

## TEAM COOPERATION AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY OF FOOD AND BEVERAGES MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN RIVERS STATE

Dike-Worlu, Stanley

[hachikaruikechi@gmail.com](mailto:hachikaruikechi@gmail.com)

Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management Studies, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt

### Cite this article:

Dike- Worlu, S. (2025), Team Cooperation and Employee Productivity of Food and Beverages Manufacturing Firms in Rivers State. International Journal of Management and Marketing Research, 1(1), 1-32.

### DOI:

[10.13140/RG.2.2.28291.82725](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28291.82725)

### Manuscript History

Received: 19 Feb 2025

Accepted: 21 Mar 2025

Published: 10 May 2025

### Copyright © 2025 The Author(s).

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND4.0), which permits anyone to share, use, reproduce and redistribute in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between cooperation and employee productivity in food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. The theoretical framework included McGregor's Theory X, Y, and Z, which explain how employee productivity can be enhanced through participative management and the integration of organizational culture. A sample size of 300 was determined from a population of 1,200 respondents using Taro-Yamane's sampling formula. Data for the study were collected through personal interviews and questionnaires. Out of 300 distributed questionnaires, 292 were retrieved and deemed useful for data analysis. The collected data were analyzed using Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient, facilitated by the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 23.0). The findings indicated a significant relationship between cooperation and employee productivity in food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State. Specifically, the study found that participative management practices, which include team cohesion, collaboration, and cooperation, significantly enhance task accomplishment, timeliness of output, and employee innovativeness. These elements are crucial measures of employee productivity in the industry. Based on these findings, the study recommends that managers of food and beverages firms should place greater emphasis on increasing employee productivity through participative management. This involves promoting employee skills and experience and encouraging their involvement in decision-making processes. Additionally, fostering a cooperative organizational culture is essential for establishing and sustaining a positive relationship between management and employees. By effectively managing organizational culture, firms can improve timeliness of output, task accomplishment, and employee innovativeness, thereby enhancing overall productivity in the food and beverages manufacturing sector in Rivers State.

**Keywords:** Team cooperation, employee productivity, food and beverages manufacturing firms

## INTRODUCTION

The significance of employee productivity in any organization cannot be overstated. The primary goal and objective of every business organization is to make a profit through increased productivity and enhanced job performance. Employee productivity, in essence, refers to the quality and quantity of products and services produced by an employee within a given period (Murkic et al., 2015). It represents an employee's ability to deliver the desired output efficiently and effectively within a specified timeframe. In the context of manufacturing firms, particularly in the food and beverages sector, this entails the transformation and conversion of raw agricultural products into consumable goods. Employee productivity is crucial as it directly influences the performance, profitability, and sustainability of an organization (Tahire et al., 2014).

In any organization, four basic resources require significant attention: people, machines, money, and materials. Among these, human resources are the most critical, as they are the driving force behind all other resources. Effective and efficient employee performance is paramount for an organization to achieve its goals and objectives (Adair, 2018). In the competitive landscape of business, organizations must continuously strive to improve productivity, which can only be achieved through the effective utilization of human resources (Hanaysha, 2016). Employees are the core component that contributes to increased productivity in firms (Bhat, 2013). Thus, understanding and enhancing employee productivity is vital for the success and competitiveness of manufacturing firms, especially in the food and beverages sector.

The food and beverages manufacturing industry in Rivers State, Nigeria, plays a significant role in the country's economy. These firms engage in the transformation and conversion of agricultural crops into consumable goods and services, essential for the health and welfare of society. According to the World Trade Organization (2020), Nigeria is the largest food basket in Africa, with substantial investments in local firms and high levels of exports of processed agricultural products. The activities of food and beverages firms in Nigeria have contributed to 22.5% of the total manufacturing value and 4.6% of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (World Bank, 2021). In 2017, spending on food and beverages in Nigeria was estimated at about 44 billion US dollars (Flanders Investment & Trade, 2020). However, as these firms grow in complexity, they encounter increasing challenges in maintaining and improving productivity.

Effective performance of food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State requires skilled and professional employees. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (2021), these firms employed about 1.5 million Nigerians and non-Nigerians, thereby reducing the rate of unemployment in the country. The sector operates across multiple trades, including fresh produce and locally processed goods, transforming domestic agricultural products for local and international markets. The high demand for food and beverage products in Nigeria necessitates the employment of highly trained and committed employees. However, finding and retaining such employees is challenging due to the competitive scramble for qualified personnel by various business organizations. To address this, firms must provide attractive welfare packages and create a conducive work environment to motivate and retain their workforce (Benrazavi et al., 2013).

Team cooperation is a critical factor in enhancing employee productivity. Cooperation involves the concerted effort of employees working together to achieve common organizational goals. Effective cooperation leads to the pooling of diverse skills, knowledge, and experiences, which

can result in innovative solutions and improved processes. Participative management, where employees are actively involved in decision-making processes, is a strategic approach to foster cooperation and enhance productivity and job satisfaction (Yohe, 2003). There are various types and degrees of participative management, one of which involves employees controlling and determining the nature of production processes through joint decision-making (Vernoy et al., 2008). Armstrong (1995) emphasized that participative management aims to enhance optimal productivity by making employees feel integral to the organization. This approach helps businesses tap into the potential of their employees, facilitating better management and higher productivity. Pearce & Robbins (2016) noted that in the global economy, where competition is increasingly intense, organizations must adopt participative management to sustain their operations and remain competitive.

This study on cooperation and employee productivity within food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State, Nigeria, is imperative. The sector is vital to the economy, and addressing the challenges related to employee productivity is crucial for its growth and sustainability. By fostering a cooperative environment and involving employees in decision-making processes, these firms can enhance productivity, innovation, and job satisfaction. This study aims to fill the knowledge gap by exploring the relationship between team cooperation and employee productivity in this context, providing valuable insights for business organizations to improve their performance and competitiveness.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Employee productivity is often significantly enhanced in firms that incorporate participative management practices, fostering a sense of job satisfaction and ownership among employees (Kelemba & Davis, 2017). However, this is not the case with food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State. These firms have notably failed to involve their employees in decision-making processes, leading to poor job satisfaction and subsequently low productivity levels (Igbokwe-Ibeto, 2012). This lack of employee involvement has created an environment where workers feel undervalued and disconnected from the organizational goals, resulting in suboptimal job performance and decreased overall productivity (Man, 2007).

The dynamic and demanding nature of the food and beverages sector in Rivers State necessitates a study to address these productivity issues. The sector's inability to produce the required quantity and quality of products has been exacerbated by low employee morale, stemming from dissatisfaction and a perceived lack of appreciation from management. Employees frequently voice their grievances, which include low job satisfaction and lack of motivation, contributing to the declining productivity in the sector. This dissatisfaction is detrimental not only to the firms but also to the broader economy, as the food and beverages industry plays a crucial role in Nigeria's economic structure.

The fundamental goal of any business organization is to generate profit and remain competitively robust within a turbulent business environment (Isaac, 2000). However, one of the major problems facing food and beverages firms in Rivers State is a decline in productivity. This decline is linked to the firms' inability to effectively convert and transform agricultural crops into consumable products. The employees, who are critical resources within these organizations, are exhibiting behaviors that are not aligned with the company's objectives. Issues such as low morale, job dissatisfaction, and a lack of trust in management have created a significant barrier to achieving the firms' goals. This discord has resulted in a lack of cooperation between management and employees, further hindering productivity.

The general attitude of workers towards achieving organizational objectives has become deplorable. There is a rising demand among employees for better wages, improved conditions of service, and enhanced welfare packages. Frequent industrial actions and conflicts between employees and management have become commonplace, disrupting the workflow and reducing productivity. The relationship between employees and management is fraught with tension, making it difficult for managers to motivate and manage their workforce effectively. The increasing complexities of managing human resources in this sector have led to confusion and ineffective management practices, which have further contributed to the current low productivity levels. The firms also struggle to hire and retain the best employees who are willing to work collaboratively within the organization.

