

Collective Decision Making and its Effect on Organization Commitment in Manufacturing Industry (A Study of Innoson Company Limited Emene)

¹Ekwochi Eucharua Adaeze, ¹Chinedu Anthony Chinedu and ²Okoh Ambrose Ndubisi

¹Department of Business Administration Faculty of Management Sciences Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu, Nigeria.

²Department of Business Administration University of Nigeria Enugu, Campus.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research work is to appraise “collective decision making and its effect on organization commitment in manufacturing industry (A study of Innoson Company Limited, Emene)”. The objectives of this research work include the following; to determine the relationship existing between collective decision making and organizational commitment. To examine the effect of collective decision making on organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu. For a successful completion of this research work, the researcher made use of both primary and secondary methods of data collection for information gathering. Primary data were collected through: questionnaire administration, oral interview, and personal observation. Secondary data were collected through; Periodicals and journals, Textbooks and lecture and note books, and Internet. The data collected were presented in tables and analyzed with simple percentage while the hypotheses stated were tested with chi square. The summary of findings made for the purpose of this research study includes the following: significant relationship exists between collective decision making and organizational commitment. Collective decision making affect organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu. In conclusion, collective decision making has impact on the performance of the company. The researcher therefore recommends that Innoson Company Limited should always implement vital decision made jointly with the workers otherwise, it would reap distrust as well as lack of confidence and commitment among its employees.

Keywords: Collective, Decision Making, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Growth and Profitability

INTRODUCTION

Decision making is defined as the process of selecting among alternatives. Decision making is implicitly aimed at picking on

alternative solution, which when applied can solve a given problem. It involves three distinct stages, namely [1] intelligence stage which comprises an attempt to identify and understand the nature of solution. The decision stage which involves formulating and assessing alternatives and the choice phase which only entails selecting among possible alternatives. Collective decision making is a situation faced when individuals collectively make a choice from the alternatives before them [2]. The decision is then no longer attributable to any single individual who is a member of the group. This is because all the individuals and social group processes such as social influence contribute to the outcome. The decisions made by groups are often different from those made by individuals. Group polarization is one clear example: groups tend to make decisions that are more extreme than those of its individual members, in the direction of the individual inclinations. There is much debate as to whether this difference results in decisions that are better or worse. According to the idea of synergy, decisions made collectively tend to be

more effective than decisions made by a single individual [3]. Collective decision is important where a large number of stakeholders are involved from different walks of life, coming together to make a decision which may benefit everyone.

However [4] noted that organizations may benefit from the perceived motivational influences of employees. When employees participate in the decision-making process, they may improve understanding and perceptions among colleagues and superiors, and enhance personnel value in the organization. Collective decision-making by the top management team can ensure the completeness of decision-making and may increase team member commitment to final decisions [5]. In a collective decision-making process each team member has an opportunity to share their perspectives, voice their ideas and tap their skills to improve team effectiveness and efficiency.

According to [6], collective decision-making can have a wide array of organizational benefits. He stated that may positively impact the following:

- Job satisfaction
- Organizational commitment
- Perceived organizational support
- Organizational citizenship behavior
- Labor-management relations
- Job performance and organizational performance
- Organizational profits

[7] noted that by sharing decision-making with other employees, participants may eventually achieve organization objectives that influence them. In this process, collective decision-making can be used as a tool that may enhance relationships in the organization, increase employee work incentives, and increase the rate of information circulation across the organization.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Lack of collective decision making is one of the major causes of organizational failures in the business environment. This is based on the premise that decisions arrived at by collective evaluations of business or organizational activities is proven to be far profitable than that arrived at

by individual evaluation. Lack of involvement of employees or junior management staff in organizational decision most often leads to loss of commitment to work thereby affecting both organizational growth and profitability.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The broad objective of this study is to appraise the concept of collective decision making and its effect on organizational commitment in manufacturing industry focusing on a study of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.

The specific objectives include the following:

1. To determine the relationship existing between collective decision making and organizational commitment.
2. To examine the effect of collective decision making on organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.

