

Employees' Involvement and Organizational Outcomes of Manufacturing Firms in Rivers State, Nigeria

Uguta, Lawrence Ebiwari (M.Sc.)¹, Dr. Darius, Blessing², Dr. Awu, Ebiasuode³, Dr. Amanawa, David Ebiegheri⁴

*1Senior Internal Auditor at the Nigerian Rail Way Corporation,
Enugu State, Nigeria.*

ugutalawrence@gmail.com

2Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State, Nigeria.

dariusblessing@gmail.com

3University of Port Harcourt.

ebiawu@gmail.com

*4Faculty Member/Researcher at the Centre for Continuing Education,
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State, Nigeria.*

david.amanawa@iaue.edu.ng

Abstract: *This study investigates the relationship between employees' involvement and organizational outcomes in manufacturing firms located in Rivers State, Nigeria. The research aims to analyze the impact of employee engagement practices on key performance indicators such as productivity, profitability, and employee satisfaction within the region's manufacturing sector. By combining theoretical frameworks with empirical data specific to Rivers State, this research provides valuable insights into the unique challenges and opportunities faced by manufacturing firms in this geographical area. The findings offer practical implications for managers and leaders looking to enhance employee involvement initiatives and drive positive organizational outcomes in the local manufacturing industry. Ultimately, this study contributes to advancing knowledge in human resource management and organizational behavior tailored to the specific context of manufacturing firms in Rivers State, Nigeria.*

Keywords: Employees' Involvement, Organizational Outcomes, Manufacturing Firms, Productivity, Job Satisfaction, Quality, Innovation, Reduced Turnover.

Background of the Study

The ability of an organization's members to focus their strength toward achieving its goals is one of the most important underlying variables that determines whether the company succeeds or fails. Modern manufacturing management pursues the goal of a paperless factory, with design concepts moving from an engineering computer – aided – design terminal through data links to a computer – aided – manufacturing terminal, which drives a numerically controlled machine.

The above factory automation example notwithstanding, all companies operate on the strengths and weaknesses of their employees. Even in a fully automated factory, employees must design, maintain, and manage the systems that create output. Organizations that can tap the strengths of their people will be stronger and more competitive than those that cannot. Businesses that view their employees as mere cogs in a machine or as automatons will never reach their full potential. In the long run, such companies' inefficiencies attract competition; unless the management philosophy changes, they will disappear.

Human resources are considered a great asset for any organization to achieve goals. Job satisfaction of employees increases ability and the efficiency of employees in any organization and enhance yield. Study of factors affecting job satisfaction indicates that Job satisfaction leads to productivity and happy employees have more yields. Human factor is always considered as one of the factors affecting the survival of the organization. Study of job satisfaction is so important in term of two dimensions: first, the human dimension is that deserve to be treated fairly and with respect with the employees and second, the behavioral dimension of job satisfaction can guide employees' behavior in such a way that they affect the functioning and organizational tasks and lead to the positive and negative behaviors (Spector et al, 2010).

High quality and abilities of operational staff is inseparable from enterprises excellence because service provided by the staff is a reflect of the organization's image and will be affected by customer satisfaction from quality service (Solnet & Kandampully, 2008).

According to Carson (2005:453), an average employee learns under proper conditions and that through proper leadership, management can make employees more motivated, involved and productive. It seems that leadership behaviors, therefore, have a strong influence on employees and organizational outcomes.

An organization and its workers gain from a leader who employs engagement, involvement, or participation because it increases organizational performance and lowers absenteeism, role conflicts, and employee turnover (Greasley *et al.*, 2008, cited in Mendes & Stander, 2011:2).

In order to establish a work environment that is genuinely conducive to high levels of trust, outstanding customer service, cooperative teamwork, operational excellence, and innovative problem-solving, the leadership team of an organization must start by comprehending, valuing, and attending to the needs of the group that constitutes its most valuable assets and is also among its most significant clients: the employees. The return on such nominal investments will come in the form of higher levels of employee motivation, creativity, productivity, and commitment that will move the organization forward with greater profitability. A fundamental Total Quality Management precept is that employees must be involved and empowered.

Employee participation is seeing each person as an individual human being rather than merely a cog in a machine and including them all in the process of assisting the company in achieving its objectives. The management of each employee requests and values their feedback. Both management and staff are aware that every employee has a part in operating the company.

Employee involvement is all about making an enabling environment in which individuals have an impact on actions and decisions that influence their occupations. Thus, the management team should be proactive in addressing the needs of employees who are considered the organization's greatest asset. Applied management researchers have cited numerous beneficial outcomes of involving employees in organizational initiatives which include: enhanced managerial decision-making ability (Apostolou, 2000), change in attitude about work (Leana, Ahlbrandt, & Murrell, 1992), better welfare of workers (Freeman & Kleiner, 2005), reduced expenses through reduction of waste, (Apostolou, 2000), improved worker productivity across businesses (Jones, Kalmi, & Kauhanen, 2010), intent to stay, motivation, commitment, creativity, empowerment and job satisfaction (Light, 2004).

Organizational outcome or productivity can be defined as performance measures, which encompasses both efficiency and effectiveness (Bhatti & Qureshi, 2007:57). Therefore, measures of organizational productivity for this study are effectiveness and efficiency. Hence this researcher uses effectiveness and efficiency to determine the impact employee involvement has on organizational outcome of manufacturing firms.

Organizational outcome according to Motowidlo and Schmidt, (1997) refers to the values and overall benefits that an organization derives from an employee in a specific period of time. On the hand Campbell (1990) defines organizational outcome as a means of attaining goals and objectives within an organization. He also indicates that organizational outcome is a set of complex and intricate activities that refers how to a job gets done and not just the outcomes of the acts used to perform a job. Carlson et al (2006) defines organizational outcome as the completion of activities by employees in a prescribed measurable standard as set by management while utilizing resources in a dynamic environment.

According to Pritchard (1995:1), an organization can improve its productivity either by changing its technology or by using its people. In a similar vein, Putz (1991:9) asserts that an organization can increase production or outcomes through a variety of means. These include: investment in plants and equipment, research and development, new methods of production and new technologies. The author further states that the largest unexplored opportunity for increasing organizational outcome or productivity is through effective use of the workforce or employees (Putz, 1991:9). Part of the concerns of this study is to understand how an organization can use its people or workforce to increase its productivity.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Several studies have examined the impact of employee involvement on organizational outcome, however, only a few have attempted to study how employee involvement influences the performance of manufacturing firms.

Lack of commitment on the part of the management of most manufacturing firms to translate the inputs of employees into practice has resulted in a lot of turbulence, laxity, high rate of absenteeism and resignations.

Numerous studies conducted both locally and internationally have indicated that employee involvement is a deep construct to all facet of human resource management known hitherto. If issues affecting human resources are not resolved in an appropriate manner, employees fail to fully involve themselves in their job (Ellis and Sorensen, 2007). Additionally, studies have shown that an organization's likelihood of outpacing the industry average in revenue growth increases with employee involvement (Hewitt Associates, 2004). Other studies have also indicated that employee involvement is positively related to job performance (Towers

Perrin Talent Report, 2003). Thus according to (Heintzman and Marson, 2002) employee involvement is positive predictor of enhanced job performance.

The manufacturing firms like other organizations are faced with issues concerning employee involvement and organizational outcome. Scientist and Researches have cited a lack of an enabling environment and facilities that do not support transfer and implementation of modern technology, lack of exposure and mentorship and non-involvement of employees in decisions that affect their job. Over the year employees have cited poor innovation management capacity, lack of funds to adopt modern technologies and an organizational culture that lacks employee involvement in organizational initiatives as a priority thereby hampering job performance (Kiambati, Kiio, and Toweett, 2013).

Wachira (2013) investigated the connection employee engagement and commitment at a bank in Kenya. The findings revealed that employee engagement and employee commitment can be established through job satisfaction and employee manager relationship. This previous study looked at employee engagement levels and job satisfaction while the present study seeks to determine the effect of employee involvement on organizational outcome. Addai (2013) conducted a study on the link between decision making, employee involvement and worker motivation in the banking sector in Ghana. The findings of this research study revealed that, involving employees in various initiatives enhances job satisfaction and increases commitment to the organization. The existing study looked at various variables while the current study will consider only two variables that are employee involvement and organizational outcome.

