employee Involvement and Organizational Performance: Evidence from Manufacturing Sector in Republic of Macedonia. *Trakia Journal of Science*, 11(1), 31-36.

Stoner, J. A, Freeman, R. E., & Gilbert, D. A. (1995). Management (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Vrba, M. J., & Brevis, T. (2002). "A Guide to Passing: General Management". Claremont: New Africa Education.

Wainaina, L., M. Iravo, M., & Waititu, A. (2014). Effect of Employee Participation in Decision Making on the Organizational Commitment Amongst Academic Staff in the Private and Public Universities in Kenya, *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Science*, 3 (12), 131-142.

Westhuizen, D. (2010). Culture, Participative Decision Making and Job Satisfaction. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 31 (3), 285-305.

Williamson, M. G. (2008). The Effects of Expanding Employee Decision Making on Contributions to Firm Value in an Informal Reward Environment. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 25 (4), 1184-1209.

Zubair, A., Bushir, M., Abrar, M., Baig, A. S., & Hassan, Y. S. (2015). Employee's Participation in Decision Making and Manager's Encouragement of Creativity: The Mediating Role of Climate for Creativity and Change. *Journal of Service Science and Management* 8. (3), 306-321.

Irawanto, W. D., (2015), Employee Participation in Decision-Making: Evidence from a State-owned Enterprise in INDONESIA, Faculty of Economics and Business, Management Department, Jl. M.T. Haryono No. 165, Malang, 65145 East Java, Indonesia, Phone +62 81353238012, Email: dodi.wi@ub.ac.id.

Ojokuku, R. M. and Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2014), examined Effect of Employee Participation in Decision Making on Performance of Selected Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Lagos, Nigeria, *European Journal of Business and Management* www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online) Vol.6, No.10, 2014.