International Journal of Innovations in Social Science, Arts and Management
Volume 8, Number 1, 2018 *Spencer Academic Publications*

IMPROVING EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY THROUGH DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY (A CASE STUDY OF 7UP BOTTLING COMPANY PLC.)

[1]James Nwoye Obi, [2]Atuma Okpara and [3]Mumen Lugard
[1]Department of Business Management, College of Business and Social Sciences Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria [2]Department of Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, [3]Department of Administration, [2&3]National Open University of Nigeria, Lagos,Nigeria
E-mail: james.obi@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

This study examined the extent to which employees' productivity can he improved in an organization through delegation of authority using 7up Bottling Company Nig. Plc as case study. The data required for this study was gathered through the instrument of questionnaire and participant observation. One hundred (100) copies of questionnaire were administered to respondents and successfully retrieved for analysis. In line with the objectives of this study, two hypotheses were formulated. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and correlation coefficient were used for testing the hypotheses. The results showed that delegation of authority is necessary for achieving high productivity in an organization. The study revealed that authority delegated to employees facilitates prompt execution of tasks and responsibilities which ultimately brings about high level of corporate performance. The study, however, advised managers to be adequately wary because delegation of authority is not the abdication of responsibility. Based on the findings, the study recommended that managers should delegate authority to subordinates as much as possible in view of its salutary effect on productivity and corporate survival.
KEYWORDS: Delegation, Authority, Employee, Productivity, Corporate survival.

INTRODUCTION

In today's ever-competitive business environment, it is essential for managers at all levels of an organization to maximize the efficiency of their workforce through delegation of authority. However, it must be emphasized that delegation of authority is not the abdication of responsibility. In other words, delegation does not imply surrender of authority by the higher level manager to the subordinate. It only means transfer of certain level of authority to subordinates to discharge responsibilities. The manager who delegated the authority is still answerable and responsible to the tasks being executed should anything go wrong. Delegation is quite common in all aspects of life including business. Even in the college, the principal delegates some of his authority to the vice-principal (Lawson, 2007).

Distrust of employees often leads to the manager's unwillingness to delegate authority. The practice of authority delegation in an organization is advisable because it serves as a means of empowering subordinates. It usually leads to harder and more work for employees.

Some Managers waste time and energy in performing tasks an employee could perform just as well, thereby lowering productivity while raising operating costs. Many managers still limit their own effectiveness, create imbalances in the organization, waste their department's time and energies, and fail to develop their employees by either ignoring or mismanaging the techniques of delegation (Lock & Schweiger, 1999).

Conceptual Framework

Today's increased speed and workload can decrease our ability to think through the best ways to get things done. In the rush of the moment we may think it is easier to do things ourselves rather than pass them to others that can help us or delegate authority to whom ever happens to be nearest to us to execute the tasks. How can we effectively get the right things done through assigning them to the right people? What is delegation, and what is the right way to do it? Delegation means to give someone the authority to do something that is normally part of your job

(Kirkman & Rosen, 2005). When delegating, you are sending the work "from" you "to" someone else. You share accountability, controls and checkpoints to monitor your employees' progress. You set clear goals and expectations for the assignment. You give them suggestions and establish limits and let them take their own action while you hold them accountable for their performance. It helps people grow under your command in an organization and pushes you higher in the management hierarchy.

Delegation obviously lightens the manager's workload and increases the skills of the people taking on the work. Delegation increases the productivity of the entire group from both the leader and the employees' point of view. Productivity increases as skills increase and employees become less dependent on the leaders. Workflow bottlenecks decrease and the leader is less likely to burn out. Thus delegation creates a win-win scenario between the manager who delegates the authority and the subordinate discharging the responsibilities (Thomas & Velthouse, 2009).