3. To determine the extent to which Innoson Company Limited undertake collective decision making.
4. To compare decisions arrived at collectively and individually in organizations.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions are formulated for the purpose of this project work;

1. Does a significant relationship exist between collective decision making and organizational commitment?
2. Does collective decision making affect organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.
3. To what extent does Innoson Company Limited undertake collective decision making?
4. Are decisions arrived at collectively more profitable than that arrived at individually?

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses are formulated for this project work;

Hypothesis One

H_0 : A significant relationship does not exist between collective decision making and organizational commitment.

H_1 : A significant relationship exists between collective decision making and organizational commitment

Hypothesis Two

H_0 : Collective decision making does not affect organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.

H_1 : Collective decision making affects organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu

Hypothesis Three

H₀: Innoson Company Limited does not undertake collective decision making to a great extent.

H₁: Innoson Company Limited undertakes collective decision making.

Hypothesis Four

H₀: Decisions arrived at collectively are not more profitable than that arrived at individually.

H₁: Decisions arrived at collectively are more profitable than that arrived at individually.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Collective decision making is a situation faced when individuals collectively make a choice from the alternatives before them [8]. The decision is then no longer attributable to any single individual who is a member of the group. This is because all the individuals and social group processes such as social influence contribute to the outcome. The decisions made by groups are often different from those made by individuals. Group polarization is one clear example: groups tend to make decisions that are more extreme than those of its individual members, in the direction of the individual inclinations. There is much debate as to whether this difference results in decisions that are better or worse.

According to the idea of synergy, decisions made collectively tend to be more effective than decisions made by a single individual [9].

Collective decisions cannot be made if one group has, or appears to have, all the power. If partners have respect for each other's abilities and potential contributions, power struggles should be avoided. [10] notes the importance of sharing power and responsibility within the collaborative in a collective decision making situation: A collaborative is most effective when all partners exercise leadership. Partners need to work collegially instead of dominating those they perceive as less powerful. Partners ideally bring a variety of strengths

and potential contributions to the table. Recognizing each partner's strengths and expertise lays the groundwork for genuinely shared leadership. It also begins to replace top-down, competitive notions of power and control with a new operating principle that sees the whole collaborative as greater than the sum of its parts. Leaders from partner organizations may experience difficulty in sharing power, but collaborative will fail unless partners willingly cultivate a new style of leadership--partnership among equals [11]." [12] is of the opinion that members of a collaborative in collective decision making may consider rotating planning meetings among different agencies to establish a sense of collective responsibility. Partners also will want to make collaborative decisions or rotate responsibility for setting the agenda for meetings, facilitating meetings, and determining and dividing up responsibilities among agencies or group members. When group members collectively decide upon objectives and activities, they should establish clear lines of authority to facilitate implementation of agreed-

upon tasks. Shared participation and responsibility help all partners develop a sense of ownership. [13] recommends that partners develop a written agreement that "creates a formal structure and clarifies roles and responsibilities in great detail"

According to [14] the collective participative decision making style indicates that the leader is involving the members of the organization. The level of involvement includes the members sharing information, ideas and perceptions with the leader. However, the leader alone makes the decision which means he or she keeps total control. The leader is also solely responsible for the decision and its consequences. The members have some input into the decision and have a sense of involvement. This is particularly useful if there are potential negative consequences for the members. The leader has access to alternative perspectives and is better informed when making the decision. When the members are notified before the decision is implemented there are no surprises

and the sense of involvement is often enhanced. The main disadvantage to the collective participative decision making style is that it can be a slow and time

intensive process. If security is an issue, this style may be inappropriate because so many people are involved from an early stage.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Social choice theory or social choice is a theoretical framework for analysis of combining individual opinions, preferences, interests, or welfares to reach a *collective decision* or *social welfare* in some sense [15]. A non-theoretical example of a collective decision is enacting a law or set of laws under a constitution. Social choice blends elements of welfare economics and voting theory. It is methodologically individualistic, in that it aggregates preferences and behaviors of individual members of society. Using elements of formal logic for generality, analysis proceeds from a set of seemingly reasonable axioms of social choice to form a *social welfare function* (or *constitution*). Results uncovered the logical incompatibility of various axioms, as in Arrow's theorem, revealing an aggregation problem and suggesting reformulation or theoretical triage in dropping some

axiom(s) [16]. According to [17] social choice theory depends upon the ability to aggregate, or sum up, individual preferences into a combined social welfare function. Individual preference can be modeled in terms of an economic utility function. The ability to sum utility functions of different individuals depends on the utility functions being comparable to each other; informally, individuals' preferences must be measured with the same yardstick. Then the ability to create a social welfare function depends crucially on the ability to compare utility functions. This is called interpersonal utility comparison. [18] has argued that preferences and utility functions of individuals are interpersonally comparable and may therefore be added together to arrive at a measure of aggregate utility. Utilitarian ethics call for maximizing this aggregate.