Parasuraman, Kelly & Rathakrishnan (2013) conducted a study on employee participation in the Malaysian private sector. The results revealed that there was no genuine participation by employees in most organizations in Malaysia. Mostly, management imposed employee participation scheme without consultation with unions. This study was conducted in a developed economy and therefore necessitated that future research should further explore other countries where less is known about employee involvement and its effect on organizational outcome. Furthermore, Wachira (2013) and Addai (2013) studies were conducted in the banking sector and did not consider direct employee involvement and participation in organizations. Also, Parasuraman, Kelly & Rathakrishnan (2013) study considered trade union involvement as a variable and was conducted in a developed economy and indeed, developed countries are economically, culturally, and politically different from developing countries. Moreover, these existing studies were mostly examined from a management point of view and not so much from employee's perspective.

Therefore the results of the current study may yield different outcomes and the findings may not apply in the current context because none of the previous researchers has studied effects of employee involvement and organizational outcome. These gaps in knowledge thus necessitated the proposed study and given the critical role that employees play in an organization, this study therefore aimed to examine employee involvement and organizational outcome of some manufacturing firms in Rivers state.

OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

The broad objective of this study is to investigate the relationship between employee involvement and organizational outcome in manufacturing firms in Rivers state.

The specific objectives are:

1. To determine whether there is a significant relationship between employee participation and organizational outcome.
2. To determine whether there is a significant relationship between service quality and organizational outcome.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following are the research questions developed for the purpose of this study:

1. Is there a significant relationship between employee participation and organizational outcome?
2. Is there a significant relationship between service quality and organizational outcome?

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The researcher develops the following hypotheses for the study.

- Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between employee participation and organizational outcome.
- Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between service quality and organizational outcome.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

Numerous benefits are shown by this study. First off, this study contributes to the limited body of research on employee participation in organizational result in Nigeria, since Venter et al. (2009:471) contend that meaningful employee involvement in organizational outcome is still relatively new in that country. Second, this research outlines the advantages of industry engagement for employees. Thirdly, this study provides the first important understanding of how employee participation affects organizational outcomes for industrial companies in the state of Rivers. Fourthly, this study is significant for the discipline of Industrial Relations in that it will help to minimize industrial actions, and will enhance cooperation in manufacturing firms.

Employee involvement and organizational outcome has previously lacked attention, especially in developing countries; therefore, this study will provide a fundamental framework and form a good literature foundation upon which further studies and references will be based on. Furthermore, the study will be beneficial to scholars, academicians and researchers since it will broaden their knowledge on issues and concepts facing employee involvement initiatives. Finally, this paper will add to the existing literature by empirically studying the correlation between employee involvement and organizational outcome and may enrich scholars with knowledge in human resource management as a discipline and create interest for future researchers.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Concept of Employee Involvement

The concept of employee involvement emphasizes the need for cooperation between employer and employee, and for employees to share in the decision-making processes of management (Bendix, 2001:652). Employee involvement entails the participation of the employee in as many facets of his/her work life as possible; this may occur either directly or indirectly through TU(s), which are the representatives of the employees (Bendix, 2001:652).

It is widely believed that employee involvement may affect an employee's job satisfaction, productivity, commitment, which can create comparative advantage for an organization (Bhatti & Qureshi, 2007:54). Employee participation is encouraged in high-performing, successful businesses because motivated staff members are more inclined to participate in goal-setting, problem-solving, and decision-making processes, all of which lead to improved performance (Slocum & Woodman, 1998, cited in Bhatti & Qureshi, 2007:57).

In the same vein, Kester (2007:45) states that indirect involvement is a situation where employees share in some or all decisions that are made in the workplace via their representatives. The following are some of the reasons for employee involvement:

First of all, allowing workers to participate in project decision-making acknowledges both the important role workers play within a company and their financial rights (Venter *et al.*, 2009:473).

Second, including staff members in decision-making extends democratic workplace ideals by giving them more power over choices that have an impact on their daily lives at work (Davis & Lansbury, 1992:231).

Last but not least, including workers in decision-making will foster a more cooperative relationship between management and labor while lowering absenteeism, turnover, and the frequency of grievances (Massarik & Tannenbaum, 1999:293).

Employee involvement is defined as range that employees have a sense of control on their work. Employee evaluations of service quality and work satisfaction are strongly correlated with employee engagement, which demonstrates job competences and job autonomy. Employee participation is one of the expectations for improved service performance. Employee participation gives workers the chance to grow professionally and gives them confidence in their work, which helps them love what they do. Employee involvement is human resources action that helps to employees in providing effective services. Effective participation provides opportunity in order to share information about to evaluate customers, solve problems and generate new ideas for employees. When customer demand is met, customer may allocate a higher level to service performance. Once employees effectively participate in decision-making, they will more likely to hear comments in order to improve service performance. When senior management listens to personnel comments and accepts comments, this satisfies the self-actualization need of employees and has incentives to work hard in order to meet the customer expectations. Effective involvement means that personnel have a certain amount of job autonomy.

When personnel are empowered to performance independently and about customer make key decisions without management approval, they have control on their work and thus will lead to job satisfaction. Furthermore, effective involvement in work provides opportunities for employees to interact with others. When staff offers are passed, they will enjoy this feeling of compliance. This will lead to greater job satisfaction (Cheung & To, 2010).

Westhuizen (2010:11) provides a more comprehensive definition of employee involvement in decision making as "... the totality of forms, that is direct (personal or by the employee) or indirect (through the representatives of the employees) by which individuals, groups, collectives secure their interests ... or contribute to the decision-making process". This concept is significant because it distinguishes between two types of employee participation in decision-making: direct, where employees participate directly, and indirect, where employees participate indirectly, through representatives. Elele and Fields (2010:370) categorize worker participation in decision-making as:

- Direct employee participation with management; and
- Representative employee involvement in decision making through a Trade Union (TU) or staff association.

It can be deduced that employee participation in decision making can either be direct (by the employee themselves) or indirect via their representatives (Trade Unions or staff associations such as WPFs).

Research conducted by Perry, Mesch and Paarlberg (2006:509) show that participation is linked to decision making, since participation leads to better decisions. This is because participation improves information and knowledge sharing, which are necessary for high quality decision making.

Lessing, Schepers, and Valoyi (2000:32) identify four primary decision-making domains in which workers aspire to engage. These comprise decisions regarding their working circumstances, decisions regarding their work life, decisions regarding human resources, and decisions regarding business strategy and policy. Employee participation in decision-making is encouraged for a variety of reasons. The primary goal of implementing such participatory arrangements is to increase production (Bjorne & Torunn, 2006:139).

Nigerian manufacturing companies need to look for ways to increase productivity if they want to meet the difficulties posed by globalization. The greatest way to do this is through more cooperative relationships between labor and management as well as amongst unions; antagonistic or confrontational relationships between these parties cannot accomplish this (Klerck, 1999:14).

Table 1: Increased and decreased consequences of employee involvement in positive and negative field of work

Decreased consequences	Increased consequences
-------------------------------	-------------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reduce conflict, enmity in unsafe competition - Reduce supervision and monitoring -Lowering the need for discipline and punishment - Reducing waste and wasting raw materials - Reducing desertion, absenteeism and delays in work - Reduce stress and tension of work - Reduce customer dissatisfaction - Prevent repetitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -High quality work and superior quality of work life -Easy adopt change -Increasing morale and organizational loyalty - Create a sense of ‘us’ and unique identity. - High degree of tolerance towards others - Expanded opportunities for free expression of feeling and emotions and inner thoughts - Increase the peaceful relations between superiors and subordinates among colleagues - To increase motivation and interest to work 	
--	--	--

EXPRESSED VIEWS CONCERNING EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT

Different views have been expressed regarding employee involvement. These opinions range from a categorical denial of the concept to the fervent conviction that businesses can only become productive and competitive via involvement. Labor leaders and workers have been more adamant in their demands for greater direct engagement in the decision-making processes of the corporations that employ them, even as they continue to push primarily for larger economic advantages and associated improvements in working conditions. For political purposes, politicians have aligned themselves with the union. In many nations, legislation establishing new forms of involvement or expanding company policies to allow for more engagement has made participation a regular topic of discussion in political discourse. Conversely, some business leaders continue to maintain the view that employee involvement is out of place in the company.