In this era of globalization there is need for employees' empowerment in organization so that employees will be in position to make quick decision and respond quickly to any changes in the environment. Organizations that are committed to employee empowerment are in a better position to motivate and retain their employees, although it is a complex management tool which needs to be nurtured and handled with a lot of care. Employee empowerment is a motivational technique that is designed to improve performance if managed properly through increased levels of employees' participation and self-determination (Spreitzer, 1995). Employee empowerment is concerned with trust, motivation, decision-making, and breaking the inner boundaries between management and employees. Employee empowerment leads to increased productivity, improved performance and job satisfaction (Leana, 2008). Employee empowerment has been associated with the concept of power, implying that power in the organization is partly shared between top management and lower level managers and their subordinates (Loretta, 1997). In a free market economy where there is open competition, challenges to provide high quality product and services and maintain high degree of innovativeness, employee empowerment is called for in the interest of organizational profitability and survival.

Whenever a group of people work together, delegation is necessary: there must be some process of sharing the work that has to be done and the decisions that must be made. We define delegation as the work a manager does to entrust a measure of work to others and to create accountability for results. Delegation is a process of sharing work with subordinates because it means that a manager is sharing with others responsibilities and decisions that otherwise would made by the manager. To delegate is to entrust an action to a representative to act on your behalf of the boss. For delegation to be successful there must be a relationship between the manager delegating the task and the subordinate to whom it is delegated. Furthermore, after successful delegation, responsibility for the task concerned is somewhat shared between the boss and the employee. However, it must be emphasized that delegation of authority is not the abdication of responsibility. In other words, the manager has given the subordinate the task to perform but he (the manager) is still responsible and accountable for the job when reporting to higher management (Cole, 2002)

If a person does not know what he is supposed to do, he will do what he prefers to do. There-in lies many of the basic problems of organizations. To clarify the delegation of responsibility, our first need is to distinguish between assigning work to a person and to a position. During the early stage of organizational growth, we tend to assign work to people in terms of their personal interests and special competences. On the other hand, people will not perform much work unless they can make decisions related to it. For example, if the superintendent must go to the plant manager for permission every time he wants to talk to a supervisor, or check material, or approve a schedule, he will spend most of his time checking with the plant manager, and neither of them will get much work done. Again, if a machine operator must go to the foreman every time he wants to start or stop his machine or reposition his work, he will spend most of his time talking with the foreman (Bowen, 2007). At some point in the process of sharing work with others, there is the need to cross-check to make sure that the job is performed properly and decisions are made the way they should be. One way is for the manager to check everything in person. But this will take too much of his time. Moreover, it tends to antagonize his people, who would not like to see the boss continually peering over their shoulders. The professional manager solves the problem by establishing limits within which the work must be done and necessary decisions made to put people under obligation to perform within these limits (Druskat & Wheeler, 2004).

Theoretical Framework

Michels (1915) was skeptical of delegation. In his iron law of oligarchy, he asserted that democratic organization inevitably becomes subordinated to the interest of their leaders and that the leadership becomes an entrenched oligarchy. Like most of his contemporaries and many of the scholars who followed him, Michels believed in the tendency of people to whom governing power is delegated to use their power against the interests of those who delegated such powers to them. The early works on agency theory were traced to Berle and Means (1932) and Jensen and Meckling (1976). They defined "agency relationship as contract under which a person (the principal) engages another person (the agent) to perform some service on his behalf which involves delegating some decision making authority to the agent." The principal normally has to pay the agent for this service. Modern scholarship has produced more precise insights on how delegation benefits the principal and the agent should flow. Many scholars now adopt the language of principal-agent models (i.e., agency theory) to describe the logic of delegation. The principal in principal-agent theories represents someone who delegates. The agent represents someone to whom authority is delegated.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Delegation Process

The process of delegation begins with defining clearly the tasks and responsibilities to be discharged by the subordinate to whom authority will be delegated. After assigning the tasks, the manager should specify the expected results. This is done in terms of quality of the final product, quantity of final product, cost of accomplishing the tasks and the time frame for the task to be completed. The manager should clearly identify the constraints, boundaries, lines of authority and responsibility. The manager must match the measure of responsibility to be discharged with the measure of authority to be delegated bearing in mind that only authority can be delegated to discharge given responsibilities while the ultimate accountability remains with the manager.