According to [10] social decisions should accordingly be based on malleable factors. He proposes interpersonal utility comparisons based on a wide range of data. His theory is concerned with access to advantage, viewed as an individual's access to goods that satisfy basic

needs (e.g., food), freedoms (in the labor market, for instance), and capabilities. We can proceed to make social choices based on real variables, and thereby address actual position, and access to advantage.

. THE CONCEPT OF EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN COLLECTIVE DECISION MAKING

Employee participation in collective decision making has been a subject matter of a lot of studies which has found it to be strongly correlated to organizational commitment. Conceptual definition of employee participation is necessary. According to [20], employee participation refers to the involvement of employees in decision making. Employee participation can take either a representational or direct form. Representation takes place through bodies such as consultative committees. Direct participation can be achieved through communication methods such as letters, employee attitude surveys, and team briefing, or through initiatives such as self-managed teams and suggestion programs. Employee participation is the process whereby employees are

involved in decision making processes, rather than simply acting on orders [21]. Employee participation is part of a process of empowerment in the workplace. Empowerment involves decentralizing power within the organization to individual decision makers further down the line. Team working is a key part of the empowerment process. Team members are encouraged to make decisions for themselves in line with guidelines and frameworks established in self managing teams.

Employee participation is in part a response to the quality movement within organizations. Individual employees are encouraged to take responsibility for quality in terms of carrying out activities, which meet the requirements of their customers. The

internal customer is someone within the organization that receives the 'product of service' provided by their 'supplier' within the organization. External customers are buyers and users outside of the organization. Employee participation is also part of the move towards human resource development in modern organizations. Employees are trusted to make decisions for themselves and the organization. This is a key motivational tool. Employee participation is also referred to as employee involvement (EI). Examples of employee participation include [22]

- i. Project teams or quality circles in which employees work on projects or tasks with considerable responsibility being delegated to the team.
- ii. Suggestion schemes - where employees are given channels whereby they can suggest new ideas to managers within the organization. Often they will receive rewards for making appropriate suggestions.
- iii. Consultation exercises and meetings whereby employees are encouraged to share ideas.
- iv. Delegation of responsibility within the organization. In modern organizations ground level employees have to be given considerable responsibility because they are dealing with customers on a day-to-day basis often in novel situations. Such employees need to be trusted to make decisions for themselves.
- v. Multi-channel decision making processes. In such situations decisions are not only made in a downward direction, they also result from communications upwards, sideways, and in many other directions within the organization.

DEGREE OF EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

Several works reviewed by researchers recognized as a central issue facing managers in carrying out their responsibility to the extent to which

they should allow their subordinates take parts in decision affecting their job, themselves, and the organization. A few of the questions concerning the

nature of a decision problem in the leadership style includes the autocratic management, benevolent management, consultative management, participative management which is often referred to as democratic management. Apart from the nature of decision problems, other determinants of degree of participation are employee's knowledge on skill and needs for participating. [23] for instance, found that some employees desire greater participation than others. So participation is mostly effective when it is reasonably matched.

[24] found out that employees desiring greater participation in decision making experience greater dissatisfaction than others. [25] in his own contribution postulates that the prerequisites for participation are as follows:

- i) Potential benefits greater than cost
- ii) Adequate employee abilities to deal with subject
- iii) Adequate time to participate
- iv) Mutual ability to participate
- v) Relevance to employee interest.

RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design is a systematic plan to study a scientific problem. The design of a study defines the study type (descriptive, correlational, semi-experimental, experimental, review, meta-analytic) and sub-type (e.g., descriptive-longitudinal case study),

research question, hypotheses, independent and dependent variables, experimental design, and, if applicable, data collection methods and a statistical analysis plan [2]. The research therefore adopted sample survey in this research work.

POPULATION OF STUDY

The population of study covers staff and management of Innoson Nigeria Plc, Enugu. The total population of the

management and staff of the company according to its personnel officer are 94.

DETERMINATION OF SAMPLE SIZE

In order to get a representation of the entire population, the Taro Yamani statistical formula was employed.

According [5] the formula is stated as follows

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

Where n = represents the sample size

N = represents the population

e = represents the margin of error

I = constant

For the purpose of this study, N will be equal to 94, e will be assumed to be 5%.

Therefore the sample size for this research work will be

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \frac{94}{1+94(0.05)^2} \\ &= \frac{94}{1+ 94(0.0025)} \\ &= \frac{94}{1 + 0.235} \\ &= \frac{94}{1.235} \end{aligned}$$

$$n = 76$$

The sample size for this study is 76.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

The researcher at this point test the hypothesis formed earlier to accept or reject them and as well as determining the extent of their reliability. In order

to achieve this, the researcher used chi - square method that is chi - square (X^2) test.

Hypothesis One:

STEP 1:

H_0 : A significant relationship does not exist between collective decision making and organizational commitment.

H_1 : A significant relationship exists between collective decision making and organizational commitment.

STEP 2:

The statistical test is $X^2 = \sum (oi - ei)^2 / ei$

STEP 3:

The level of significance used is 5%.

That is 0.05

STEP 4:

TABLE 1:

OPTIONS	O _i	E _i
Strongly agree	35	16.75
Agree	15	16.75
Disagree	11	16.75
Strongly disagree	6	16.75
Total	67	67

Where: oi = Observed frequency

ei = Expected frequency

To get the expected frequency, the researcher divided the total frequency by the number of options. Thus we have:

$$ei = 67 / 4 = 16.75$$

$$X^2 = \sum (oi - ei)^2 / ei$$

$$= (35 - 16.75)^2 + (15 - 16.75)^2 + (11 - 16.75)^2 + (6 - 16.75)^2$$

$$= (18.25)^2 + (-1.75)^2 + (-5.75)^2 + (-10.75)^2$$

The degree of freedom is given by $(k - 1)$.

That is, $DF = (k - 1)$.

Where K = Number of rows or columns

STEP 5:

The critical value is given as $X^2 = 7.37776$. This value was determined from the table of Chi - square (X^2) using the degree of freedom and level of significance.

STEP 6:

Computation of the test statistic using table 7:

16.75

$$= 19.88 + 0.18 + 1.97 + 6.99 = 29.02$$

STEP 7:

Comparing the test statistic with critical value $29.02 > 7.37776$

STEP 8: DECISION RULE

Since the calculated value of X^2 is greater than the critical value, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

We therefore conclude that a significant relationship exists between collective decision making and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis Two:

STEP 1:

H_0 : Collective decision making does not affect organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.

H_1 : Collective decision making affects organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.

STEP 2:

The statistical test is $X^2 = \sum (o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i$

STEP 3:

The level of significance used is 5%. That is 0.05

STEP 4:

The degree of freedom is given by $(k - 1)$. That is, $DF = (k - 1)$.

Where K = Number of rows or columns

STEP 5:

The critical value is given as $X^2 = 3.8$. This value was determined from the table of Chi - square (X^2) using the degree of freedom and level of significance.

STEP 6:

Computation of the test statistic using table 8:

TABLE 2:

OPTIONS	O _i	E _i
Yes	47	33.5
No	20	33.5
Total	67	67

Where: o_i = Observed frequency

e_i = Expected frequency

To get the expected frequency, the researcher divided the total frequency by the number of options. Thus we have:

$$e_i = 67 / 2 = 33.5$$

$$X^2 = \sum (o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i$$

$$= (47 - 33.5)^2 + (20 - 33.5)^2$$

$$33.5$$

$$= 5.44 + 5.44 = 10.88$$

STEP 7:

Comparing the test statistic with critical value $10.88 > 3.8$

STEP 8: DECISION RULE

Since the calculated value of X^2 is less than the critical value, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.

We therefore conclude that collective decision making affects organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.

Hypothesis Three:

STEP 1:

H₀: Innoson Company Limited does not undertake collective decision making to a great extent.

H₁: Innoson Company Limited undertakes collective decision making.