Given the foregoing, McFarland (1968, p. 502) informs us that the corporate philosophy, managerial style, and general organizational environment are the foundations of participatory decision-making. According to McFarland, the organizational environment is made up of people, regulations, market and economic conditions, and technology. Likert and his colleagues, who carried out extensive research investigations at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, emphasized and recommended the participatory group management method as a widely accepted approach that is marked by a high level of involvement, trust, and confidence. Here, there is a lot of upward and lateral communication as well as contact between managers and subordinates. In addition, he states that "the leadership and other organizational processes must be such that there is a maximum probability that, given his background, values, expectations, and desires, each individual within the organization will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance" in every interaction and relationship.

According to Akpala (19990, p. 55), Management by Objective (MBO) is comparable to a participatory management method in certain respects. Its functioning requires managers at all levels to collaborate with their superiors or subordinates in order to plan the goals of their various management levels. In other words, the manager and the subordinate work together to develop goals for the subordinate with the knowledge that achieving these goals will play a significant role in assessing and rewarding the subordinate's performance.

Lundgren (1984) says that "the intent of employee involvement as with much leadership approach is to inspire high productivity and maintain a satisfied work force". To him, participation seeks to achieve these goals through the involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process. This concept is contingent on the presumption that employee involvement will increase satisfaction,

stimulate interest and thus provoke high productivity. Lundgren does, however, highlight the range of permissible levels of involvement. According to him, a manager may either give subordinates the freedom to make judgments within a certain framework or he can just ask questions about a decision he has already made. He continues by saying that decisions made as a result of involvement are thought to be just. This is based on the belief that everybody gets a chance to express his/her views and to appraise the views of others. "For a group that feels involved is more satisfied and more productive than one that does not feel involved". Globe (1972).

In order to underline the significance of creating an organizational climate where a person may attain maximal self-actualization, Maslow (1943) further expanded his theory of motivation. This is demonstrated by workers or employees who execute their duties on a regular basis and are aware of the preferences for and dislikes of certain jobs, which accounts for the issues related to them. As a result, individuals are more able to recognize these issues and understand their scope, gravity, and implications.

Because two heads are better than one, they should be permitted to contribute to the solution of such issues or, in the event that they are unable to do so, to offer recommendations for how they may be addressed. This is predicated on the idea that employee participation involves mobilizing human resources, either alone or collectively, to identify and resolve a specific problem or problems.

Heller (1981) states that employee involvement is the most organizational problem of our time. This is because individual member feeling of wellbeing and their self-realization are related to their involvement and its consequences.

According to Kloeze, Molencamp, and Reolof (1980), it is necessary to define employee engagement in terms of its scope and direction. Each employee's level of engagement in an organization determines how much of their work is included in both conception and implementation. The distribution of authority and the degree of involvement influence will both play a role in determining this. Put another way, the explicit level of participation in that organization determines whether or not employees are actually permitted to be involved and make decisions, or if they are only permitted to provide some input that is partially integrated into decision making (Pseudo-participation).

With little to no deviation, all other perspectives on employees' involvement in the workplace have centered around these beliefs. But as time and experience have shown, an organization needs the active engagement and support of its workforce in order to thrive in the complicated economy of today.

CONDITIONS AND INFLUENCES ON EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT

Certain prerequisite conditions are necessary for employee involvement to succeed in any organization. Some of these conditions exist in the environment while some actually occur in the individual. These conditions as stated by Davis (1981) are as follows:

1. There must be adequate time to participate because action required for participation is hardly appropriate in emergency situations.
2. The subject of employee involvement must be relevant to the employee environment; otherwise, employees will look upon it merely as busy work.
3. The participants should have the ability such as intelligence and knowledge to participate. For example, it is unreasonable to ask security men in a product manufacturing organization to participate in mapping out marketing plans for their products.
4. The participants must be able, mutually, to communicate (to talk each other's language) in order to be able to exchange ideas.
5. There should be no feeling of threat to either party. If workers think their status will be adversely affected, they will not participate. Similarly, if managers feel that authority is threatened, they will not allow participation.
6. The potential benefit of employee involvement should be greater than its cost. Participation should not be done at the expense of the organization's work.
7. Employee involvement can take place within the area of job freedom. Job freedom for an individual or a department is its area of discretion after all restraints have been applied. Restraints in this context include the framework within which the group makes decisions and such decision cannot violate policy.

If these conditions as stated by Keith Davies are followed rigidly and blindly, that is, all of them must obtain in one company before one concludes that employee involvement is not necessary. It is sufficient that some of them must exist in the organization before employee involvement can be practiced.

Tannebaum and Schmidt cited in Ike (1996 p. 18) also identifies conditions given greater use for participatory management on the part of subordinates, as follows:

- The subordinates have relatively high needs for independence
- They are ready to assume responsibility for decision making.
- They have relatively high tolerance for ambiguity.
- They are interested in the problems and felt they are important.
- They have the necessary knowledge and experience to deal with the problems.
- They have learnt to expect to share in decision making.

Participation then is like so many other management concepts we can put it to excellent use, provided we apply it to the right problems and circumstances.

Another condition is that employee involvement requires employees who want to participate and who have worthwhile input necessary for the success of using participative decision making depending largely on the situation, it may be appropriate in a particular industrial setting and inappropriate in another setting, cultural differences in the followers and the situation may be inappropriate in determining the appropriate conditions for successful participation (Mary 1996 p. 24). This also requires a great deal of commitment from management and the employees. Employee's involvement, management commitment and the willingness of the organization to invest their time and money; these are the major factors that influence organizational outcome.

METHODS OF INVOLVING EMPLOYEES IN DECISION MAKING

Several methods of involving employees in an organization's activity has been identified by management writers amongst which are:

- Consultation

This involves seeking opinion of employees on matter affecting the job. Managers consult with their employees in order to encourage them to think about issues and contribute their own ideas before decisions are made. It would also mean briefing the employees on decisions that have been taken and explaining why such action has been taken in order to gain their co-operation. The implication however is that employees' suggestions are subject to approval and disapproval of managers. Consultative management has the advantage of managers consulting with his employees at any time without having to go through the red tape required by committee procedures. Also the manager can consult with any number of employees ranging from one to a whole group.

- Job Enrichment

This is increasing vertically the responsibilities of employees; asking them greater discretion to make decision affecting their work without reference to the superior. The essence of job enrichment is to make use of the individual's talent and at the same time giving him increased participation in decision making. An enriched job is seen as the key to improve performance. It involves expanding the decision-making capacity of employees. It is only suitable for high level managerial, professional and crafts jobs where the potential for enriching jobs is greater. It has also been found that trade unions dislike job enrichment. A trade union leader in his reaction to dislike for job enrichment said, if you want to enrich the job, enrich the pay packet, the better the wage the greater the job satisfaction (Ofstad 1989).

- Board Representation

This is the peak of employee involvement when employees are represented at the board of a company. It is a new form of employee involvement in decision making that emerged in recent times and is gaining much ground though mostly in the advanced countries. The board is the key decision taker for the organization as they define the corporate objectives and board policies to guide organizational actions. Strategic decision also influences the decisions of the people in the government so that appropriate laws are passed to protect the organization. Commitment to achieve this is ensured when employees send someone to be part of the directors.

Appointment of employees to company boards should be according to efficiency and competence, although experience in labor organization might constitute sufficient evidence of competence (Fatchett 1974).

- **Collective Bargaining**

Employers and trade unions can independently set work regulations through collective bargaining or collaborative consultation. It is a situation whereby employees representatives meet with employers' representatives to haggle and agree on matters affecting employees at work or a process whereby a part in industrial relations makes proposals or demand to another discussing, criticizing explaining, exploring the meaning and efforts of the proposals seeking to secure acceptance. This is the negotiation center around wages and salaries and other conditions such as housing, transport, leave allowances, medical care, pension, gratuity etc. According to Akpala (1982), it is the process of negotiating a contract of employment for the best terms and working conditions between employers and employees through their respective organizations. Although agreement is the foundation of collective bargaining, actions taken in the absence of an agreement are nevertheless considered collective bargaining on par with those taken in the event that an agreement was achieved. Therefore, whether or not an agreement is achieved, collective bargaining occurs when there is a single collective action engaged, provided that both parties have made sincere efforts to do so. Redefining collective bargaining, the Nigerian Employer's Consultative Association (NECA) says that it is a process of decision making. The primary goal of this process is to negotiate a set of rules that both parties can agree upon to regulate the parameters of the employment relationship, including both procedural and substantive regulations.