Be Approachable: The manager who is delegating authority to subordinates must be approachable. Remember that when people are given new task, they sometimes take a while to build confidence. So give them opportunity to ask questions, provide for mistakes and be ready to guide them appropriately. Provide adequate support and be available to answer questions.

Focus on Results: Concern yourself with what is to be accomplished by the subordinate rather than detailing how the work should be done. Your method may not necessarily be the best method. Allow for the use of personal initiative.

Build Motivation and Commitment: It is necessary to discuss how success in accomplishing the task will impact financial rewards, future opportunities, recognition and other desirable benefits to the individual and to the organization.

Draw Time frame: The need to discuss timeline and deadlines is essential. Agree on a schedule of check-points at which you will review progress, make adjustments and take time to review submitted work

"SMARTER" Guide to Delegation: For delegation to be effective generally, it should follow the "SMARTER" acronym. This means that the task to be done must be **specific, measurable** and must be **agreed** up by the manager and the subordinate. The task must be **realistic,** have **time** line for completion, be guided by work **ethics** and the results be **recorded.**

Benefits of Delegation to the Manager and the Subordinate

Delegation reduces workload: By allowing the manager to divide and allocate work to subordinates, delegation helps in reducing his workload so that he can work on more important areas like planning, business analysis and other critical decision issues.

Delegation fosters mutual relationship: Delegation is the bedrock on which the superior-subordinate relationship in an organization stands. Organizational functions flow from top level to bottom and vice versa.

Delegation develops future leader: Delegation of authority gives enough room and space to the subordinate to flourish with their abilities and skills. Through delegation of authority, the subordinate gets a feeling of importance which motives him to work with greater diligence. Delegation also helps in breaking the monotony of the subordinate so that he can be more creative and efficient. Delegation of authority is not only beneficial to subordinates but it also helps the manager to develop talents and skills since the manager gets enough time to concentrate on more important issues. Also through granting powers and getting the work done through subordinates, delegation helps the manager to attain communication skills, supervision ability and additional leadership knowledge.

Delegation allows time for managerial activities: Delegation gives the manager the opportunity to handle other aspects of the job which no one can do better. These activities might include; project planning, monitoring team members and handling personnel problems as they arise. Delegation generally eases unnecessary burden on managers by allocating some of the work to subordinates.

Delegation develops team members' skills: Failure to delegate effectively will deprive team members of opportunities to improve their skills and assume greater responsibilities. Team members will realize that they are not learning and gaining experience they desire. As a result, they may leave the organization for more challenging and supportive environment. The most talented team members are the ones most likely to leave. Delegating wide variety of assignments to subordinates not only serve as training opportunity to them but also serves as a means of building backup personnel that will be useful in times of emergency.

Delegation increases team members' involvement: Proper delegation encourages team members to understand and develop their desire for the work. It allows team members a chance to incorporate their value in the workplace and work on activities that especially interest them. With reduction on the workload of the superior, the manager can concentrate his energy on more important and more critical issues of concern to the organization, such as planning and making forecasts and projections for the future.

Delegation maximizes efficient output: When tasks are performed according to the skills and abilities of each member of the work group, the organization as a whole is likely to produce a higher level of output. Delegation helps an organization to make the best use of available human resources and achieve the highest possible rate of productivity resulting from a pool of ideas, view-points and suggestions. Delegation helps managers to develop their skills and talents. Since managers get enough time through delegation, they concentrate on more strategic matters thus enhancing their decision-making skills. Delegation enables the manager to record greater productivity in the organization. Through proper selection, assignment and coordination of tasks, the manager can mobilize resources to achieve more than would have been the case if subordinates are left to work on their own. Granting power and getting work done through others help managers to develop effective communication and supervision skills (Rock, 1994).

Benefits of Delegation to the Organization

Delegation of authority, if applied effectively, offers great opportunities to the manager, the subordinate and the organization. Lawson (2007) categorized delegation into two types; delegating for organizational results and delegating for employee development. Delegating for organizational results work best when the employee knows which results are required and has the ability to determine how the assignment should be successfully accomplished. Delegation for development is used when a manager assigns a task to an employee who might not be the best suited for the job but who is nonetheless up to the challenges. Such delegation enables the employee to gain invaluable experience and knowledge for the future.