STEP 2:

The statistical test is $X^2 = \sum (o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i$

STEP 3:

The level of significance used is 5%. That is 0.05

STEP 4:

The degree of freedom is given by $(k - 1)$. That is, $DF = (k - 1)$.

Where K = Number of rows or columns

STEP 5:

The critical value is given as $X^2 = 7.37776$. This value was determined from the table of Chi-square (X^2) using the degree of freedom and level of significance.

STEP

6

:

TABLE 3:

OPTIONS	O _i	E _i
Strongly agree	38	16.75
Agree	14	16.75
Disagree	12	16.75
Strongly disagree	3	16.75
Total	67	67

Where: o_i = Observed frequency

e_i = Expected frequency

To get the expected frequency, the researcher divided the total frequency by the number of options. Thus we have:

$$e_i = 67 / 4 = 16.75$$

$$X^2 = \sum (o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i$$

$$= (38 - 16.75)^2 + (14 - 16.75)^2 + (12 - 16.75)^2 + (3 - 16.75)^2$$

$$16.75$$

$$= 26.96 + 0.45 + 1.35 + 11.29 = 40.05$$

STEP 7:

Comparing the test statistic with critical value $40.05 > 7.37776$.

STEP 8: DECISION RULE

Since the calculated value of X^2 is less than the critical value, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.

We therefore conclude that Innoson Company Limited undertakes collective decision making.

Hypothesis Four:

STEP 1:

H₀: Decisions arrived at collectively are not more profitable than that arrived at individually.

H₁: Decisions arrived at collectively are more profitable than that arrived at individually.

STEP 2:

The statistical test is $X^2 = \sum (o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i$

STEP 3:

The level of significance used is 5%. That is 0.05

STEP 4:

The degree of freedom is given by $(k - 1)$. That is, $DF = (k - 1)$.

Where K = Number of rows or columns

STEP 5:

The critical value is given as $X^2 = 7.37776$. This value was determined

TABLE 3:

OPTIONS	O _i	E _i
Strongly agree	28	16.75
Agree	17	16.75
Disagree	12	16.75
Strongly disagree	10	16.75
Total	67	67

Where: o_i = Observed frequency

e_i = Expected frequency

To get the expected frequency, the researcher divided the total frequency by the number of options. Thus we have:

$$e_i = 67 / 4 = 16.75$$

$$X^2 = \sum (o_i - e_i)^2 / e_i$$

$$= (38 - 16.75)^2 + (14 - 16.75)^2 + (12 - 16.75)^2 + (3 - 16.75)^2$$

$$16.75$$

$$= 26.96 + 0.45 + 1.35 + 11.29 = 40.05$$

STEP 7:

Comparing the test statistic with critical value $40.05 > 7.37776$.

STEP 8: DECISION RULE

Since the calculated value of X^2 is less than the critical value, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.

from the table of Chi - square (X^2) using the degree of freedom and level of significance.

STEP 6:

We therefore conclude that decisions arrived at collectively are more profitable than that arrived at individually.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The summary of findings made for this study includes:

1. The researcher discovered that 52% of the respondents strongly agree that a significant relationship exists between collective decision making and organizational commitment, 22% agree, 16% disagree while 10% strongly disagree. Therefore, a significant relationship exists between collective decision making and organizational commitment. The researcher found out that 70% of the respondents are of the opinion that collective decision making affect organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu while 30% of them said no. Therefore, collective decision making affect organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu. Since majority of the respondents noted that Innoson Company Limited undertake collective decision making to a very great extent, the researcher therefore concludes that Innoson Company Limited undertakes collective decision making to a very great extent.

2. The researcher discovered that 42% of the respondents are of the opinion

that the decisions arrived at collectively are more profitable than that arrived at individually, 25% agree, 18% disagree while 15% strongly disagree. Therefore, the decisions arrived at collectively are more profitable than that arrived at individually. The researcher found out that the benefits of collective decision making in Innoson Company Limited, Enugu include; job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support and labor-management relations.

3. The researcher discovered that 42% of the respondents strongly agree that collective decision making has impact on the productivity of the company, 28% of them agree, 19% disagree while 11% of them strongly disagree. Therefore, collective decision making has impact on the productivity of the company.