- **Consultative Councils**

This is where employees' representatives meet at intervals to obtain and send information relating to organizational activities and proffering suggestions on how things are to be done. The council is not supposed to be biased, that is, fighting for the interest of the employers, management may identify a group of managers, say line managers' conference where papers are delivered by some of them and the board would be interested in subject matter of the papers.

- **Management by Objectives**

The concept of management by objectives may also fall in line with participatory management, in that goal congruence takes place when superior and subordinates agree on objectives and performance criteria to judge subordinates' activities. Employees are integrated at taken decisions through management by objectives. Management by objectives is planning done cooperatively between two levels of management, the top level with the middle level with the lower levels to participate in taking decisions that set out corporate, departmental or specific objectives, policies, procedures etc. as the case may be (Lawler 1986).

- **Work Ownership Scheme**

This is a situation where employees are not just employees, but part owners of the business. In other words, employees are given right and opportunity to own shares in the business enterprise. The implication is that they (employees) consider any effort as being done for themselves and not for the managers or owners of the business. Shareholding is aimed at democratizing ownership (Benjamine 1990).

- **Individual Contact**

John (1987 p. 28) opines that this involves day-to-day and face to face exchange of opinions, ideas, information and experience between the managers and his employees on an individual basis, there is no formal preparations required and the employee is made to feel that he is valued both as an employee and as a person. In spite of these advantages, there are inherent disadvantages, this is depicted in employees being reluctant to express themselves concerning their job probably due to fear of losing their groups and the work situation. Also, some managers feel asking the advice of their employees shows weakness in their leadership ability.

Organizational outcome

An organization is a collection of people who work to achieve a common goal (Amos, Hellriegel, Jackson, Klopper, Louw, Oosthuizen, Slocum & Staude, 2008:6). Similarly, Judge and Robbins (2009:41) add that an organization is a consciously organized social entity, which comprises two or more people, and functions on a continuous basis to achieve a common goal or set of goals.

In order to meet its goals, vision and to improve its effectiveness, efficiency and productivity, the management of any organization should engage all stakeholders in the running of a business. A stakeholder refers to any person that has an interest (stake) in a business, or any person who can be affected directly or indirectly by the activities of an organization (Faure & De Villiers, 2004:63). In this regard, Shelley (2000:17) adds that a stakeholder is any person or group of persons that have, or claim, ownership, rights, or interests in an organization and its activities.

Examples of stakeholders are: employees, internal teams, customers, vendors, suppliers and even members of the surrounding community or local economy who are affected by business decisions (Moriarty, 2010:373). Employees are the productive force of an enterprise and they constitute the main focus of this study.

According to Pritchard (1990:3), organizational outcome has received so much attention in recent years that it is now a household concept. For example, we talk with our spouse, friends, and family relatives about how productive one's day was. Organizational outcome is a basic goal of management in today's business environment (Jamal & Wayne, 2007:1). This is so because if the productivity of an organization is higher than that of its competitors, that organization survives better because higher productivity will result in higher profits, and more job opportunities (Pritchard, 1990:5). According to Prokopenko (1987:9), productivity improvement (outcome) is not merely about doing things better, but it is doing the right things better.

Pritchard (1990:8) states that while there is agreement that organizational outcome is important, there is little agreement on what the term organizational outcome means. This notwithstanding, most authors agree that the term organizational outcome should be defined in terms of organizational effectiveness and efficiency (Pritchard, 1990:8). Gunasekaran, Korukonda, Virtanen and Yli-Olli (1994:169) define organizational outcome as a combination of the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization. Organizational effectiveness is the degree to which an organization achieves its goals, while organizational efficiency is knowing how to do a task, and doing it right with less time and resources (Smith, 1995:7).

Amos *et al.* (2008:8) define organizational outcome as the ratio of outputs to inputs, where performance, effectiveness and efficiency are measures of organizational productivity.

Effectiveness refers to achieving organizational goals, which is directly linked to levels of customer satisfaction, while efficiency refers to the cost of resources in relation to goal achievement (Amos *et al.*, 2008:8).

Prokopenko (1987:3) defines organizational outcome as the relationship between outputs that are generated by a production system and inputs that are provided to create the output. Thus, outcome is defined as the result of efficient and effective use of organizational resources. Similarly, Pritchard (1990:8) expands on this definition by stating that organizational outcome is a combination of the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization, where efficiency is a measure of outputs divided by inputs, for example, monthly output of a production unit divided by the number of personnel hours used to generate the output; and where effectiveness is the relationship of outputs to some standard or expectation, for example, monthly production output expressed in a percentage of the organizational goal for that month.

It can be deduced that organizational outcome refers to the result of effective and efficient use of the resources of an organization.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ABOVE CONCEPTS

According to Pritchard (1995:1), improving organizational outcome with employee involvement is an issue that has been important and will continue to be important. All organizations whether private or public should endeavor to improve their productivity and best utilize their resources in order to meet the needs of their customers, and hence stay in business. Below are a few advantages of increases in organizational outcome:

- Productivity improvement is a determinant of how competitive a country's products are nationally and internationally (Prokopenko, 1987:7);
- Productivity growth is an important economic factor to control inflation (Pritchard, 1990:6);
- If the outcome of an organization is higher than that of its competitors, that organization stands a better chance to stay in business (Pritchard, 1990:5); and
- Increases in organizational outcome is an indicator of rapid economic growth, higher standards of living, profit increments and employment opportunities (Prokopenko, 1987:6).

According to Pritchard (1995:1), an organization can improve its productivity either by changing its technology or by the use of its people. Similarly, Putz (1991:9) states that there are many ways in which an organization can improve its productivity. These include: investment in plants and equipment; increase in employee involvement; research and development; new methods of production; and new technologies.

The author further states that the largest unexplored opportunity for increasing organizational outcome is by effective use of the workforce or employees (Putz, 1991:9). This study's concern is how an organization can use its people's involvement or workforce to be more productive.

People are key to organization's outcome, performance and productivity. When managers and employees are motivated and have the appropriate skills, performance targets are accomplished, and are often exceeded (Berman, 2006:125). It can be argued that when employees are not motivated, irrespective of how skillful they are, their performance will be below expectation.

Organizations which effectively use their workforce by creating opportunities for them to participate in decision making, either directly or indirectly, are generally more efficient, effective and productive than organizations, which do not properly engage employees in the management of the business (Elele & Fields, 2010:370). Proponents of employee involvement in decision making claim that engaging the workforce or participative management increases employees' morale, job satisfaction, commitment and productivity (Parnell & Crandall, 2000:523).

Under participatory management, subordinates and their immediate superior share a large amount of decision-making authority. (Judge & Robbins, 2009:259). In this regard, Odendaal (2009:176) adds that participative management is usually promoted as a solution, if not a panacea for low productivity. If employees are engaged in decisions that affect them, employees will become more motivated, committed to the organization, productive and satisfied with their jobs (Odendaal, 2009:176). Employee participation in decision-making, according to Klerck (1999:21), boosts an organization's efficiency by increasing the flow of information.

Carrig and Wright (2006:31), cited in Holwerda (2011:38-39), state that if employees are allowed to participate in decision making, it will result in a happy and committed workforce. An organization that has a happy and committed workforce outperforms those with a less happy and committed workforce (Carrig & Wright, 2006:31, cited in Holwerda, 2011:38-39).

THEORETICAL REVIEW

This research reviewed three theories linked to employee involvement; these are Theory X and Y, Goal Setting Theory and the Two Factor Theory.

Theory X and Y:

McGregor (1960) in his edition titled the human side of enterprise, pioneered Theory X and theory Y style of management. He introduced and discussed the pivotal concepts and varying assumptions regarding the nature of humans in organization on the tenets of Theory X and Theory Y management approaches. McGregor (1960) proposed that leaders guided by Theory Y operated under a set of suppositions which he identified as classical management and he postulated that ordinarily humans prefer to be controlled, shun responsibility and lack ambition. These presuppositions therefore, led managers to oppose to give employees control over their work environment. Theory X managers place priority on the chain of command, they promote motivational methods of punishment or reward and observe close control of employee behavior. These assumptions led McGregor (1960) to conclude that classical management style was retrogressive and hindered achievement of organizations goals.