An important benefit of delegation of authority to the organization is the achievement of higher quality of work which is derivable from employees who have direct knowledge of products and services and are able to make decisions for proper accomplishment of the tasks. Through delegation of authority, quality of work can improve tremendously especially when employees doing the work feel challenged for accomplishment even though the ultimate responsibility for the task rests with the manager who delegated the authority to them. Delegation also saves cost, promotes team-work, increases productivity and efficiency.

Challenges of Delegation of Authority

In spite of the enormous benefits of delegation to the manager, the subordinate and the organization, many drawbacks are still encountered in its application by managers. As pointed out by Hocutt & Stone (2002), everyone knows that managers are supposed to delegate ruthlessly and empower their people fearlessly, but only very few managers do it because the ultimate effect could reduce the manager's role. Managers are aware of the benefits derivable from delegating part of their jobs to subordinates but are afraid of doing so in order not to lose their jobs to the subordinates.

Often managers who delegate lack the motivation to do so mainly because they believe in the fallacy that says: "if you want to do it right, you have to do it yourself". In most cases, the manager has no trust on the subordinates' ability and intension to handle the task. There is also the problem of choosing the right person to do the job as some managers allow sentiments to over-ride their judgment. Another problem is also lack of competencies necessary to delegate effectively on the part of the manager who may choose the wrong task and may delegate to the wrong person. Other problems associated with delegation include; the fear of delivering incorrectly completed task by the subordinate which may hurt the over-all productivity of the organization (Caldar & Douglas, 1999). It is pertinent to identify some of the factors that make managers prefer the "Do it yourself" style instead of delegating to subordinates. The identification of these challenges will also prepare the managers to develop ways of tackling the pitfalls when delegating authority to their subordinates. A total of 12 pitfalls to the delegation of authority are identified below:

1. Unawareness of managers on the significance of delegation

There is no doubt that many managers exist in all types of organizations who are simply not aware of the prime importance of delegation of authority to subordinates. They do not know what advantages are linked to delegation and for this reason they tend to centralize most of their authority within their positions and sometimes within their personality.

2. Unwillingness on the part of the manager to take risk

Delegation of authority engenders apprehension that someone may take a wrong step somewhere or may make a wrong decision that will injure the organization. Some people are truly incapable of delegation due to this kind of apprehension. Some managers end up in sinking their own ship because they cannot simply imagine delegating authority. Such managers forget that if subordinates are not permitted to work on some matters where they could make mistakes and correct themselves, they would never develop their requisite confidence. The subordinates would also have no opportunity to develop themselves and groom for managerial position in future if they are not allowed to develop their potentials (Lawler, Mohrman & Benson, 2001).

3. Inability of managers to accept inadequacies of subordinates

Some managers are so perfectionist in their thinking and their expectations concerning accomplishment of tasks are so high that their subordinates are simply unable to achieve such standards. Since these managers cannot accept a less-than-super-perfect job, they do not delegate authority. Sometimes this perfection tendency goes beyond all reasonable limits. While there are certainly some tasks that require flawless execution, many organizational tasks might be accepted on the basis of some reasonable standards.

4. Aversion of organizational environment to delegation

A prolonged autocratic rule in a society greatly influences the day-to-day operations of a culture of its organizations as well. In such culture, corporate leaders usually do not consider their subordinates well-suited and properly groomed to participate in decision-making process and other important organizational matters. Thus, the culture of centralized operations is further strengthened. In such environments, it is just not in vogue to decentralize authority and get jobs done through delegation of authority to subordinates (Spreitzer & Robert, 2001)..

5. Fear of being exposed

Sometimes, delegation of authority to lower level subordinates is feared to result in goof-ups here and there. Therefore, managers prefer to do things by themselves instead of leaving them to their untrustworthy subordinates who would soon goof on the tasks. On the other hand, if a subordinate is competent and knowledgeable and he is given opportunity to perform sometimes better than his manager, the incumbent manager might construe that his senior colleagues might view the better performance of his subordinate as managers inadequacy or incompetence. The end result in such scenario is that centralization will remain the best choice of managers to the detriment of the subordinates and organizational productivity.