4. The researcher found out that 73% of the respondents are of the opinion that the company achieves its corporate objectives in its collective decision making while 27% of them said no to this. Therefore, the company achieves its corporate

objectives in its collective decision making.

5. The researcher found out that 75% of the respondents are of the opinion that collective decision making has

impact on the performance of the company while 25% of them said no to this. Therefore, collective decision making has impact on the performance of the company.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1. A significant relationship exists between collective decision making and organizational commitment.
2. Collective decision making affect organizational growth and profitability of Innoson Company Limited, Enugu.
3. Innoson Company Limited undertakes collective decision making to a very great extent.
4. The decisions arrived at collectively are more profitable than that arrived at individually.
5. The benefits of collective decision making in Innoson Company Limited, Enugu include; job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived

organizational support and labor-management relations.

6. Collective decision making has impact on the productivity of the company.
7. The company achieves its corporate objectives in its collective decision making.
8. Collective decision making has impact on the performance of the company.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Going by the findings of this research work the following recommendations are hereby suggested by the researcher.

- 1) Innoson Company Limited should always implement vital decision made jointly with the workers otherwise, it would reap distrust as well as lack of

confidence and commitment among its employees.

2) Innoson Company Limited should also adopt and apply as appropriately the employee participation programmes such as democratic management works committee, middle

management committee and industrial democracy. By so doing, it will be able to identify and fulfill employee needs for security or safety welfare, ego and self-actualization. The fulfillment of these needs have been found to engage organizational commitment.

REFERENCES

1. Anaga, C. (2010). Integrating the individual and organization in collective decision making. Enugu: Abic Books and Equipment.
2. Argris, C. (2007). "Personality and Organization". New York: Harper and Row.
3. Benneth, R. (2005). Managing personnel and performance: An alternative approach. London: Business Book London.
4. Davis, K. (2005). "Human Behaviour at work Organizational Behaviour". New Delhi: McGraw Hill Publishing Company.
5. Mash, R.M. and Mannari, H. (2009). Organizational commitment and turnover. A production study administration science quarterly. Vol. 12 (9).
6. Steer, R.M. (2008). Introduction to organizational behaviour. London: Harper and Row Publishers.
7. Vroom, V. and Yetton P. (1983). Leadership and decision making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
8. Akpala, A (2009) Management: An Introduction and the Nigerian Perspective. Enugu: Department of Management, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus.
9. Drucker, P., (2010). An Introductory View of Management, New York: Harper's College Press.
10. Egbo, V O (2011) Corporate Policy and Strategy: Managing for Competitive Advantage:

- Enugu: Splash media Organization
11. Ejiofor, P. N (2010) Management in Nigeria: Theories and Issues. Onitsha: African Fep Publishers.
 12. Enudu, T (2008) Business Policy: AN Introductory Analysis. Enugu: New Generation Books.
 13. Farmer, R. N. and B. M. Richman (1999), Comparative Management and Economic Progress, Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
 14. Flipppo, E (2009) Personnel Management. London: McGraw Hill Inc.
 15. Hastings, P. G (2009) Introduction to Business. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
 16. Ile, N. M. (2003), Comparative and International Management, Enugu: Ochumba Printing and Publishing Company Limited.
 17. Jones, A., George. O and Hill, D (2005:45) Management. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
 18. Koontz, H., Cyril O'Donnell and Heinz Weihrich (1999), Management International Publishers.
 - Student Edition, Tokyo: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
 19. Mocker, J. R (2002) The Management Control Process. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
 20. Onuoha, B. C (2003), Entrepreneurial Development in Nigeria: An Integrated Perspective. Okigwe: Avan Global Publications.
 21. Orji, A (2006) Principles of Research Methodologies. Enugu: New Generation Books.
 22. Shubin, J. A (2007) Business Management: An Introduction to Business and Industry. New York: Barnes and Noble Books.
 23. Stoner, James A. F. and B. Edward Freeman (2007), Management, New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
 24. Ukeje, B. O (2003) Leadership: The Bane of Nigerian Development. Journal of Management Sciences, Faculty of Management Sciences, UNIZIK, Jan. Vol, 1, No. 1
 25. Taro, Y (1964) Statistics: An Introductory Analysis. New York: Harper and Row