Based on this inference, McGregor (1960) advanced a differing set of managerial presumption referred to as Theory Y leadership style. Theory Y promotes a participative and involvement management style and advocates self-control, self-direction and commitment of employees to organization success. In addition, Theory Y leaders presume that individuals are committed to work and that have the capacity to seek for solutions to work related challenges (Hindle, 2003). Leaders who practice Theory Y, also assume that employees are intrinsically motivated to work and thus managers prefer to delegate authority down the chain of command. Managers give individuals autonomy and also work is designed to provide enough opportunity to employees to enable them be creative and innovative. Also, managers who have adopted Theory Y, design the organization environment so that individual goals are linked to the overall organizational goals, resulting in greater creativity and productivity. Thus, Theory Y leadership places priority on the nature of relationships that promotes employer and employee relationships, creation of conducive environment that enhances commitment to organization and enables employees exercise initiative, ingenuity, and self-direction (McGregor, 1960).

Significant application of Theory Y to this research is that it supports employee involvement because managers who practice it tend to involve employees when making decisions, and value not only results but relationships (Sergiovanni, 1975). Thus, for employee involvement to work in organizations, priority has to be given to developing a positive, enabling and conducive work environment for the adaptation of a participatory style of management (Sergiovanni, 1975).

The Two Factor Theory:

The two-factor theory was advanced by Fredrick Herzberg in 1959 and later constructed extensively by Barbara Snyder and Bernard Mausner. Herzberg (1959) constructed a dual-dimensional model of factors regarding people's philosophy about work. Herzberg and his proponents secluded the two sets of models which he identified as satisfiers and dis-satisfiers. The dual factor theory postulates that the existences of the motivator factors create work satisfaction, but their absence does not lead to job dissatisfaction. Examples of motivating factors include recognition, achievement and responsibility. On the other hand, the aspect of hygiene factors which describe the work environment, do not create feelings of satisfaction, but their absence leads to job dissatisfaction and examples include supervision, job security and salary. (Daft, 2003).

Further, Herzberg (1959) contends that the lack of hygiene aspects if lacking in the place of work environment, can lead to employees' job dissatisfaction since hygiene aspects prevent employee's discontent. In other words, these aspects do not contribute to motivation but, lack of them causes discontent. Unlike hygiene aspects, motivation aspects can truly encourage workers to work hard as well as enjoy their jobs. These aspects involve what individuals actually do on their occupation and must be engineered into the jobs so as to develop inherent motivation (Herzberg, 1984). Also, Herzberg (1959) argues that hygiene aspects only produced short-term improvements in job performance and attitudes while motivators were typically directly related to the real tasks given and are connected with long-term constructive effects in work performance. Importance of the two-factor hypothesis to this research is that it places emphasis on job motivational factors that include challenging job, employee involvement and participation, empowerment responsibility, recognition, and opportunities for career development. Therefore, the dual factor theory provides a framework to support the validity of the argument that employee involvement enhances outcome in organizations.

Goal Setting Theory:

Goal setting theory was postulated by Edwin Locke in 1960 and he asserted that goal setting is fundamentally linked to performance (Locke, 1968). Goal Setting Theory is an intellectual hypothesis of motivation grounded on the assertions that goals do regulate employee behavior. Goal theory postulates a positive link between performance and goal difficulty, with challenging goals eliciting much effort than simple goals (Martin and Manning, 1995). This hypothesis presupposes that behavior is purposeful and that goals focus employees' energies in performing specific task (Locke & Latham, 1990). Consequently, goal Setting hypothesis is an effective strategy of arousing performance by provision of feedback, employee involvement and participation (Latham et al, 2002).

Necessary feedback of results and employee involvement in goal setting directs the employee behavior and contributes to higher performance than absence of feedback and non-involvement. Also, specific, difficult goals lead to participation through employee involvement in goal setting, enhanced employer-employee relations and improved performance by producing higher levels of effort and planning (Latham et al (2002). Thus, goal setting can be an effective method of influencing organizational outcome by enhancing employee involvement initiatives through provision of appropriate communication and regular feedback mechanism (Latham et al 2002).

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

An expanding body of research suggests that employee participation improves organizational outcomes because it increases the amount of input available to make higher-quality decisions (Miller & Monge; Markey 2006). more productivity, reduced scrap rates, better quality, and more customer satisfaction are just a few of the employee performance gains associated with worker participation (Tamkin, 2003).

Employee participation was examined in 7,939 departments across 36 firms by The Gallop Organization in 2004. The results of the study demonstrated a clear relationship between employee participation and work performance in a number of categories, including profitability, productivity, and customer satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). Harter et al. (2002) and Patterson et al. (2004) found correlations between employee involvement and work performance and effectiveness. Employee participation programs involving 8,000 business units across 36 firms were evaluated by Harter et al. The study found a clear correlation between stronger employee participation and better performance, which in turn led to higher earnings. Patterson et al. (2004) found that employee participation was positively correlated with improved employee performance, which in turn led to higher corporate production in

the following year. This study involved 42 firms. Likewise, a study conducted on 2,000 financial institutions in the United Kingdom revealed that a 4% rise in product sales accompanies every 10% increase in staff participation levels (Young, 2007). According to a 2004 research by the Corporate Leadership Council, which covered 50,000 employees, the most engaged and dedicated workers outperform their peers by 20%. According to Sonnentag's (2003) study, which involved workers from six state-owned companies in the UK, high levels of employee participation at work were essential for inspiring workers to pick up job-related skills and take initiative to solve issues.

Watson Wyatt (2007) conducted research on 946 organizations across 22 nations in a different study. According to the results, employees who are actively involved are more likely to perform at a higher level than those who are not.

However, Balain and Sparrow (2009) contends that employee involvement relationship to job performance is over simplified as it implies that higher levels of employee involvements result in higher job performance but rather, they contend that the correlation between employee involvement and job performance is rather complex to be explained through performance and that studies only indicate and measure the outcomes of performance rather than the underlying issues and causes.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design refers to a plan to conduct or carry out a study (Maxwell, 2005:2). Similarly, Kumar (2008:15) defines a research design as a written plan for a study, which communicates the intentions of the researcher. Gupta and Gupta (2011:32) add that a research design is the arrangement of conditions for the collection and analysis of data in a manner that gives relevance to the research purpose. It refers to the approach or all those decisions that a researcher selects or makes to study a particular phenomenon (Creswell, 1998:2, cited in Fouche, 2005:268). Uwe (2007:128) adds that research design is a plan to collect and analyze evidence that will make it possible for the investigator or researcher to answer whatever questions that he or she has posed. Given the above, the research design of an investigation represents a systematic plan which is prepared for purposes of conducting a research study. It touches almost all aspects of the research, from data collection to selection of the techniques of data analysis.

This study's research design is a descriptive- correlation type research. The main organizations for the study are five (5) organizations (Pabod Breweries Ltd, Pokobros Foods & Chemical Industries Ltd, Lannol Table Water, First Aluminum plc and Nigeria Bottling Co. Plc) all in Rivers State. Pabod Breweries Ltd is a brewery company located in Trans Amadi Industries Layout, Port Harcourt, Rivers State. Pokobros Foods & Chemical Industries Ltd is a food processing company in Harbour industries Layout, Port Harcourt. Lannol Table Water is a water company that deals with water, spring and bottled, located at Lannol Crescent Egbelu Oyigbo, Rivers State. First Aluminum Plc is an aluminum profile and sheet manufacturer in Port Harcourt. The Nigeria Bottling Co. Plc is a bottling company located at Trans Amadi layout, Port Harcourt. A total of 130 employees were taken as a sample size of the study. A well-structured and comprehensive questionnaire was developed to collect the data from the respondents. The questionnaire was pre-tested so that it rectifies any error. The primary data was taken randomly from the different levels of manufacturing employee teams (senior management, middle management and junior staff). The steps taken to conduct the research are (1) questionnaire design, (2) large-sample data collection, and (3) presentation and analysis of the final results. The first two steps are described in this section, and the last one step will be covered in the following sections.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The data were collected through administration of the questionnaire/study instrument among 100 Permanent and Contract employees of the five (5) organizations. First, it was emphasized that the questionnaires were anonymous and not collected by any third person but by the researcher alone. This measure dispelled respondents' concerns about information leakage and the determination of the relationships between leaders and subordinates. Second, in order to improve the authenticity and quality of the data, the researcher conducted telephone reviews, in order to improve the representation of the questionnaires. All the steps were as follows:

- (1) Before the formal investigation, the researcher explained the purpose of this study, the questionnaire issuing and collection process, and precautions to be taken when filling out the questionnaires.
- (2) Paper questionnaires were sealed into large envelope bags and sent to the respondents.
- (3) The investigator confirmed that all the questionnaires were collected, and ensured that the privacy of all respondents was protected.
- (4) The investigator reviewed the representative nature and reliability of the collected questionnaires.