6. Fear of losing competent subordinates

Many managers do not delegate authority due to their fear that the competent employees would outshine themselves and ultimately would either leave their organization, be picked up by somebody else or be promoted to a higher position. In all the cases mentioned, the manager feels losing a competent helping hand.

7. Fear of emptiness

Some managers feel void in their managerial positions as well as in their personality when authority is decentralized. They feel as if they are left with empty hands after they have delegated authority. For them a person without authority cannot be reckoned with in organizational processes.

8. Inability to get work done through others

It is sometimes the belief that doing the job yourself is easier than getting it done through others. For this reason, some managers feel reluctant to get any job done through subordinates. Such feeling is more pronounced with managers who are newly promoted to managerial position.

This means that, although, such people have been promoted to managerial position, they are finding it difficult to shed off their blue-collar over-all garment for hands-on practical work to take charge as managers getting things done through others (Hadden, 1999).

9. Lack of Encouragement from senior managers

Sometimes, managers may be inclined to delegate authority to subordinates to execute some tasks but they are discouraged by the senior managers from doing so. If such managers go on to delegate in spite of the advice not to do so and something goes wrong, they will not receive recue support from the senior managers. "They will be on their own" as the saying goes. It is clear in managerial set up that junior managers will find it difficult to succeed without the backing of the senior executives.

10. Feeling more confident in doing the detailed work

Some managers feel much more confident when doing detailed and operative work than when they are performing their managerial functions especially those that rose through the ranks. Most people have the fear of the unknown and tend to shy away from their managerial duties. It is understandable that a new manager would feel much more confident doing those things that he did successfully in the past. This behaviour is likely to occur if the new manager has initial set-backs in performing the managerial functions. Discouraged managers often tend to immerse themselves in their old duties (Earl, 1999).

11. Preconceived ideas about certain employees

Great majority of organizational managers erroneously jump to conclusion about the capabilities of some employees. For example, a manager may form negative opinion about an employee's ability based on one negative or unimpressive occurrence. That occurrence may be a mistake that does not truly represent the employee's true character or capability. Another possibility is for a manager to base his opinion of an employee on second-hand information. Such information may come from other employees or managers and the information may be very inaccurate. Always give employees second chance before drawing conclusions about their character or capability. This is very important because if the manager has no trust on the capabilities of an employee he (the manager) can never delegate authority to that employee (Cole, 2002).

12. Desire to give good example

Most managers want to set a good example for their employees by doing many tasks themselves instead of delegating authority to subordinates. The problem with this approach is that it is sometimes difficult to identify what constitutes good example. Some managers think that in order to set a good example, they must be busy with work at all times. Such managers hoard work that should be delegated to subordinates for improved productivity. Managers with this kind of management mentality end up recording poor productivity continually for the organization (Thomas and Velthouse, 2009).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Survey research design was adopted in this article which involved a cross sectional study. A sample of 134 employees responded to the questionnaire which formed the data for the study. The data were analyzed through the use of simple descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (ANOVA and Correlation Coefficients). The analysis of the data generated from completed copies of the research instrument (questionnaire) utilized the SPSS computer package software. In establishing the reliability, the following were implemented: The items in the questionnaire were placed on Likert's five-point scale: strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD). Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated for the research instrument, and the coefficient served as additional evidence of convergent validity. In other words, the research instrument was tested for reliability using the Cronbach alpha method and the result of the test showed a coefficient of 0.800 as shown below:

Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
.800	16

The final step in the measurement validation involved computing alpha coefficients for each set of measures to test reliability. Cronbach alpha is used to test the reliability of a multi-item scale. The cutoff point is generally regarded to be 0.6 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, (1992), if reliability coefficient is either .70 or higher, it is acceptable. Therefore, the reliability coefficient in this result is acceptable

Data analysis and interpretation

This section attempted to analyze and interpret the data obtained through the use of questionnaire, cross tabulation, percentages and frequencies. The analysis and hypotheses testing were done using, linear regression, difference of mean and Pearson correlation through the use of a statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS), after which the results were clearly interpreted..

SECTION A

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	22-30	40	40.0	40.0	40.0
	31-38	24	24.0	24.0	64.0
	39-46	12	12.0	12.0	76.0
	46-54	10	10.0	10.0	86.0
	55-above	14	14.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

The number of employees within the age bracket of 22-30 years is 40 and this is the highest.

Table 2 GENDER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	68	68.0	68.0	68.0
	Female	32	32.0	32.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

The total number of male sex is 68 higher than the females at 32.

Table 3 EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	OND/NCE	42	42.0	42.0	42.0
	HND/B.sc	36	36.0	36.0	78.0
	M.sc/MBA	20	20.0	20.0	98.0
	Doctorial/Ph.D	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field survey, 2018

Workers with OND/NCE top the list at 42 in the service of the company.

Table 4 LENGTH OF SERVICE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	below 5yr	32	32.0	32.0	32.0
	5-10yrs	31	31.0	31.0	63.0
	10-15yrs	21	21.0	21.0	84.0
	15yrs and above	16	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

32 employees are the longest serving workers in the company.

Table 5 EMPLOYEE OFFICIAL POSITION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	junior staff	59	59.0	59.0	59.0
	senior staff	26	26.0	26.0	85.0
	management	15	15.0	15.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 5 shows that junior employees are the greatest in number at 59.

Interpretation

Table 1 showed that 100 copies of the questionnaire were administered and all were successfully retrieved. Table 2 showed that 68 respondents were male and 32 female. Table 3 indicated that only two employees have the highest qualification (Ph.D) in the workforce. Table 4 highlighted that 16 employees have served the company for 15 years and above. And table 5 showed that junior workers were the greatest in number among the respondents. A total of 59 junior employees completed the questionnaire.

SECTION B:

Table 6

Analysis of Research Questions

Research Question 1: The Role of Cost in the Effectiveness of Employee Decision Process

Profitability positively affects employees' effectiveness

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	4	4.0	4.0	4.0
	D	6	6.0	6.0	10.0
	U	6	6.0	6.0	16.0
	A	34	34.0	34.0	50.0
	SA	50	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Total number of 84 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 7

Research Question 2: Employees motivation as the key factor for enhancing productivity.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	U	12	12.0	12.0	14.0
	A	40	40.0	40.0	54.0
	SA	46	46.0	46.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

A total of 86 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 8

Research Question 3: Involvement of employees in planning and decision process enhances productivity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	4	4.0	4.0	4.0
	D	14	14.0	14.0	18.0
	U	22	22.0	22.0	40.0
	A	38	38.0	38.0	78.0
	SA	22	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

A total of 60 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 9

Research Question 4: Employee effectiveness reduces cost of managerial decision process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	10	10.0	10.0	10.0
	D	10	10.0	10.0	20.0
	U	18	18.0	18.0	38.0
	A	32	32.0	32.0	70.0
	SA	30	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Total number of 62 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 10

Research Question 5: Delegating tasks and activities are necessary in large organizations for the attainment of greater output.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	U	2	2.0	2.0	4.0
	A	36	36.0	36.0	40.0
	SA	60	60.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Total number of 96 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 11

Research Question 6: Small organizations basically do not delegate much authority to subordinates

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	4	4.0	4.0	4.0
	D	10	10.0	10.0	14.0
	U	16	16.0	16.0	30.0
	A	58	58.0	58.0	88.0
	SA	12	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

A total of 70 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 12

Research Question 7: Size of the organization is the determining factor of the level of delegation in the firm.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	6	6.0	6.0	6.0
	D	4	4.0	4.0	10.0
	U	20	20.0	20.0	30.0
	A	36	36.0	36.0	66.0
	SA	34	34.0	34.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2013

Total number of 64 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 13

Research Question 8: Coordination and control in large organizations enhance employee output

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	D	4	4.0	4.0	6.0
	U	12	12.0	12.0	18.0
	A	52	52.0	52.0	70.0
	SA	30	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Total number of 82 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 14