The numerous challenges facing food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State have rendered the sector increasingly unstable and unable to compete favorably with counterparts in other regions and countries. Problems such as non-participative management practices, lack of employee training programs, mistrust between employees and management, poor team cooperation, inadequate motivational packages, poor working conditions, insufficient salaries, centralized power structures, undemocratic leadership styles, and poor communication systems are all contributing factors to the declining productivity in this sector. Consequently, the performance of food and beverages firms in Rivers State has fallen below expectations, necessitating urgent attention and improvement.

Previous studies on team cooperation and employee productivity have largely been conducted outside Rivers State, failing to address the specific challenges faced by food and beverages firms in this region. This study aims to investigate the relationship between cooperation and employee productivity within the unique context of Rivers State's food and beverages sector. The study will incorporate theories such as McGregor's Theory X, Y, and Z, to provide a comprehensive theoretical framework. These theories will facilitate a deeper understanding of cooperation and its impact on employee productivity, ultimately addressing the existing knowledge gap and offering solutions to enhance productivity in the food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

### **Aim and Objectives of the Study**

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between cooperation and Employee Productivity of Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. To achieve the aim, the objectives are to;

1. examine the relationship between Cooperation and Task Accomplishment in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State.
2. determine the relationship between Cooperation and Timeliness Output in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State.
3. ascertain the relationship between Cooperation and Employee Innovativeness in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were raised by the researcher to guide the study.

1. How does Cooperation relate with Task Accomplishment in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State?
2. In what ways does Cooperation relate with Timeliness Output in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State?
3. What is the relationship between Cooperation and Employee Innovativeness in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State?



## Hypotheses

This study formulated the following research hypotheses to guide the research work

- H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Cooperation and Task Accomplishment in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State.
- H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Cooperation and Timeliness Output in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State.
- H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Cooperation and Employee Innovativeness in Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Conceptual Review

#### Cooperation

Employee and management Cooperation is a situation where employees and management work together to accomplish a particular goal or Task, meaning that there must be a mutual acceptable means of communication to both parties (Key, 2010). According to Koontz and O'Donnell (2016) Cooperation is a strategy of a continuous process of enhancing mutual trust and respect through sharing of information, interaction, consultation and negotiation.

Cooperation is a scheme or arrangement by an organization that enhances workers participation process on matters concerning the employees not covered initially by collective bargaining agreements. Where Cooperation to enhance the relationship between employees and management is established there will be mutual trust and respect for both parties. According to Mac-Odo (2016) also there will be mutual sharing of ideas between employees and the management. When employees and management cooperate or come together to solve a common problem it will lead to achieving the organizational goal. The achieved goal is based on the existence of the Cooperation between employees and management. Cooperation also promotes workers being allowed to participate in the process of making decisions that was not originally included in the bargaining agreement between management and employees contained in the conditions of service.

McCrimmon (2007) opined that, the Cooperation between employees and management need to be enshrined in the Organizational Culture. The importance of Cooperation between management and employees should be viewed as the greatest asset or resources of an organization. Therefore, each individual employee through this means has the ability to change and improve the deplorable situation of the organization (Edward, 2019). It is noted that not only the organizations have good ideas to solve a problem. Employees can also contribute ideas that may help solve the problem challenging the corporate existence of the organization (Ahina, 2018). When both the employees and management meet through any available and acceptable medium, they brainstorm on ideas that will help proffer solutions for a better performance of the business organization (Likert, 2017).

According to Weinbery (2018), Cooperation between employees and management is aimed to solve a common problem of common interest based on the challenges facing both the employees and the management at the same time and period. It is basically labour and management-related common issues concerning the organization's employees and other numerous issues within the business environment (Rogers, 2015).

Bath (2013) argued that employees and management Cooperation should be seen as an interaction in which the objective is to improve the well-being of both parties (employees and

management) (Milliman, 2013). The degree to which organizations should emphasize the importance of Cooperation among employees of Teamwork is an age-long contemporary issues (Rogers, 2015).

#### Indicators of Cooperation

##### **Productivity**

According to Foss and Ellefson (2012), over production can sometimes lead to organizational failure in terms of firm's growth, some scholars also believe that a report of profit declaration is just a mere result and not a real measurement of good performance credited to the organization. The, productivity in this contest proves that the efficiency, effectiveness, performance process and policies are strictly maintained by the company (Agwu, 2015). Therefore, profit and policies strictly achieved and maintained by the company do not mean the organization performed well. Good performance can only be reported by the company that produces the expected quality and quantity of product and services which is productivity (Okwandu, 2006). What is expected to be reported is productivity and not profit so that any defect or reject appearing during the production process can be corrected. Therefore, a favorable productivity report produces corresponding profit report. At this point, Drucker (2013) identified or found out the difference between efficiency and effectiveness. He referred efficiency as "doing things right, while effectiveness was defined as doing the right things.

In Drucker's (2013) definition, opined that efficiency recorded in all organization shows that the organization achieved the desired Output by using the minimum Input level. At the same time, Achabal (2014) stated that efficiency is combines with the element like minimum cost of resources used in producing the Output. Efficiency is also regarded as when resources are optimally used in producing products and or services. Again Chan, (2013) said that efficiency is when resources are utilized economically to achieve a desired result. That is (labour, Machine, man or capacity and energy). He also stated that when resources are used to their fullest potentials, the organization will save money and time. It also means that the organization performed very well. The ratio to measure efficiency is to identify what is to be consumed (e.g.), what quantity of sand is expected to be used and what quantity of sand was actually used (Parastoo et al., 2012). On the other hand, the ratio here is between what was actually produced and the expected product and services actually produced. Similarly, the amount of resources used and the Output to be produced ought to be predicted. Efficiency can also be described as when the resources are maximally utilized as customers are equally satisfied. An ideal system of an organization is measured when the time of accomplishing a Task is measured over the total time allotted (Parastoo et al., 2012). Efficiency can also be measured as the quality of material or resources used to produce the quantity of the products. Effectiveness is measured by the firm that possesses the ability to rearrange its objectives and goals and arrange how to achieve the set goal (Keh et al., 2016).

Simply put, organizations that consider itself effective is only when they achieve the objective of the company. The most notable among them is when they deliver the value of product and services customers of the organization expected (Tangen, 2015). Customers of organizations are said to be satisfied when there are quality/quantity effective product and timely service delivery. Effectiveness is not easily defined in this context but it is the relationship between Input and Output in an organization (Agwu, 2015).

### **Task Accomplishment**

A Task is a component part of the total job that needs to be accomplished or completed within a defined stated period of time. It is a small unit of work that has deadline for completion towards achieving the desired goals. It is a piece of work in segments that are split into different components of a particular project. A Task can be split into smaller segments and must have a starting and ending time and date of completion (Dobble, 2013). Once a Task is assigned to an employee, it is expected to be executed. For a Task to be completed, the components of other Tasks must be completed as well. The coordination of other Tasks assigned to employees must also be required. As employees are coordinated to interact with each other to execute a Task, it helps to integrate the time, energy, effort, ability, and resources of individuals to achieve a common goal. Employee co-ordination in the process of Task Accomplishment involves and binds workers together into one entity to complete a larger Task (Agwu, 2015). Aydin and Ceylan (2019) insist that to succeed in carrying out a Task by a competent employee, it is important that those employees assigned to perform the Task understand what they are expected to achieve. This ranges from profitability, organizational growth, survival of the organization, and expansion of the organization among others. The effort by the coordinated workers helps employee or subordinates establish a cordial relationship with each other before they can accomplish the objectives of the organization, including the employee personal interest. The assignment of Tasks to employees must be clear and understood by the assignees. Obasi (2012) noted that the principle of objective states that before one initiates or wants to carry out a project, the initiator must have knowledge of the nature of the project to be embarked upon, the objective of what to be achieved from the project (Task), must understand or have experience of the project to be embarked upon, and the project must be clearly stated. Furthermore, those assigned to perform the Task must be authorized (authority). The authority assigned to the employees must be a full one, so that the assignees will not be frustrated and eventually fail in performing the Task as expected by the organization. In addition, those of the employees that are to be selected to perform the Task must be properly chosen without any form of favoritism and sentiment. In fact, not all members of the organization's staff are mentally competent to be assigned with such a responsibility and not all are capable of carrying out such a Task. Those employees that are discovered not to possess the skills, knowledge and experience or poorly motivated are not meant to be assigned to carry out such Tasks (Darden & Babin, 2014).