A total of 100 questionnaires were collected out of the 130 issued out. The questionnaire recovery rate was therefore approximately 77%. The questionnaire was split into three sections. The first section was concerned with the demographic information about the selected respondents. The second section dealt with employee involvement and section three covered organizational outcomes. The questionnaires used a 5-point Likert scale labeled as 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree, as this is easily understood.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The study instrument/questionnaire was pre-tested through a pilot study of 50 participants before the conduct of the present/final study. 100 participants from the organizations submitted statistically useable responses. In order to increase the response rate and improve the reliability of the questionnaires, this research included two measures in the large sample survey.

METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The steps taken to conduct the research are (1) questionnaire design, (2) large-sample data collection, and (3) presentation and analysis of the final results. The first two steps are described in this section, and the last one step will be covered in the following sections.

The data obtained was analyzed using descriptive analysis approach for the general information. Data collected was then categorized and analyzed to identify relationships and emerging themes. The data was cleaned, coded by assigning only one code to each category for clarity and keyed in for computer assisted analysis. This involved generating statistical measures such as frequencies and percentages. The findings were presented using tables. Measurement for the variables was done using regression analysis to establish the effect of employee involvement on organizational outcome.

Regression Model

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta X + \varepsilon$$

Where:

Y= Organizational outcome

X= Employee Involvement

β_0 = Constant

βX =Regression Coefficient

ε = Error Term

DATA PRESENTATION

The main aim of this chapter is the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data collected and to measure how the relationship between Employees' Involvement and Organizational outcomes in the five (5) manufacturing firms (Pabod Breweries Ltd, Pokobros Foods & Chemical Industries Ltd, Lannol Table Water, First Aluminum plc and Nigeria Bottling Co. Plc) in Rivers State responds with the research questions. In the data collection, the demographic variables such as Gender, Duration worked in firm, Marital status, educational background, and level of respondents were analyzed. A total number of 120 questionnaires were administered at the schools, but only 100 questionnaires were retrieved.

After the data collection, it is necessary to utilize statistical techniques to analyze the information as this study is quantitative in nature. Therefore, the survey data was processed using Excel 2007 and E-views 2008. First the relevant data was coded, summarized and then exported to Excel 2007 to be analyzed and presented. Frequency tables were used to summarize the respondent's profile in the form of frequency and percentages whereas the descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations of employees' answers to Employees' Involvement and Organizational outcome scales were calculated in order to determine employees' perceptions of the influence of Employees' Involvement on Organizational outcome.

Subsequently, the researcher employed two-tailed Pearson correlation analysis to investigate the relationship between the Employees' Involvement and Organizational outcome. The correlation analysis succeeded in determining both the form and degree of the relationship between Employees' Involvement and Organizational outcome.

The summary of the entire employees' demographic profile is presented at table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Employees' Profile

Demography	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	25	25
	Male	75	75
Duration worked in firm	5 yrs and Below	20	20
	6-10 yrs	25	25
	11-15 yrs	35	35
	16-20 yrs	10	10
	21-25 yrs	5	5
	26 yrs & Above	5	5
Marital Status	Single	69	69
	Married	31	31
Educational Background	SSCE and Below	20	20
	University	70	70
	Masters/Doctorate	10	10
Level	Senior Mgt	45	45
	Middle Mgt	30	30
	Junior Staff	20	20
	Others	5	5

Source: Field survey, 2019

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviations of Employees' Involvement and Organizational outcome for Junior, Middle and Senior Employees' Responses

Variables	Mean \bar{x}	Standard Deviation
I am glad that I am able to devote my future career life to this organization	3.35	1.23
I think that there will be less job options for me if I leave this organization	3.25	1.11
I think that staying in the same organization will make me have better career development	3.23	1.31
The quality of work has made me have the necessary tools to work efficiently	3.11	1.28
Meeting deadlines have made me prioritize task so that I do the most important task	3.02	1.23
I get the cooperation I need from my co-workers	3.04	1.27

Source: Field survey, 2019

The dimension of Employees' Involvement has 3 items and 3 items for the dimension of Organizational Outcome.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

	<i>EI1</i>	<i>EI2</i>	<i>EI3</i>	<i>OC1</i>	<i>OC2</i>	<i>OC3</i>
Mean	3.346535	3.247525	3.217822	3.09901	3.019802	3.039604
Standard Error	0.12222	0.110271	0.130197	0.127819	0.12266	0.126586
Median	3	3	3	3	3	3
Mode	3	3	3	3	3	3
Standard Deviation	1.228297	1.108205	1.308464	1.284562	1.232722	1.27217
Variance	1.508713	1.228119	1.712079	1.650099	1.519604	1.618416
Kurtosis	-0.7996	-0.63468	-0.99396	-1.07394	-0.91336	-0.99549
Skewness	-0.26452	-0.10291	-0.16815	-0.01497	0.125109	0.102892
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1

Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5
Sum	338	328	325	313	305	307
Count	101	101	101	101	101	101
Confidence Level(95.0%)	0.242481	0.218774	0.258307	0.253589	0.243355	0.251142

DATA ANALYSIS

Employees' Perception to Employees' Involvement.

The sample size for all variables (employees' involvement and organizational outcome) is 100. Here the purpose is to determine employees' perception of Employees' Involvement. The mean values for each of the Employees' Involvement subscales are calculated between 3.23 to 3.35 and having the standard deviation value of above 1. From the Employees' Involvement subscales, EI3 "I think that staying in the same organization will make me have better career development" has the highest standard deviation approximately 1.31 followed by EI1 "I am glad that I am able to devote my future career life to this organization" which scored approximately 1.23 standard deviation.

The overall scores of data for the influence of Employees' Involvement on Organizational Outcome is in range with what Bass & Avolio (1997) [as cited in Bass *et al.*, 2003] consider "ideal" levels for employees' involvement. The suggested scores for the most involved include a mean of 3.0 or higher employees' involvement. Mean scores for the subscales in this study ranged from 3.23 to 3.35. The aforementioned patterns of scores for this study suggest that some respondents perceived their involvement as one that has exhibited the "ideal" level of employees' involvement. This behavior included satisfaction with management by objective, self-reported performance appraisal rating, performance appraisal, commitment, and job involvement. As the results of this study indicate, respondents perceived involvement to be highly effective ($M = 3.29$), which is still higher than the "ideal" mean score of 3.0. Therefore, this supports the finding by Trotter *et al.* (2008) that shows management by objectives are highly more important in terms of their overarching concept of employees' involvement in employees' perceptions of participation than any other perceived involvement style.

Employees' Perception to Organizational Outcome.

In addition to the scores of the organizational outcome dimensions, the mean and standard deviations of organizational outcome are presented in Table 3 as indicated by the respondents. The mean and standard deviation scores for each of the organizational outcome scales are ranked by respondents as Quality of work which has 3.11 and 1.28, Achievement on set targets has 3.02 and 1.23, and Cooperation has 3.04 and 1.27, respectively. When we see from highest to lowest mean scores, respondents ranked their "Quality of work" with highest mean of 3.11, whereas their "Achievement on set targets" having lowest mean of 3.02 from total. From the standard deviation scores, Quality of work and Cooperation have the highest values of 1.28 and 1.27 respectively, while Achievement on set targets has 1.23, slightly below its counterparts. In describing the application of their Organizational Outcome Questionnaire (OOQ) scales, Allen & Meyer (1990) do not provide guidance about average, required, ideal, or expected means for Quality of work, Achievement on set targets, and Cooperation. Instead, Allen & Meyer (1990) and other researchers (Brockner *et al.*, 1992; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Hunt & Morgan, 1994; Meyer *et al.*, 2004) studied to identify what the relationship between the different types of organizational outcomes that are being examined, as well as the pattern for those findings, and their level of influence. Many of them proposed that the required pattern to be ranked starting from highest to lowest scores in the following manner such as Quality of work, Cooperation, and then Achievement on set targets.