Research Question 9: Character and beliefs of the top management have an impact on employees' efficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	D	6	6.0	6.0	8.0
	U	4	4.0	4.0	12.0
	A	42	42.0	42.0	54.0
	SA	46	46.0	46.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Total number of 88 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 15

Research Question 10: Centralization of power is more advantageous in achieving high employees' efficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	4	4.0	4.0	4.0
	D	10	10.0	10.0	14.0
	U	16	16.0	16.0	30.0
	A	42	42.0	42.0	72.0
	SA	28	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Total number of 70 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 16

Research Question 11: Decentralization can be used to attain cost minimization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	4	4.0	4.0	4.0
	D	12	12.0	12.0	16.0
	U	24	24.0	24.0	40.0
	A	32	32.0	32.0	72.0
	SA	28	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Total number of 60 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

Table 17

Research Question 12: Decentralization is a tool for achieving low employees' turnover

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	6	6.0	6.0	6.0
	D	12	12.0	12.0	18.0
	U	28	28.0	28.0	46.0
	A	36	36.0	36.0	82.0
	SA	18	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

A total number of 54 respondents agreed and strongly agreed with the above research question.

HYPOTHESES TESTING AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In the testing of the hypotheses and discussion of results, two different hypotheses each of them having null and alternative hypotheses will be tested. The correlation analysis will be used in testing all the hypotheses.

Hypothesis One

H_0: There is no significant relationship between delegation of authority and improvement in productivity.

H_1: there is significant relationship between delegation of authority and improvement in productivity.

Table 18
correlations

		Delegation of authority	Improvement in productivity
Delegation of authority	Pearson Correlation	1	.450
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	100	100
Improvement In productivity	Pearson Correlation	.450	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	100	100

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)

Interpretation

The relationship between delegation of authority and improvement in productivity was tested using pearson product moment correlation coefficient.

The thumb rule for correlation decision rule stated by Hinkle and Wiersma (2003) indicated that there are five ways of interpreting its results:

1. Very high positive (negative) correlation = .90 to 1.00 (-.90 to – 1.00)
2. High positive (negative correlation = .70 to .90 (-.70 to -.90)
3. Moderate positive (negative) correlation = -50 to .70 (-.50 to -.70)
4. Low positive (negative) correlation = .30 to .50 (-.30 to -.50)
5. Little if any correlation = .00 to .30 (-.00 to -.30)

Based on the thumb rule stated above, the statistical result showed low positive significant relationship between the variables because the size of correlation falls within (.30 to .50); r = .450, and since the P-value is <0.05, we reject the null hypothesis Ho and accept the alternate hypothesis Hi. This statistically means that we accept the alternate hypothesis which states that there is significant relationship between delegation of authority and improvement in productivity.

Discussion of Findings

From the above table, it can be concluded that the significant relationship between delegation of authority and improvement in productivity is low. Since the significant relationship between delegation of authority and improvement in productivity is low, employers of labour have to device new strategy for achieving effective delegation of authority to employees in order to enhance productivity.

Hypothesis two

Ho: There is no significant relationship between co-worker relationship and improvement in productivity in an organization.

Ho: There is significant relationship between co-worker relationship and improvement in productivity in an organization.

Table 19
correlations

		Co-worker relationship	Improvement in productivity
Delegation of authority	Pearson Correlation	1	.013
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.928
	N	100	100
Improvement In productivity	Pearson Correlation	.013	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.928	
	N	100	100

Interpretation

The relationship between delegation of authority and improvement in productivity was tested using pearson product moment correlation coefficient. The thumb rule for correlation decision rule stated by Hinkle and Wiersma (2003) indicated that there are five ways of interpreting its results:

1. Very high positive (negative) correlation = .90 to 1.00 (-.90 to – 1.00)
2. High positive (negative correlation = .70 to .90 (-.70 to -.90)
3. Moderate positive (negative) correlation = -50 to .70 (-.50 to -.70)
4. Low positive (negative) correlation = .30 to .50 (-.30 to -.50)
5. Little if any correlation = .00 to .30 (-.00 to -.30)

In line with the rule of thumb stated above, the statistical result showed that there is little if any correlation between the variables because the size of correlation falls within (.00 to .30); r = .013, and since the P-value is <0.05, we accept the null hypothesis Ho and reject the alternate hypothesis Hi. This statistically means that we accept the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between co-worker relationship and improvement in productivity.

Discussion of Findings

From the results of hypothesis two tested, we can conclude that there is no relationship between co-worker relationship and improvement in productivity.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study are derived from the analysis of data generated through questionnaires during the field survey and the testing of the formulated hypotheses. A firm can provide its early-career employees with multiple skills for different jobs by incurring extra costs on human capital development. The employees will then obtain a good understanding of the firm's entire work process through acquiring improved skills. The firm can also take advantage of its employees' multiple skills by employing horizontal information structure in which real decision-making authority is delegated to lower hierarchical levels, because employees with multiple skills can cope with irregular and emergent events quickly and effectively.

In the course of the research study, two hypotheses were formulated and tested using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) tool. From the two hypotheses tested, the alternative hypotheses (H_1) was accepted and the null hypotheses (H_0) was rejected for hypothesis one. In hypothesis two, the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternative hypothesis was rejected. The conclusion as shown in hypothesis one is that delegation of authority is a veritable tool for improving employee productivity. It was affirmed that delegation of authority is one of the management processes used in enhancing the over-all performance of 7up Bottling Company Nig. Plc. It was also noted that the size of the organization enhances employees' output under delegated authority. It was revealed that employees' capabilities positively affect their productivity and ultimately the performance of 7up Bottling Company Nig. Plc.

REFERENCES

Ashforth, B. E. (2006). The experience of powerlessness in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making Processes, 43*, 207-242.

Asika, N. (1999) *Research methodology in behavioural science*. Ibadan: Longman publishers

Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (2007). *Empowering service employees*. Sloan Management Review, Summer, 73-84.

Calder, N. A. & Douglas, P.C. (1999). *Empowered employee teams: The new key to improving corporate success*.

Cole, R. (2002). *Work, Mobility, and Participation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Druskat, V. & Wheeler, J. 2004. *How to lead a Self-Managing Team*. MIT Sloan Management Review., 45: 65-71

Earl, G. (1999) *Research; practical approach.* New York: Free Press

Fagbohungbe, A. (1993). *Research in organizational behavior*. Lagos: Foundation publishers

Hadden, R. (1999). *Listen up: The best ideas may come from workers*. Washington Business Journal. Vol. 17, No. 44.

Hocutt, M. & Stone, T. (2002). The *impact of employee empowerment on the quality of Service recovery effort*. Journal of Quality Management. Vol. 3, No. 1.

Kirkman, B. & Rosen, B. (2005). Beyond self-management: *The antecedents and consequences of team empowerment*. Academy of Management Journal, 42, 58-71.

Lawler, E.E., Mohrman, S.A., & Benson, G. 2001. *Organizing for high performance: Employee Involvement, TQM, Reengineering, and Knowledge Management in the Fortune 1000*.

Lawson, K. (2007). How to delegate effectively. *Lawson Consulting Group Inc. Lansdale.*

Leana, C. R. (2008). Power *relinquishment versus power sharing: Theoretical clarification and empirical comparison of delegation and participation*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1987, vol 72, 228-233.

Locke, E.A. & Schweiger, D.M. (1999). Participation *in decision making: One more look* on Research in Organisational Behaviour, eds L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw. 1979.

Loretta, D. & Polsky, W. (1997). *Share the power*. *Personnel* Journal, September 1991, 116.

Obamiro, J.K (2008) *Management; principles and strategies: Pumark publication.*

Rock, S. T. (1994). *What does empowerment mean?* Director, February 1994, 3.

Spreitzer, G. M. & Robert, E.A. (2001). *A Company of Leaders: Five Disciplines for Unleashing the Power in your Workforce*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). *Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation*. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 1442-1465.

Thomas, K.W. & Velthouse, B.A. (2009). *Cognitive elements of empowerment*. Academy of Management Review, 15, 666-681.