### **Timeliness of Output**

According to AFREC (2018), Timeliness is defined as the measurement of how many times within a specified period a Task is achieved or performed. Timeliness of Output is determined by time and punctuality. It is also referred to as the speed in which products and services are produced and delivered within a specified given time (Angham, 2016). Timeliness is also referred to the speed in which a Task or product is completed within the deadline. According to (Bateman & Snell, 2014), missing deadlines might mean missing the opportunity to be productive. It also means that an organization is operating on stale data and making wrong decisions.

Effective time management of an organization affects positively the productivity of the organization and helps workers to cope with over burden, resolve conflicts and unnecessary pressures that may bedeviled the organization efficiently. According to Garvin (2010) effective time management allows employees to allocate specific time to each of the activities based on

their importance. Time management refers to making the best use of time as time is always limited.

Effective time however demands the application of a good sense of judgment and the organization in the lives of both the managers and employees. Time management may also affect period of high demand, the organization at this point, employ more number of employees, add more facilities and equipment. Companies may as well motivate or attract consumers by reducing the prices of their goods and services during low demand periods (Garvin, 2010). Companies may also like to use reservations or storing of goods in other to spread the demand evenly among the customers. When customers waiting time for delivery is too long, the company that produces such product may indeed make consumers to be unhappy. Service providers may even miss one or several sales opportunities or even worse, they can also loose a loyal customer despite an effective service recovery strategy.

### **Employee Innovativeness**

Employee Innovativeness can be defined as the engagement in innovative behaviors of employees of an organization which includes the behaviors that relate to innovation process i.e., idea generation, idea promotion or enhancement and idea realization with the aim of producing innovative products and services (Ramamoorthy et al., 2015). Innovation is connected to the implementation or adoption of feeling or novel ideas that can in turn be categorized as either technological or administrative creativity is said to be central when it comes to innovation process, many authors differentiate between creativity and innovation (Anderson et al., 2014; Miron et al., 2014). Innovation can as well be seen as when creativity is implemented successfully, and the innovativeness must be something that produces economic value, while creativity is something that has to do with idea leading to production of goods and services (Schoff & Bruce, 2014). It can also be argued that creativity requires innovativeness. No doubt, without innovation in the workplace, no business established can record any significant growth (Dede, 2019). The ones or responsibility to achieve innovativeness lies on the shoulders of the management of the organization.

It is the duty of the management of an organization to put in place a system that promotes collaborative innovation among its employees in the workplace to improve their skills and use the acquired skill to the advantage of their business activities (Edigin, 2019). Innovativeness in an organization can be achieved when the management promotes or encourages healthy working environment and cordial relationship with the workers. The management should ensure the workers always feel at home while discharging their responsibilities (Edward, 2019).

Furthermore, during brainstorming sessions, business managers of an organization should engage all their employees to share and opine their views about the activities of the business.

According to Davis, (1990) overall innovation is very important to business, especially in today hyper-competitive environment in this study. According to statistics, 84% of global business executives believe that innovation is paramount to their growth strategy.

## **Theoretical Framework**

### **McGregor's Theory X, Y and Z**

This study derived its foundation from theory X, Y and Z. It was propounded and developed by McGregor (1960) in which three ideas were formulated and developed. The first idea generally developed was that all the managers of any organization have the concept of human work motivation; McGregor also noted that a manager could explain (explicate) his/her behaviors



which is unimportant. This is because, a manager's behaviour and practice ultimately reflects to the fundamental assumptions about people - which McGregor (1960) referred to as cosmology (the source of origin and development of the universe).

McGregor developed the second idea saying that there are two diametrically (completely opposite) sides of people at work which McGregor called Theory X, Theory Y and Theory Z (Lawter et al., 2015). From the negative view points of human nature; Theory X of McGregor (2010) stated that the theory was based on assumption on different classes of workers who are naturally lazy and who also tries to avoid work always at the workplace. This class of workers are irresponsible and therefore require to be closely monitored before they can work as expected. The workers of this category have little or nothing to contribute intellectually on activities of the organization. Therefore, they need full and detailed instruction, guide and to reduce the work load on them to match with their limited abilities to enable them perform better (McGregor, 2015).

Categories of workers under theory z are believed by their managers as workers who are naturally driven to work without much supervision and motivation. It also means that workers are given autonomy to operate independently. The autonomy given to this class of workforce was considered based on the ability demonstrated by this category of workers on creativity and innovativeness. The concept of theory z encourages an organization to be well structured such that the personal goal of the employees and that of the overall goal of the organization are achieved at the same time leading to the increase in productivity and creativity. (Terbory (2015). Theory z categories of the employees have so much cordial relationship between employees and employers. A well-structured environment encourages workers to practice creativity as it strengthens or encourages motivation, discourages imitativeness, ingenuity and embraces self-direction (McGregor, 1960). The importance of theory z cannot be over emphasized because it encourages workers engagement by managements in decision making processes and reinforces positive relationship between employees and the management. Finally, the strategy of describing or using theories x, y and z to explain in detail the concept of employee Participative Management in decision making process is to enable organizations achieve its desired goals. This research based on the three theories finally recommends that managers of business organizations should adopt the management theories mentioned above as the available means of organizational survival.

### **Empirical Review**

Zia khan and Nouman (2014) also investigated the impact of Participative Management Style on Job Satisfaction of employees in Islamabad. Primary data were collected from 86 faculty members of the universities in Islamabad. The hypotheses were tested statistically and analyzed using regression method to generate study result. Findings revealed that Participative Management style generate a greater influence on job satisfaction of employees.

Samad and Shapour (2011) conducted a survey to explore the relationship between Participative Management and productivity of the employees in 2010 in Iran. The population includes the employees of Gachsaran Gas and Oil Company. Regarding the literature, questionnaire designed by the authors were used in order to examine Participative Management and productivity. The results of the research hypotheses test, showed that there is a meaningful relationship between Participative Management with its elements autonomy, Participative decision making, objective by group, organization shift, changing and participation in problem solving.

Lawan and Habu (2019) examined the attitude of management and perspective of employees towards Participative Management, the practice of Participative Management in existence and the impacts of Participative Management towards productivity. This research was necessitated due to the believe of some manages that punishment is a tool to control controversies that exist on the fear of losing control over employees and the impact of its perception on the productivity. Findings from the study confirmed that there is a significant relationship towards the attitude of management and employees on the adoption of Participative Management, there is also the relationship on the practice of Participative Management in the organization and there is significant impact of the practice of participatory management on the organization. The study concluded that employee participation has been found to have favorable effects on employee attitude, commitment and productivity even on the efficiency of the managers. Consequently, Participative Management is seen as an inevitable mechanism in organizations.

Jones (2018) examined the effect of employee relations on employee performance and organizational performance and at the same time identify various employee relations practices used by small organizations in Tanzania. The study adopted cross-sectional survey research design and used stratified random sampling technique to select the sample size of 387 respondents from selected small organizations in Tanzania. Data was collected using structured questionnaires and interviews and analyzed the data using descriptive statistics and Correlation analysis and the results was presented using tables. The findings of the study showed that small organizations in Tanzania are aware of the benefits of maintaining good employee relations and correct remedial actions taken to minimize poor employee relations in the organizations. The findings further indicate positive significant relationship between employee relations and employee performance as well as between employee relations and organization performance. Moreover, the findings reveal the use of unfair labour practices in small organizations in Tanzania. The study recommends that small organizations in Tanzania should focus more on implementing fair labour practices and building effective and sustainable employee relations that will ensure their growth and survival.

In a study carried out by Boakye (2015) on the impact of Participative Management on employee performance, using KomfoAnokye teaching Hospital and ejisu government Hospitals. Several measures of Team performance were analyzed including Team trust, recognition and rewards. The study used Correlational techniques to analyze the relationship between the two variables that is, Participative Management and organizational performance. The study found that Participative Management is positively and significantly related to organizational performance.

In another study, Manzoor et al., (2011) worked on the effect of Participative Management on employee performance, using the staff of higher education department of Khyber Pakhtoon Khawa, Eshawar Province of Pakistan. The study which was designed as descriptive survey design found that positive and significant relationship exist between Participative Management and employee performance.

In a study undertaken by Jones et al., (2017) on the effect of Team building in the organization using a descriptive survey of 579 mining workers, it was found that employees working as a Team can produce more Output compared to individual effort. Also, in another study carried out by Ingram (2010) on linking Participative Management with performance and with a descriptive survey analysis on 1,245 employees of commercial Banks. It was found that a good manager is one who assigns responsibilities to his/her employees in form of group or Team in order to achieve maximum Output from the employees. In another study carried out by Conti & Kleiner

(2013) on how to improve Participative Management in an organization using descriptive survey on 284 workers of Airline Company, it was found that Teams offer greater participation, eliminates challenges and ill-feelings leading to Accomplishment of Task. It was concluded that organizations with Team Cohesion will attract and retain the best people as employees in an organization.

In a related development Walid and Zubair (2016) carried out a study on impact of effective Participative Management on employee performance using an entertainment company in Kuala Lumpur capital of Malaysia as the study area. The study adopted descriptive and exploratory research design. The result showed that efficient communication, level of trust, leadership and accountability, has positive and significant impact on employee performance while intrapersonal skills and cohesiveness has no influence on employee performance.

Ooko (2013) did a study on impact of Participative Management on the achievement of targets in organizations in Kenya, using SOS children of the village, Eldoret was the study area. The study adopted descriptive research design. The study found that job satisfaction will be achieved through recognition and reward of achievement, promotions, good working environments and fair rewards and remunerations. This was conducted to investigate the impact on Team performance if it was to be executed correctly. It was concluded that there was no effective Participative Management at SOS despite employees being aware of how much they can achieve by working together in Teams. Also, Soeters (2016) did a study on promotion practice of Teams in an organization and found that there is positive relationship between promotion practice for Teams and perceived performance of employees.

## METHODOLOGY

The cross-sectional research design used in this study is suitable because the respondents were not under the control of the researcher to respond to the item statements contained in the questionnaire or the instruments. The Population of the study comprise all the categories of individual employees of Food and Beverages Manufacturing firms in Rivers State. According to the record available and obtained from the (industry) report, (2021) indicates that there are seven (7) operational Food and Beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State. These firms have their branches in Port Harcourt. However, the study conducted research on 1200 respondents constituting lower, middle and top employees of the seven operational Food and Beverages firms. The 1200 respondents being the accessible population of the study were obtained from the human resource department of each of the Food and Beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State using purposive or convenience sampling technique. The study adopted Taro Yamane's (1967) sampling techniques as it helps in determining the sample size of 300 from the huge population of 1200 respondents of the entire employees and management staff of the seven Food and Beverages manufacturing companies that were chosen as the sample size for the study.

In addition, Bowley (1964) technique was applied for the purposes of adequate distribution of the questionnaire to the individual Food and Beverages Firms of the study.

Below shows the individual population size of each Food of Beverages manufacturing Firms in Rivers State and Bowley's (1964) technique:

(a) Taro Yamane's formula (1967) and (b) Bowley's (1964) technique.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(2)^2} \frac{N}{1+N(0.05)^2} \text{ And } \frac{nNh}{N}$$

Taro Yamame's (1967) sample and sampling formular is as follows;

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

n = Sample size  
e = Level of significance or degree of error expected  
N = Population of the study  
I = constant

While the Bowley's (1964) technique for the calculation of the sample size in proportion to each firm of Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State.

$$nh = \frac{nNh}{N}$$

Where nh = individual sample size (for each firm)  
Nh = The number of respondent in each Food and Beverages Firms in Rivers State  
n = Total sample size  
N = The accessible population size

Hence to compute the sample size for the distribution using Bowley's (1964) formula see appendix 3 & 4 for detailed computation using Taro Yamane's sampling technique and Bowley's (1964) technique.

=(C-way Nig. Ltd)

Thus, in this case, the sample size is 300 respondents.

The nature of data collection was primary data collection. The primary source provided direct or first-hand evidence about the objective of the research. This study conducted tentative pilot study to ascertain the internal consistency of the reliability of the instrument. The questionnaire were partially issued to fifteen 15 employees of Food and Beverages firms in the industry to obtain vital information on how the employees are involved in Participative management of Food and Beverages firms of their organizations. The CRONBACH ALPHA reliability coeficient was used to test for the reliability, and the study used SPSS version 23.0 for the computation of the test.

**Table 1: Cronbach Alpha Test's Result on Reliability of Instrument**

N/s	Dimension/scale	Number of items	Alpha value	Remarks
1	Team Cohesion	5	0.861	Accepted
2	Task Accomplishment	5	0.808	Accepted
3	Timeliness Output	5	0.779	Accepted
4	Timeliness Output	5	0.857	Accepted
	Total	20		

Source: Field study (2024)

In the administration of the instrument two graduates were engaged to distribute the questionnaire to the respondents with attached written letter as a guide to the respondents on how the questionnaires were filled. The essence of engaging graduate assistants was because they were familiar with the environment and the staff of the firm in which the instrument or questionnaire were distributed. The questionnaires were retrieved within two-weeks after filling the document.

The descriptive statistical data analysis which consists of frequencies, percentages represented on a designed table containing Pie and Bar Charts were used to analyse the socio-demographic



characteristics of the respondents, and research questions. Percentage representation of the analysis was used to analyze the responses from the While the multiple regressions or inferential analysis was used to test the hypothesis.

## RESULTS, DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

### Demographic (Descriptive) Data Analysis

**Table 2: Gender Distribution of Respondents**

Gender	Response Rates	Percentage (%)
Male	150	51.4
Female	142	48.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Source: Research data (2024)

The table above indicates the percentage rate of the gender. The result shows that 150 were male while the female were 142 and this implies that the male recorded high percentage rate of respondents participated.

**Table 3: Age of the Respondents**

Age	Response Rates	Percentage (%)
20-30yrs	40	13.7
31-40yrs	65	22.3
41-50yrs	140	47.9
Above 50yrs	47	16.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Source: Research data (2024)

From Table 3, 40 (13.7%) were between 20-30 years, 65 (22.3%) were between 31-40 years while 140 (47.9%) were between 41-50 years and only 47 (16.1%) were above 50 years. With this result, it shows that majority that responded to the questionnaire were between 41-50 years.

**Table 4 Educational Qualification**

Educational Qualification	Response Rates	Percentage (%)
O' Level	35	12.0
OND/NCE	40	13.7
DEGREE/HND	134	45.9
MSC/MBA	48	16.4
PhD/DBA	35	12.0
	<b>292</b>	<b>100%</b>

From table 4, 35 (12.0) were O'level certificated holders, 40 (13.7) were holders of OND/NCE while 134 (45.9) were DEGREE/HND holders, 48 (16.4) were MSC/MBA degree certificate holders and only 35 (12.0) were PhD/DBA degree holders. At this point the result shows that the percentages were Degree/HND educational qualifications.

**Table 5: Years of Experience in the Firm**

Years of experience	Response rate	Percentage
0-5years	54	18.5
6-10years	145	49.7
11-15years	30	10.3
16-20years	24	8.2
21-30years	18	6.7
Above 31years	21	7.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Research Data (2024)**

Table 5 result shows that the respondents years of experience is 54 (18.5%) between 0-5years, 145 (49.7%) were between 5-10years. 30 (10.3%) were between 11-15years while 16-20years were showed 24 (8.2%), 18 (6.7%) indicated 21-30years and above 31years showed (7.2%)

**Table 6: Categories of Employees**

Categories	Response rate	Percentage
Low categories	130	44.5
Middle categories	110	37.7
Top categories	52	17.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source: Research Data (2024)**

The result on table 6 shows that 130 (44.5%) were low categories of the employees 110 (37.7%) were middle categories of the employees while 52 (17.8%) were top categories of employees. The result clearly shows that majority of were low categories of employees.

**Table 7: To what extent do you participate in decision making to increase productivity of Food and Beverages of your firm?**

Level of extent	Response Rate	Percentage %
High extent	45	15.4
Very high extent	35	12.0
Moderate extent	40	13.7
Low extent	125	42.8
Very low extent	47	16.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source: Research Data (2024)**

Result on table 7 indicates that the extent to which employees participate in decision making to increase the level of productivity of Food & Beverages of their firms were 45 (15.4%) shows a high extent, 35 (12.0%) show very high extent. 40 (13.7%) indicated moderate extent. 125 (42.8%) also showed low extent and finally 47 (16.1%) indicated very low extent. Thus, the result shows that majority of respondents indicated low extent to which employees participate in decision to increase the level of productivity of their Food and Beverages firms.

**Table 8: Number of years in operation of your organization**

Years of operation	Response Rate	Percentage %
0-10yrs	180	61.6
11-20yrs	60	20.5
21-30yrs	37	12.7
31 and above	15	5.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source Excel Output (2024)**

The above table clearly shows the percentage of years in operation of the employees. As a result of this, 180 (61.6%) were between 0-10 years, 11-20 years were 60 (20.5%), 37 (12.7%) were between 21-30 years while 31 years and above were 15 (5.1%) thus, the majority who responded to the questionnaire were 61.6%.

**Table 9: Food and Beverages Firm Patronised Most**

S/N	Firms	Response Rate	Percentage (%)
1.	C-Way Nig Ltd	25	8.6
2.	Nig Bottling Co. Ltd	60	20.5
3.	Dufil prima Food Plc	40	13.7
4.	Lassien Bottling Co. Ltd	42	14.4
5.	Int. L Breweries Ltd	60	20.5
6.	7up Bottling Co. Ltd	40	13.7
7.	Genesis Food	25	8.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100%</b>

In reference to the Food and Beverages firms the result from the analysis on table 4.8 indicates that 25 (8.6%) shows C-way Nig Ltd; 60 (20.5%) for Nig. Bottling Co. Ltd; 40 respondents were referred to Dufil (13.7%). Further 25 (8.6%) indicated Genesis Food Lassien bottling Co. Ltd shows 42 (14.4%) patronized the firm while 7up recorded 40 (13.7%) respondents.

**Table 10 Analyses of items on Cooperation's**

S/N	Items	SA 5	A 4	D 3	SD 2	N 1	NO	TS	MEAN	STD
11	I feel cooperative within the organization that helps me foster effective service delivery	140	60	50	30	12	292			
		700	240	150	60	12		1162	4.0	
12	My firm engaged me to participate in decision making process	70	130	40	35	17	292			
		350	520	120	70	17		1077	3.7	
13	My company always write me for Brain storming among employees	90	110	41	37	14	292			
		450	440	13	108	14		1135	3.9	
14.	Employees work faster when	80	115	45	40	12	292			

	they work in cooperatively	400	460	135	80	12	1087	3.7
15	I always participate	115	58	49	48	22	292	
	In group which helps to enhance	575	232	147	96	22	1072	3.7

**Source: SPSS output (2021)**

Frequency table indicating the percentage rates of Respondents to items on Cooperation

**Table 11: I feel cooperative within the organization that helps foster effective service delivery**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	140	48.0
Agree	60	20.5
Disagree	50	17.1
Strongly disagree	30	10.3
Neutral	12	4.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 11 shows 48.0% as the highest response rate which are those who strongly agreed that they feel Cooperation within the organization that helps foster effective service delivery to employees of the organization

**Table 12: My firm engaged me to participate in decision making process of the company**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	70	24.0
Agree	130	44.5
Disagree	40	13.7
Strongly disagree	35	12.0
Natural	17	5.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

From table 12, 44.5% shows the highest response of these who agreed that their firms engage them to participate in decision making process of the company.

**Table 13: My Company always invites me for brain storming among employees**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	90	30.8
Agree	110	37.7
Disagree	41	14.0
Strongly disagree	37	12.7
Natural	14	4.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 13 indicates 30.8% as the lightest response of those who agreed that their firms engage them to participate in decision making process of the company.



**Table 14: Employees of my firm work faster when they collaboratively work together**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	80	27.4
Agree	115	39.4
Disagree	45	15.4
Strongly disagree	40	13.7
Neutral	12	4.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table on 14 shows 39.4% of the highest response rate of respondents who agreed that employee of their firm work faster when they collaboratively work together.

The study analyses items on Cooperation based on 292 copies of questionnaire retrieved as indicated on tables 4.10 to 4.13. The results show that the majority of the respondents agreed with high percentage rates. At this point, the results display above sincerely shows that all the item statement fell above 3.0 criterion mean and the standard deviations are equal to or greater than 1.96 as indicated on table 4.23 to 4.27. Hence the study accepted the response rates that employee actually willing to cooperate with management of their firms if they are so encourage. However, from the analysis of this study, it seems that the management of Food and Beverage firms are not willing to give the necessary encouragement based on Cooperation of management of the firms which will enhance increase in the level of productivity of the industry.

**Table 15: Analyses of items of Task Accomplishment**

S/N	Items	SA 5	A 4	D 3	SD 2	N 1	NO	TS	MEAN	STD
16	My firm always complete tasks effectively through collaboration	20 100	22 88	80 240	140 280	30 30	292	738	2.5	
17	My company always accomplish tasks as Result of coordination	19 95	28 112	85 255	130 260	30 30	292	762	2.6	
18	My organization complete task on time when we work together as a Team	20 100	29 116	86 258	127 254	30 30	292	750	2.6	
19	My firm produce quantity and qualitative products as we work as a Team	12 60	18 72	140 420	100 200	22 22	292	774	2.7	
20	I am motivated to accomplish tasks assigned to me	13 65	20 80	180 540	60 120	19 19	292	824	2.8	

**Source SPSS output (2021)**

Frequency table showing the percentage rates of Responses to items on Task Accomplishment

**Table 16: My firm always complete tasks effectively through collaboration**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	20	6.8
Agree	22	7.5
Disagree	80	27.4
Strongly disagree	140	47.9
Neutral	30	10.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The result on table 16 shows that 47.9% of the respondents strongly disagreed implying that their firm do not always complete tasks affectivity through collaboration.

**Table 17: My Company always accomplishes tasks as a result of coordination**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	19	6.5
Agree	28	9.6
Disagree	85	29.1
Strongly disagree	130	44.5
Neutral	30	10.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

In respect to the result on table 17, 44.5% of the respondents being the lightest rate of the responses strongly disagreed that their company always accomplish takes as a result of coordination. The few employees who agreed might be some top management levels who are not physically and directly involved in the production of quality and quantity products of the organization.

**Table 18: My organization complete tasks on time when we work together as a Team**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	20	6.8
Agree	29	10.0
Disagree	86	29.5
Strongly disagree	127	43.5
Neutral	30	10.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The result in table 18 represents 43.5% of respondents which also is the highest respondents who strongly disagreed that their organization completes tasks on time.

**Table 19: My firms produce required quantity and quality products as a Team**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	12	4.1
Agree	18	6.2
Disagree	140	48.0
Strongly disagree	100	34.2
Neutral	22	7.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table 19 as indicated above shows that the highest rate that responded to the items statement were 140 representing 48.0% of the respondents who disagreed that their firms produce required and quality products as a Team.

**Table 20: I am motivated to accomplish tasks assigned to me**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	13	4.5
Agree	20	6.8
Disagree	180	61.6
Strongly disagree	60	20.5
Neutral	19	6.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 20 shows that 61.6% of the respondents disagreed that they were motivated to accomplish tasks assigned to them.

The study engaged in the analysis items on Task Accomplishments based on 292 copies of questionnaire retrieved as shown on table 4.29 to 4.33. From the result, it shows that majority of the respondents disagreed with high percentage rate. Furthermore, univariate analysis was performed on Task Accomplishment. Majority of the respondents also do not agree that their employees are motivated to accomplish tasks assigned to them by the organization. Hence from the above results, it is quite obvious that all the items fall below 3.0 criterion mean and the standard  $\leq 1.96$ . Therefore the study accepted the response rates from item 16-20 which show that majority of employees are not motivated by their firms.

**Table 21 Analysis of items of Timelines output**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	N	NO	TS	MEAN	STD
		5	4	3	2	1				
21	My firm accompanies Task through Team collision	15 75	17 68	150 450	70 140	40 40	292	773	2.6	
22	My firm organization training Programme to enhance timeliness out put	17 85	19 76	160 480	76 152	20 20	292	813	2.8	
23	My firm recognize collaborative Team work to enhance timelines and effective productivity	6 30	8 32	190 570	83 166	5 5	292	803	2.8	
24	I intend to work with my company because it delivers and complete its task timely	12 60	18 72	180 540	50 100	32 32	292	804	2.8	
25	I am emotionally attached to my firm due to its timelines	13 65	17 68	185 555	60 120	17 17	292	825	2.8	

**Source: SPSS Output (2021)**

Frequency table showing the percentage rates of responses to items or timelines output

**Table 22: My firm accomplish to Task through Team Cohesion**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	15	5.1
Agree	17	5.8
Disagree	150	51.4

Strongly disagree	70	24.0
Neutral	40	13.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 22 Indicates that 51.4% of the respondent disagreed that their firms accomplish tasks through Team collision.

**Table 23: My firm organization training Programme to enhance Timeliness Output**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	17	5.8
Agree	19	6.5
Disagree	160	54.8
Strongly disagree	76	26.0
Neutral	20	6.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 23 results indicated that 54.8% of the respondents scored the lightest points who do not agree that their firms organizes training programme to enhance Timely Output.

**Table 24: My firm recognizes collaborative Team Work to enhance timelines and effective productivity**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	6	2.1
Agree	8	2.7
Disagree	190	65.1
Strongly disagree	83	28.4
Neutral	5	1.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The result obtained from table 24 showed that 65.1% of the total respondents disagreed that their firm recognizes collaborative Team work to enhance Timeliness and effective productivity.

**Table 25: I intend to work with my company because it delivers and complete its task timely.**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	12	4.1
Agree	18	6.2
Disagree	180	61.6
Strongly disagree	50	17.1
Neutral	32	11.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

From the result obtained in table 25 shows 61.6% of the respondents rate disagreed that they intend to work with their company because it delivers and complete its task Timely.

**Table 26: I am emotionally attached to my firm due to it Timeliness Output**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
-------	-----------	---------





Strongly agree	13	4.5
Agree	17	5.8
Disagree	185	63.4
Strongly disagree	60	20.5
Neutral	17	5.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The result of the lightest respondent rate on table 26 shows that 63.4% disagreed also that they are emotionally attached to their firms due to its testiness output.

The study at this stage conducted detailed analysis out of the responses obtained from the employees based Timeliness Output. The result gathered on item statements from number 21 to 25 clearly revealed that majority respondents disagreed which also showed that they do not produce product/output or accomplish task timely due to several factors discussed in this study earlier. Based on this fact, from the above results, all the items fall below 3.00 criterions mean when the standard deviations is  $\leq 1.96$ . As a result the study accepted the response rates meaning that employees of Food & Beverages firms in Rivers State are not adequately committed to Timeliness Output of their Organizations.

**Table 27 Analysis of items of Timelines output**

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	N	NO	TS	MEAN	STD
		5	4	3	2	1				
26	I am more creative when I work as a Team member	17 85	30 120	50 150	160 320	35 35	292	710	2.4	
27	My Company employ workers who are ready to work as a Team for innovation to develop the firm	6 30	15 60	190 570	70 140	11 11	292	811	2.8	
28	I am valued by my company because I came up with innovative ideas	13 65	20 80	60 180	170 340	29 29	292	694	2.4	
29	My firm invest largely on training because of employ perfect creativity	12 60	15 60	90 270	150 300	25 25	292	715	2.4	
30	My firm invest Readily on group research and development	14 70	13 52	70 210	180 360	15 15	292	707	2.4	

**Source: SPSS Output (2021)**

Frequency table showing the respondent rates of responses to items on Employee Innovativeness

**Table 28: I am more creative when I work as a term number**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
-------	-----------	---------

Strongly agree	17	5.8
Agree	30	10.3
Disagree	50	17.1
Strongly disagree	160	54.8
Neutral	35	12.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

From the result obtained above on table 28, 54.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed that they are more creative when they work as Team members.

**Table 29: My Company Employ workers who ready to work as a Team for innovative idea to develop the firm**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	6	2.1
Agree	15	5.1
Disagree	190	65.1
Strongly disagree	70	24.0
Neutral	11	3.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 29 indicates that 65.1% of the respondents which is the highest response rate disagreed that their company employ workers who are ready to work as a Team for innovation to development their Team.

**Table 30: I am valued by my company because I came up with innovative ideas to development my firm**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	13	4.5
Agree	20	6.8
Disagree	60	20.5
Strongly disagree	170	58.2
Neutral	29	9.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The result obtained from table 30 from the respondents shows that 58.2% responded that they are not valued by their companies because they came up with innovative ideas to develop their firms.

**Table 31: My firm invests largely on training due to the employee's perfect creativity**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	12	4.1
Agree	15	5.1
Disagree	90	30.8
Strongly disagree	150	51.4
Neutral	25	8.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The result on table 4.30 shows 51.4% strongly disagreed that their firms invest largely on training due to employee's perfect creativity.

**Table 32: My firm invests heavily on group and development**

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	14	4.8
Agree	13	4.5
Disagree	70	24.0
Strongly disagree	180	61.6
Neutral	15	5.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The result of descriptive statist veal data analysis on table 32 indicates that 61.6% of the respondent rate strongly disagreed that their firm invest- heavily on group and development.

From table 4.26 to 4.31 respondents strongly agreed. This indicates that majority of the employees do not engage in employee innovative due to lack of job satisfaction and other basic incentives from the management of their firms.

From the above result, it is clear that all the items fall below 3.00 criterion mean, while the standard deviations are  $\leq 1.96$ . Based on this, the study accepted the response rates from items 26 to 30 that majority of employees are not evolved in “Employee Innovativeness in the business organization of Food & Beverages firms”.

### Hypotheses Testing (Bivariate Analyses)

#### Test of Hypothesis (1)

Considering Hypothesis 1 the question was raised to know the relationship between Cooperation and Task Accomplishment in Food and Beverages Manufacturing firms in Rivers State?

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between collaboration and Task Accomplishment in Food and Beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

**Table 33: Correlations between Cooperation and Timeliness Output**

Correlation	Cooperation	Timeliness Output
Spearman's rho Team Cohesion Correlation coefficient	1.000	..855**
Sig (2-tailed)		
N	292	292
Timeliness Output Correlation coefficient	.855**	1.000
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	292	292

**\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

The result obtained on table 33 shows that there is a relationship between Cooperation and Timeliness Output in Food and Beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State. The Correlation occurred at 0.855. The P-value is less than 0.05 level of significance  $P(0.000) < 0.05$

#### Test of Hypothesis (2)

The test of hypothesis 2 provided answer to the research question eight on what ways does Cooperation relates with timelines output in Food and Beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State?

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Cooperation and Timeliness Output in Food and Beverages firms in Rivers State.

**Table 34: Correlation between Cooperation and Timeliness Output**

Correlation		Cooperation	Employee Innovativeness
Spearman's rho Team Cohesion Correlation coefficient		1.000	.818**
	Sig (2-tailed)		.000
	N	292	292
Timeliness Output Correlation coefficient		.818**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	292	292

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The result obtained from table 34. The Correlationship between Cooperation and Timeliness Output occurred at 0.818 while the p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance:  $P(0.000) < 0.05$  Based on this result, the null Hypothesis was rejected because the probability value was less than 0.05 level of significance.

### Test of Hypothesis (3)

The hypothesis 3 statement was made to answer research question 3 in chapter one. In what ways does Cooperation relates with Employee Innovativeness in Food and Beverages manufacturing firms in Nigeria?

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Cooperation and employee innovativeness in Food and Beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

**Table 35: Correlation between Cooperation and Employee Innovativeness**

Correlation		Cooperation	Employee Innovativeness
Spearman's rho Team Cohesion Correlation coefficient		1.000	.831**
	Sig (2-tailed)		.000
	N	292	292
Employee Innovativeness Correlation coefficient		.831**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	292	292

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The result shown on table 35. Indicates that relationship exists between Cooperation and Employee Innovativeness which occurred at 0.831. The result also reveals that p-value is less than 0.05 level of significance  $P(0.000) < 0.05$ . The null hypothesis was therefore rejected while the study claimed that there is significant relationship between Cooperation and emotive innovation in Food and Beverages Manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

**Table 36: Summary of Empirical Results from Tested Hypotheses**

Statement of Results	P-value	Level relationship	Decision
<b>hypotheses</b>			
CO/TA	0.855	P(0.000)<0.05	Very strong Relationship
CO/TO	0.818	P(0.000)<0.05	Very strong Relationship
CO/EI	0.831	P(0.000)<0.05	Very strong Relationship

#### Source: Research Findings (2021)

Where:

CO	=	Cooperation
TA	=	Task Accomplishment
TO	=	Timeliness Output
EI	=	Employee Innovativeness

### Discussion of Findings

#### Significant Relationship between Cooperation and Task Accomplishment

The study expected that Cooperation will develop Task Accomplishment. Based on the tested hypothesis (1), the study revealed that Cooperation relates with Task Accomplishment. The finding of this study is backed up by the work of (Key, 2010), Employee and management work together and establish a good and cordial relationship to achieve the desired goal that will be of a common interest of both the organization and the employees. It is a strategy that enhances Participative management as a paradigm to improve the level of productivity of the organization. In the work of (Edward, 2019) it is only when employees and employers come together, shares views of common interest and contribute ideas that could help solve problems challenging the corporate existence of the organization. (Alina, 2018) stated that when both employees and management meet through any acceptable medium, they brain storm on ideas that will proffer solutions for better performance of the business organization.

With the above explanation based on the findings of the study conducted, the level of the relationship between Cooperation and Task Accomplishment will be high if Food and Beverages manufacturing firms will promote Participative management through Cooperation to enhance Task Accomplishment in the company.

#### Significant Relationship between Cooperation and Timeliness Output

This study expected Cooperation to improve Timeliness Output. The result of the test of hypothesis 2 supported the findings derived in this study which stated that there is significant relationship between Cooperation and Timeliness Output. The research work of (Bateman, 2010) revealed this finding. Indeed Dincer (2018) recommended that firms should established cordial relationship with their employees to enhance timely delivery of product and services to their customers leading to increase in revenue and profitability of the organization. When a firm and the union of the employees establish cordial relationship with each other both parties will trust each other to increase job performance in the company. Thus, with the result of this work it is quite clear cooperation will improve Timeliness Output in Food and Beverages Manufacturing Firms in Rivers State.

#### Significant Relationship between Cooperation and Employee Innovativeness

It is the expectation of this study that cooperation will improve Employee Innovativeness as it was supported in the outcome of the test conducted on hypothesis 3. The result obtained from the hypothesis shows a significant relationship between Cooperation and Employee Innovativeness. This assertion was supported by the work carried out by Barlet (2011) found that the outcome of



continuous Cooperation between Employees and Management will proffer solutions of common interest of both parties through feedback and innovative ideas. Cooperation between Employees and the organization will also encourage workers to be engaged on participative management in decision making process which could also cover collective bargaining agreement such as the conditions of service of the organization. According to Jacqueline (2014) argued that Cooperation offer Union leaders to share common ideas with the management to address certain critical issues that leads to employee productivity. This implies that, without Cooperation between employees and employers, the organization will be starved with information on what the Employees need to increase productivity and subsequently leading to increase in high wages and salaries, other benefits including increase on job security and job satisfaction.

This also shows that organizations that promote the Cooperation between them and their workers will develop Employee Innovativeness and Creativity. Workers will be given the opportunity through Cooperation to proffer ideas that enhances solutions to the challenges of Food and Beverages Manufacturing Firms in Rivers State.

### Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between cooperation and employee productivity within food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. The findings indicate that participative management practices, characterized by employee involvement in decision-making processes, play a crucial role in enhancing employee productivity. However, the current state of non-participative management in these firms has led to significant challenges, including low employee morale, job dissatisfaction, and a lack of trust between employees and management. These issues have adversely affected productivity, highlighting the need for a shift towards more inclusive and cooperative management practices.

The empirical analysis demonstrated a strong positive relationship between cooperation and various aspects of employee productivity, including task accomplishment, timeliness of output, and employee innovativeness. The data revealed that firms with higher levels of cooperation and participative management experienced better task completion rates, timely delivery of products and services, and greater innovation among employees. These findings are supported by established theories and previous research, underscoring the importance of creating a collaborative work environment to foster productivity and growth.

Furthermore, the study highlighted several specific problems facing food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State, such as inadequate training programs, poor communication systems, and centralized power structures. Addressing these issues requires a comprehensive approach that includes improving employee engagement, providing better training opportunities, and fostering a culture of open communication and trust. By doing so, firms can enhance their competitiveness and contribute more effectively to the economic development of the region.

In conclusion, the findings of this study provide valuable insights for food and beverages manufacturing firms in Rivers State and beyond. To improve productivity, these firms must adopt participative management practices that foster cooperation, trust, and employee involvement in decision-making processes. By addressing the identified challenges and leveraging the strengths of a cooperative work environment, these firms can achieve higher levels of productivity, innovation, and overall organizational performance. The study's recommendations offer a roadmap for managers and policymakers to enhance the effectiveness of their workforce and contribute to the sustainable growth of the food and beverages sector.

### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations were made based on the results, the findings and the various conclusions drawn from the study, it therefore became imperative to recommend as stated below;

1. Management of Food and Beverages firms should encourage Cooperation between employees and the Management as a strategy to increase Timeliness Output in the industry.
2. Management should endeavor to retain employees through Team Cohesion by providing them with the necessary motivation packages for effective and efficient Task Accomplishment in the firms.
3. Management of the firms should establish cordial relationship between employees union for mutual joint bargaining agreement and the company to enhance employee innovativeness.

## REFERENCES

- Adair, J. (2018). *The action-centrered leader. The industrial society*. Pearson Educational Press.
- AFREC. (2018). Firm resources and the theory of competitive advantage. *Journal of Firm Resources*, 99(2), 78-90.
- Agwu, F. (2015). Physical architecture and customer patronage of banks in Nigeria: An empirical study. *African Journal of Marketing*, 6(8), 110-120.
- Ahiauze, Q., &Asawo, T. (2016). *Research methodology in the behavioral sciences*. Longman Publishers.
- Anderson, S. L., Kulp, C. A., Holt, L. E., &Carr, T. H. (2014). More on the fragility of performance: Choking under pressure in mathematical problem solving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 133(9), 584-600.
- Angham, G. (2016). Choking under pressure: Self-consciousness and paradoxical effects of incentives on skillful performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(2), 610–620.
- Armstrong, M. (1995). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Aydin, B., &Ceylan, A. (2019). The effect of spiritual leadership on organizational learning capacity. *African Journal of Business Management*, 3(5), 184-202.
- Barlet, P. (2011). Assessing the dynamic capabilities view: Spare change, everyone? *Strategic Organization Journal*, 7(2), 75–90.
- Bate, A. N., & Holton, W. (2010). Distraction-conflict theory: Progress and problems. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Journal*, 19(8), 21-40.
- Bateman, T. O., & Snell, P. (2014). Paradoxical effects of supportive audiences on performance under pressure: The home field disadvantage in sports championships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(8), 85–93.
- Benrazavi, S. R., &Silang, A. D. (2013). Employees' job satisfaction and its influence on willingness to work in Teams. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 14(1), 127-140.
- Bhat, Z. H. (2013). Impact of training on employee performance: A study of retail banking sectors in India. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 3(6), 292-299.
- Boakye, D. (2015). Occupational stress, organizational commitment and ill-health of employees at a higher education institution in South Africa *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31(1), 47-54.

- Chan, A. E. (2013). Performance measurement in a supply chain. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 21(9), 534-548.
- Conti, P., & Kleiner, M. (2013). Effects of audience status, evaluation, and time of action on performance with hidden-word problems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27(1), 74-85.
- Darden, W. R., & Babin, B. J. (2014). Exploring the concept of affective quality: Expanding the concept of retail personality. *Journal of Business Research*, 29(2), 101-109.
- Davis, K. (1990). Evolving models of organizational behavior. In Participative Management and concepts. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9(4), 222-254.
- Dede, C. H. (2019). Employee participation in decision making and organizational productivity: Case study of Cross River State Board of Internal Revenue, Calabar. *International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 5(1), 453-489.
- Dincer, A. C. (2018). Effects of being observed on short- and long-term recall. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 100(8), 395-348.
- Dobble, J. H. (2013). The empowerment environment. *International Journal for Training and Development*, 47(2), 55-69.
- Drucker, P. F. (2016). *People and performance: The best of Peter Drucker on management*. Routledge Press.
- Edigin, P. A. (2019). Social facilitation: Effects of performance anticipation, evaluation, and response competition on free association. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(7), 270-275.
- Edward, A. (2019). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
- Foss, A. O., & Ellefson, H. (2012). Understanding dynamic capabilities: Progress along a developmental path. *Strategic Organization Journal*, 7(11), 91-102.
- Garvin, A. D. (2010). Evaluation apprehension and the social facilitation of dominant and subordinate responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10(7), 446-454.
- Hanaysha, I. R. (2016). Contact points and flash points: Conceptualizing the use of justice mechanisms in the performance appraisal interview. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(8), 101-123.

- Isaac, R. B. (2000). Clergy role stress and satisfaction: Role ambiguity isn't always bad. *Pastoral Psychology Journal*, 54(5), 561–570.
- Jacquiline, K. (2014). *Development of the behaviorally anchored rating scales for the skills demonstration and progression guide*. Princeton Press.
- Jones, A. G. (2018). Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Y: Toward a construct-valid measure. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(9), 255-271.
- Jones, P., Richard, A., Paul, I., Sloane, M., & Peter, B. (2017). Further development of a measure of theory X and Y managerial assumptions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 24(7), 450-470.
- Keh, B., Lawter, L., Kopelman, R. E., & Prottas, D. J. (2016). The arousal-performance relationship revisited. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 51(7), 77–90.
- Kelemba, M., Kopelman, R. E., Prottas, D. J., & Davis, A. L. (2017). McGregor's theory X/Y and job performance: A multilevel, multi-source analysis. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 27(1-4), 84-101.
- Key, S. (2010). The effect of culture on management style: A comparison of U.S. and Indonesian managers. *Journal of Transnational Management Development*, 5(3), 23-46.
- Koontz, H., & O'Donnell, C. (2016). *Motivation and satisfaction*. <http://www.brainkart.com>.
- Lawan, I., & Habu, A. B. (2019). Participative Management and employee perspective: Its impact on decision making and productivity in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 19(7), 14-22.
- Likert, R. (2017). *The human organization: Its management and values*. McGraw-Hill Book Company Publishers.
- Mac-Odo, P. A. (2016). *Great minds in management: The process of theory development*. Oxford University Press.
- McCrimmon, M. (2007). *What is leadership style?* Retrieved from <http://suite101.Com/article/what-is-leadership-style-a18991>.
- McGregor, D., Abraham, U., & Maslow, P. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. McGraw-Hill Press.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2017). *Commitment in the workplace*. Sage Press.
- Mohrman, S. A., & Lawler, E. E. I. (2018). Participative managerial behavior and organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 1(1), 45-49.



- Mohrman, S., & Lawler, A. (2018). Integrating roles and structure in the lateral organization. In organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations. *Journal of Lateral Organization*, 65(21), 37-47.
- Murdick, S. P., Render, M., & Russell, R. (1990). Performance appraisal revisited. *Institute of Personnel Management Journal*, 77(9), 771-798.
- Ojokuku, R. M., & Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2014). Examined effect of employee participation in decision making on performance of selected small and medium scale enterprises in Lagos, Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(10), 121-133.
- Okunribido, M. O. (2015). *Intellectual capital and employee performance of selected manufacturing bottling companies in Lagos State*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), NnamdiAzikiwe University, Awka.
- Pearce, R., & Robbins, S. P. (1997). *Strategic management formulation, implementation and control*. McGraw Hill Publishers.
- Phina, O. N., Arinze, A. S., Chidi, O. F., & Chukwuma, E. D. (2018). The effect of Teamwork on employee performance: A study of medium scale industries in Anambra State. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches*, 5(2), 174-194.
- Rogers, F. I. (2015). Goal setting: A motivational technique that works. *Organizational Dynamics Journal*, 8(2), 68–80.
- Samad, U. H., & Shapour, K. (2011). A comparative study of Employee Productivity analysis of public and private sectors banks in India. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, 1(85), 62-67.
- Scoff, D. H., & Bruce, I. (2014). Effectiveness of performance appraisal system and its effect on employee motivation. *Nile Journal of Business and Economics*, 5(8), 15-39.
- Tahir, N., Cottrell, A. P., & DeWaal, N. B. (2014). *The practice of management: A study of the most important function in America society*. Harper and Brothers Press.
- Tangen, (2015). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 17(1), 23-32.
- Taro, P. W., & Yamane, B. (2014). The institutional origins of dynamic capabilities in multinational enterprises. *Industrial and Corporate Change Journal*, 19(2), 1225-1246.
- Terbory, A. O. (2015). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. Routledge Publishers.
- Tesema, N. M., & Soeters, P. A. (2016). *Activation and behavior*. Wiley Publishers.



- 
- Vernooy, T., Qul, A., &Jvancha, U. (2018). Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. *Organization Science*, 13(1), 339-351.
- Walid, O. E., &Zubair, M. 2016). Strategy research: Governance and competence perspectives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(5), 1087–1110.
- Weinbery, L. M. (2019). Competition in motor performance: An experimental analysis of motivational components. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 8(12), 427–437.
- Weinbery, P. P. (2018). The data of levy and levy. *Management Science Journal*, 49(12), 979-981.
- Yohe, M. (2012). Competence. *Psychology of Group Influence Journal*, 12(9), 35-50.
- Yohe, S. (2003). Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A review, model and research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(3), 917-955.
- Zia-Khan, F., &Nouman, R. (20144). Patterns of organizational commitment and perceived management style: A comparison of public and private sectors employees. *Human Relations Journal*, 47(8), 977-1010.