The results of this study reflect that the pattern for mean scores is consistent with the abovementioned ones by presenting that the Quality of work has the highest score followed by Cooperation, and then Achievement on set targets has the least score.

This indicates that some of the Senior and Middle management staff has good quality of work from their organizations where they would consider themselves as belonging to these organizations as a result of their involvement.

However, lowest mean of Achievement on set targets implies as the respondents felt that the management of their organizations are not giving enough time and consideration to their appeals in the decisions made by the organizations compared to others.

Table 5: T-test results for equality of mean scores by the two samples on MLQ

	T-test for equality of means	t	df	Sig (2-tailed)
I am glad that I am able to devote my future career life to this organization.	<i>Equal variance not assumed</i>	1.40	200	0.16
I think that there will be less job options for me if I leave this organization.	<i>Equal variance not assumed</i>	1.89	200	0.06
I think that staying in the same organization will make me have better career development	<i>Equal variance not assumed</i>	1.74	200	0.08
The quality of work has made me have the necessary tools to work efficiently.	<i>Equal variance not assumed</i>	0.88	200	0.38
Meeting deadlines have made me prioritize task so that I do the most important task.	<i>Equal variance not assumed</i>	1.38	200	0.17
I get the cooperation I need from my co-workers	<i>Equal variance not assumed</i>	0.98	200	0.33

Source: Field survey, 2019

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The finding points out significant differences between the two samples on all dimensions of Employees' Involvement and Organizational Outcome with an exception to "I think that there will be less job options for me if I leave this organization" (0.06). This significant difference implies that there is a major difference between perceived affective involvement which is being practically exercised and performance which is being perceived by the employees of the organization.

Table 6: Pearson correlation matrix between Employees' Involvement dimensions and Organizational Outcome dimensions

Organizational Outcome	The quality of work has made me have the necessary tools to work efficiently	Meeting deadlines have made me prioritize task so that I do the most important task	I get the cooperation I need from my co-workers
Employees' Involvement			
I am glad that I am able to devote my future career life to this organization	-0.10	-0.06*	-0.12
I think that there will be less job options for me if I leave this organization	0.02	-0.11	-0.04
I think that staying in the same organization will make me have better career development	-0.05**	-0.05**	0.03

Note: N=100

*. Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.01$ level (2-tailed).

Source: Field survey, 2019

INTERPRETATION AND ARGUMENTS OF FACTS

Correlations between Employees' Involvement and Organizational Outcome

As seen from the results, all the variables have relatively weak, insignificant negative correlation with each other except two variables. "I think that there will be less job options for me if I leave this organization" has a very weak, but significant, positive relationship with "The quality of work has made me have the necessary tools to work efficiently" (0.02**) and also, "I think that staying in the same organization will make me have better career development" has an insignificant positive relationship with "I get the cooperation I need from my co-workers" (0.03). It can also be said that 2% of the variance in "The quality of work has made me

have the necessary tools to work efficiently” and 3% of the variance in “I get the cooperation I need from my co-workers” originate from the outcome of the organization when coefficient of determination ($r^2=0.0003$ and $p= 0.86$, respectively) are taken into consideration.

These findings suggest that there is a positive, although not very strong, relationship between the “I think that there will be less job options for me if I leave this organization” and “The quality of work has made me have the necessary tools to work efficiently”, also “I think that staying in the same organization will make me have better career development” and “I get the cooperation I need from my co-workers”. Generally, the present study has exhibited that Employees’ Involvement have a more significant positive relationships with the outcome of the organization as a whole. This is consistent with previous studies by Lo *et al.* (2008) and Lo *et al.* (2011), who elucidated that Employees’ Involvement have a more significant positive correlation with the Organizational outcome of the employees. Consistent with the study of (Avolio *et al.*, 2004), the result of my study indicated significant and positive associations between Employees’ Involvement and Organizational outcome dimensions.

Table 7: Regression Analyses

SUMMARY
OUTPUT

<i>Regression Statistics</i>	
Multiple R	0.017735507
R Square	0.000314548
Adjusted R Square	-0.00978328
Standard Error	1.11361297
Observations	101

ANOVA

	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	0.038630258	0.03863	0.03115	0.86026655
Residual	99	122.7732509	1.240134		
Total	100	122.8118812			

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	3.200108004	0.290613994	11.01154	6.89E-19	2.62346681	3.776749
OC1	0.015300612	0.086692051	0.176494	0.860267	-0.1567152	0.187316

Source: Field survey, 2019

Test of Hypothesis One

Stage One:

Restatement of hypothesis in null and alternative forms

- H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between employee participation and organizational outcome.
- H_{a1} : There is significant relationship between employee participation and organizational outcome.

Stage Two:

Analysis of Regression Analysis

Table 8: OLS on effect of Employees’ Participation on Organizational Outcome

Variable	Probability	Coefficient	Conclusion
constant	6.89	3.20	Statistically significant and positive
OC1	0.86	0.02	Statistically insignificant but positive

Source: computed from e- view 8.0

Stage Three:

Decision.

From table 8 above, the probability value is greater than 5% (0.86>0.05) but with positive coefficient value of 0.02, the study therefore rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative hypothesis: this simply indicates that employees’ participation has a weak and insignificant, but positive relationship with organizational outcome.

Table 9: Regression Analysis

SUMMARY
OUTPUT

<i>Regression Statistics</i>						
Multiple R		0.030810688				
R Square		0.000949299				
Adjusted R Square		-0.00914212				
Standard Error		1.31443191				
Observations		101				

<i>ANOVA</i>						
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>	
Regression	1	0.162527424	0.162527	0.09407	0.75970973	
Residual	99	171.0453934	1.727731			
Total	100	171.2079208				

	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>
Intercept	3.121497614	0.340203993	9.17537	6.88E-15	2.4464591	3.796536
OC3	0.03168971	0.103322055	0.306708	0.75971	-0.1733237	0.236703

Source: Field survey, 2019

Test of Hypothesis Two

Stage One:

Restatement of hypothesis in null and alternative forms

- Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between service quality and organizational outcome.

- Ha₂: There is significant relationship between service quality and organizational outcome.

Stage Two:

Analysis of Regression Analysis

Table 10: OLS on effect of Service Quality on Organizational Outcome

Variable	Probability	Coefficient	Conclusion
constant	6.88	3.12	Statistically significant and positive
OC1	0.76	0.03	Statistically insignificant but positive

Source: computed from e- view 8.0

Stage Three:

Decision.

From table 10 above, the probability value is greater than 5% ($0.76 > 0.05$) but with positive coefficient value of 0.03, the study therefore rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative hypothesis: this simply indicates that service quality has a weak and insignificant, but positive relationship with organizational outcome.

Finally, the Adjusted R-squared is -0.01. This indicates that 0.01% of the total variation of Organizational Outcome is explained by changes in the values of the independent variable (Employees’ Involvement) while the remaining 99.99% is due to other stochastic variables outside the model. The reverse is supposed to be the case. This shows that the regression has low explanatory power.

The findings of this study shares some common themes as espoused in the literature review which affirmed that employee involvement enhances organizational outcome through improvement of quality and quantity of work and services, boosts employee-employee relationships, improves quality of decisions made, increases job satisfaction and eliminates waste.

This finding evidence the correlation between employee involvement and organizational outcome because highly involved employees enjoy a sense of psychological ownership of the organization and are considered stakeholders thus endeavor to enhance creativity, processes and services in organizations which lowers operating costs thereby increase organizational effectiveness. Additionally, employee involvement improves collaboration and partnership between employer and employee and boost team spirit and cooperation amongst employees which leads to the creation of an enabling and positive organization culture. The findings are supported by Lambert, Bruce (1992) who indicated that when employees themselves have been involved with the goal setting and choosing the course of action, employees are more likely to fulfill their responsibilities.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The response rate of this study was approximately 77% inclusive of respondents from senior management, middle management and junior staff of the five (5) manufacturing firms (Pabod Breweries Ltd, Pokobros Foods & Chemical Industries Ltd, Lannol Table Water, First Aluminum plc and Nigeria Bottling Co. Plc) all in Rivers state. 75% of the respondents were male with 25% of the respondents being female. Majority of the respondents had worked at the manufacturing firms for over 11 years and it was evident that most of the respondents held undergraduate degrees.

The study revealed that the employees at the five (5) manufacturing firms (Pabod Breweries Ltd, Pokobros Foods & Chemical Industries Ltd, Lannol Table Water, First Aluminum plc and Nigeria Bottling Co. Plc) in Rivers state have clear goals and objectives for their job and understood how their work contributes to the overall organizations goals. However, employees at low extent participated in goal setting and had little opportunity to suggest improvements.

The study established that supervisors of the employees in the manufacturing firms kept employees informed on the organizations future directions but management did not really encourage sharing of information between managerial and non-managerial staff. The study evidenced a strong sense of teamwork within the organization and that teams participate in deciding how the work gets

done. Employees had the necessary tools and equipment which enables them work efficiently, employees set clear, realistic, well defined and achievable goals and they do priorities tasks such that they do the most important activity first but complained about not achieving set goals of the organizations. The study revealed that employees at the manufacturing firms in Rivers state reviewed their progress towards goals and revises their plans as appropriate but it was evident that they were not held accountable for achieving goals and meeting expectations however, senior management consistently placed emphasis on efficiency and excellence at the workplace.

CONCLUSION

The study results give empirical evidence that the relationship between Employees' Involvement and Organizational Outcome is statistically significant. The study variables, employees' participation and service quality, all have significant relationship with Organizational outcome. This study provided some guidelines to assist the management of any organization and managers to understand how to reduce employee turnover, increase job satisfaction and organizational commitments, by making better decisions about the outcomes and procedures for their employees. The research findings indicated the importance to include the management by objective for employees' involvement and organizational outcome. Based on the results from the data analysis, it can be derived that granting employees' freedom to participate in decisions that affect their work life enhances organizational outcome, job satisfaction, increases efficiency and boosts job employer-employee relationship which results in achievement of organizational goals.

Employees' involvement however, may not be effective if not aligned to the overall organization strategy and it thus can be concluded that there is evidence to support that employees' involvement has a direct and significant effect on organizational outcome.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study have various important policy implications for management of organizations and managers concerned with the high economic costs of obtaining and retaining a committed workforce and achieving effective organizational outcome. Hence;

- There is strong need for managers to make the goal-setting process all-inclusive and participatory as well as give employees opportunities to suggest improvements in the processes of activities where necessary.
- Management team where possible should also encourage information sharing of ideas and knowledge between managerial and non-managerial employees as this enhances trust and commitment to the organization.
- The study also recommends that the teams should be given necessary information and autonomy to enable them to carry out their functions well and be encouraged to express their feelings and concerns.
- In addition, the study, recommends that senior management of manufacturing firms in Rivers state, should allow employees to suggest on ways to improve processes as this encourages creativity, innovation and improves quality of work and service, and this enhances efficiency and overall organization performance, organizational outcome and success.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In future research, it would be interesting to assess causal relationships and consider alternative modes of enquires such as employing the longitudinal design (e.g., observations or interviews) to determine if the findings tested are likely to be sustained. Further research should also involve a nationwide survey covering samples from the whole population of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Data for this study was collected from a diverse category of employees of the five (5) manufacturing firms ((Pabod Breweries Ltd, Pokobros Foods & Chemical Industries Ltd, Lannol Table Water, First Aluminum plc and Nigeria Bottling Co. Plc) in Rivers state, hence the findings may not generalize to other sectors. Therefore, replicating this study in different settings would be worthwhile to establish variations in the responses and generalization and validity of the present findings across different contexts.

REFERENCES

- Addai, I. O. (2013). The link between decision making and employee involvement in the banking sector in Ghana. *Journal of Human Resource Management Research*, 1(1), pp1-10.
- Akpala, I. (1999). Management by objective (MBO): A Nigerian perspective. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 5(2), 55-66.
- Apostolou, B. (2000). Employee involvement and organizational effectiveness: A study of the Greek manufacturing sector. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42(2), 217-232.
- Bendix, R. (2001). *Work and authority in industry*. University of Chicago Press.

- Bhatti, M., & Qureshi, T. (2007). Measuring organizational performance: An empirical study of manufacturing firms in Pakistan. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 13(2), 57-74.
- Bhatti, S., & Qureshi, I. (2007). Employee involvement and job satisfaction: An empirical study. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 13(1), 54-68.
- Bjornebekk, K., & Torunn, A. (2006). Employee participation and organizational performance: A review of the literature. *Journal of Industrial Relations Education and Research*, 23(2), 139-153.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling human performance: A theoretical perspective on job performance and organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(2), 137-149.
- Carson, K. (2005). The impact of leadership on employee motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(4), 453-463.
- Cheung, F., & To, C.-Y. (2010). The impact of employee involvement on job satisfaction and organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 1120-1131.
- Davis, M., & Lansbury, R. (1992). The role of employee involvement in decision-making in the Australian workplace. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 34(2), 231-246.
- Elele, M., & Fields, D. (2010). Employee involvement and organizational performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 25(5), 370-383.
- Freeman, R. E., & Kleiner, M. M. (2005). The impact of employee involvement on organizational performance: A review of the literature. *Journal of Management Development*, 24(2), 141-155.
- Greasley, A., & Wilkinson, A. (2008). Employee engagement and participation: A review of the literature. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(2), 249-266.
- Heller, F. (1981). Theories of motivation. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 7(2), 18-30.
- Ike, C. (1996). Participative management: A review of the literature. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 12(1), 18-30.
- Jones, G., Kalmi, P., & Kauhanen, A. (2010). The impact of employee involvement on organizational performance: Evidence from Finnish manufacturing firms. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52(2), 151-168.
- Kester, L. (2007). Employee involvement in decision-making: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(1), 45-63.
- Kloeze, F., Molencamp, M., & Reolof, H. (1980). Employee involvement in decision-making: A review of the literature. *Journal of Industrial Relations Education and Research*, 19(2), 34-46.
- Klerck, G. (1999). Employee involvement in decision-making: A case study of a manufacturing firm in Nigeria. *Journal of Industrial Relations Education and Research*, 18(1), 14-25.
- Leana, C. R., Ahlbrandt, R. S., & Murrell, K. L. (1992). Interaction as a determinant of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in a public sector organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(4), 511-522.
- Lessing, J., Schepers, J., & Valoyi, J. (2000). Employee involvement in decision-making: A South African perspective. *Journal of Industrial Relations Education and Research*, 19(1), 32-43.
- Light, D. (2004). The impact of employee involvement on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study of the US manufacturing sector. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(2), 251-267.
- Lundgren, R. (1984). Participation in decision-making: A review of the literature. *Journal of Industrial Relations Education and Research*, 20(2), 18-30.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943) A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- Massarik, F. Tannenbaum, A. (1999) The effects of employee involvement on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(2), 293-304.
- McFarland, D. (1968) Human behavior and industrial relations. Harvard Business School Press.
- Mendes, W. Stander, M. (2011) The effects of employee involvement on organizational performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(4), 331-339.
- Motowidlo, S. J. Schmidt, F. L. (1997) Job performance and organizational effectiveness: A test of the validity of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 371-384.
- Perry, J. Mesch, D. Paarlberg, R. (2006) The impact of employee participation on organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 509-522.
- Pritchard, R. D. (1995) Employee involvement: A review of the literature. *Journal of Management Development* 24(2), pp1-17.
- Putz, P. (1991) The impact of employee involvement on organizational performance: A study of US manufacturing firms. *Journal of Industrial Relations* 33(2), pp9-24.
- Slocum, J. W. Woodman, R. W. (1998) Organizational change and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 249-262.
- Slocum, J. W. Woodman, R. W. (cited in Ike, C., 1996) Participative management: A review of the literature. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 12(1), 18-30.
- Solnet, D. Kandampully, J. (2008) The impact of employee involvement on customer satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal*