



Vol. 5(2), Pp. 103-113, August 2024,

Author(s) retain the copyright of this article

This article is published under the terms of the
Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.

<https://journals.directresearchpublisher.org/index.php/drjmss/index>

Research Article
ISSN: 2354-4163

Employee Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction among Non-teaching Staff of Abia State University, Uturu

Philomena Ekwutosi Igbe^{1*}, and Evaristus Osita Oti²

¹Department of Sociology, Abia State University, Uturu, Nigeria.

²Department of Sociology, Abia State University, Uturu, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author Email: iekwutosim@gmail.com

ABSTRACT This study focused on employee participation in decision-making and job satisfaction among Non-teaching staff of Abia state university, Uturu, Nigeria. The specific objectives of this study included: to ascertain whether non-teaching staff participate in staff meetings; examine whether there is free expression of opinions during such meetings; and ascertain how employee participation in decision-making in the study area leads to job satisfaction among them. It was hypothesized that: there is a significant relationship between Non-teaching staff participation in staff meetings; free expression of opinions during such meetings; and employee participation in decision making and job satisfaction. The mixed methods research design was adopted. Quantitative data were collected through questionnaire while the qualitative data were gathered through interview. The Multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted to select respondents for this study. A sample of 272 persons participated in the quantitative aspect while 8 interviews were conducted to generate the qualitative data. The quantitative data were processed using SPSS Version 20.0 and was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The QDA Miner software was used to analyze the qualitative data. The hypotheses were tested using Chi-square statistic. The findings showed that the extent Non-teaching staff participate in staff meetings is highly commendable, hence, there is, a statistical significance between Non-teaching staff participation in meetings and job satisfaction ($p > 0.035$). There is free expression of opinions by Non-teaching staff during staff meetings; hence, there is a statistical significance between staff expression of their opinion in meetings and job satisfaction ($p > 0.049$). Employee participation in decision-making of Abia State University Non-Academic Staff does not lead to job satisfaction; therefore, there is no statistical significance between employee participation in decision-making and job satisfaction among them ($p > 0.853$). It was, therefore, recommended that the management should device inclusive implementation strategies to ensure that decisions reached in meetings translated into job satisfaction.

Keywords: employee-participation, decision-making, job-satisfaction, non-teaching staff, Abia State University

Article information

Received 28 July 2024;

Accepted 19 August 2024;

Published 31 August 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26765/DRJMSS20705571>

Citation: Igbe, P. E., and Oti, E. O. (2024). Employee Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction among Non-teaching Staff of Abia State University, Uturu . *Direct Research Journal of Management and Strategic Studies*. Vol. 5(2), Pp. 103-113. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.

INTRODUCTION

Employees refer to the workers in an Organization who had been employed to produce goods and or services. In the course of rendering their services, they are expected to abide by decisions which refer to guidelines, principles, procedures etc that guide work processes. Modern institutions are large and complex and are established to achieve specific goals. The main focus of any Organization /Institution should be its human resource

because it is the live wire of the Organization. A part of the human resource is responsible for decisions regarding the objectives and programmes of the organization. This part is referred to as Management. When an Organization becomes large and complex, the need may arise for different segments to contribute to decisions on how it is run. Set policies and practice should be employee-centered and practices that should

be developed to tap the natural capabilities and potentialities of institutional members (Litterer, 1987). One of such practices is participation of other members of an institution in decision-making processes formally meant and reserved for management (those who are not part of management)

The concept of employee participation in decision – making represents a popular theme in the analysis of the world of work among scholars in the field of Industrial Sociology, Industrial Relations as well as Management. Noah (2008), argues that employee participation in decision making is any arrangement designed to involve low cadre workers in the enterprise's decision-making process. This implied that rather than saddling only a group within the organization (for example management) with the sole responsibility of making decisions, all those affected by these decisions (including the workers) would be involved in its formulation and implementation. This involvement may take place at departmental level where individual employees make input on issues that may directly or indirectly affect their job. It may also take place at a level where employees through their respective units make their input to organization-wide issues that may affect the running of an organization at large which may also directly or indirectly affect individual employees, group or all employees. Employee participation can also be termed industrial democracy and participative decision- making.

Employees' participation has generated many meanings to different people. For the manager, it is a Joint Consultation, prior to making decision; to the Union leader, it is a new welcoming era of social relationship (Eugene 2007). Scholars in recent times, give increased attention to issues of employee participation (Mankindly 1994; Verma and Syha 1991, Kester and Pinaud, 2006, Adu- Amankwah and Kester 2005). These concerns reflect a growing interest in measuring ways to make work more meaningful and satisfying to the employees. This rests on the basis that the organizational goal of high productivity and harmonious industrial relations are best achieved when the higher level needs of the human elements (workers) are satisfied. In the 19th century, the idea that the workplaces should have a share in the decisions which affect the operation of the undertaking was expressed in various doctrines. It took broad and practical dimensions towards the end of the second world war in many countries of the world in form of collective bargaining of cooperative enterprise, establishment of joint committees, councils, just to mention but a few.

In Britain, the Whitley report in 1916 advocated joint committee. Two years later joint committees were set up in municipal undertakings. Similar, action took place in Austria in 1919 and in Germany factory committees were recognized in 1920 while in Russia, they were recognized by decree in April 1917. The idea of employee participation in decision-making within the organization

gained ground after the Second World War. Work councils were re-established in several European countries by the law or government. Some countries like France, Finland and Netherland, Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom had their established laws guiding worker participation in decision making. In Africa, countries like Egypt, Mali, Angola, Algeria, have various laws and decisions made requiring workers to be represented in various ways in decision-making mostly in public undertaking (Ajayi and Owoeyi 2005).

Regardless of the fact that the idea of worker participation in decision making in organization was traced back to 19th century, yet it sounds very new in certain environments (David 1998). Nigeria, despite its popularity, is still unable to take bold step toward this. In most organizations in Nigeria the idea of worker participation is not popular. This may be as result of the fact that there hardly exists act or provisions to compel the employer to meet and bargain with his workers representatives as opined by Fashoyin (1999:35).

It is worthy to note that African industrial workers were not mindful of labour relations process; they are primarily interested in the wage and not the working of the industry. It is observed that workers are not really interested in the work but the money it provides. As soon as much amount has been made, such workers give up their jobs, thus creating higher labour turnover. This observation has changed in the modern African society, an industrial worker is interested not only in the money he made from the system but the working of the industry as the growth of the labour sector has generated a high consciousness of relation between union and management in modern organizations. Union or employee representatives now meet with management to deliberate on the survival of the organization.

In the recent time, increased relationship between the employer and employee in the relation/activities at workplace has evoked to be part of decision-making especially as it concerns the employee. An old maxim says that the best person to be in-charge of a problem is the most affected by the outcome. That means workers who are expected to implement organizational decision should be involved in choosing the cost of action. It creates psychological ownership or the decision rather than viewing themselves as an agent of someone else's decision. Participation could also be likened to grease used on a machine to make it more effective. When employees are involved in the decision-making process, they tend to exhibit less resistance to change and are motivated to implement the decision. Kelby and Girigin (2002) affirm that Nigerian workers are capable of producing as much as their counterparts in Europe, but some fundamental factors militate against them. These factors are a number of management functions namely:

- a) The provision of adequate incentive

- b) Adequate supervision
- c) Proper organization of work.

Furthermore, intrinsic and extrinsic factors may also militate against Nigerian workers. On one hand, intrinsic (internal) factors are those factors that make individuals feel happy and motivated internally because of the fulfillment he/she gets from the job and the environment. Such factors are intangible and include the meaningfulness of the job, recognition and growth opportunities (Roos and Van Eeden 2008). On the other hand extrinsic factors are external factors of the job and an environment that makes an individual feel happy at work. These factors are tangible and may include pay, company policies and physical work conditions (Roos and Van Eeden 2008). If employee participation in decision making is one of the job satisfaction factors, it may be categorized as an intrinsic factor because of its nature. A number of factors both internal and external factor to the workplace influence the Nigerian workers in their achievement of job satisfaction. These are important determinants of the level of productivity of Nigerian employees. For effective organization to make a worker satisfied and motivated there is the need to ensure a strong and effective motivation of staff at various departments, sections of the organization (Chukwudi and Aworo 2001). One of the most challenging issues facing most organizations is how to effectively manage the issue of worker's satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is a complex concept which can mean different things to different people; this could be as a result of differences between scholars in terms of their culture, belief and environment. Assad (1983) expressed the lack of a clear and commonly accepted definition of this concept of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction can be described as affective or emotional reaction to the job resulting from the incumbent's comparison of actual outcome with the required, anticipated and deserved outcome (Cranny et al.,1992; Locke and Luthams, 1990). Job satisfaction is more of attitude internal state. It could, for instance, be associated with personal feeling of achievement either quantitative or qualitative (Fatemah, 2010). Job satisfaction could also be seen as a personnel evaluation of conditions present in the job, or in outcome that rise as a result of having a job (Schneider & Snyder, 1975; Stander & Rothmann, 2009). Mullins (2005) opined that job satisfaction is an emotion, a feeling, an attitude and a matter of perception. Job satisfaction is so important in that its absence often leads to lethargy (Lavinson, 1997, Moserj1997). Job satisfaction helps to achieve a high level of motivation, therefore, in order to get the best out of the workers and attempt to improve job satisfaction, it requires a sport of teamwork and co-operation and very importantly, allowing the workers participation in decisions that affect them at work. More often than not, little attention is paid to the needs of the

workers and consequently in the social relation between workers and management. To a great extent, most policies of the organization are focused on ensuring workers' productivity. For this reason the major emphasis in every organization is the proper implementation of human resource management strategy like employee participation, empowerment and participative management to ensure job satisfaction and employee commitment for the better harmony and productivity. It is on this background of the prevailing circumstances that the researcher decides to study the relationship between employee participation in decision-making and job satisfaction.

Objectives

The specific objectives of this study are to:

1. Find out whether Non-teaching staff participate in staff meetings.
2. Examine whether there is free expression of opinions by non-teaching staff during such meetings.
3. Ascertain how employee participation in decision making of Abia State University non - academic staff is leading to job satisfaction among them.

Research Questions

Three research questions are guiding this study as follows:

1. To what extent do non-teaching staff participate in staff meetings?
2. To what extent is there free expression of opinions by non-teaching staff during staff meetings?
3. How is employee participation in decision making of Abia State University non - academic staff leading to job satisfaction among them?

Hypotheses

Three hypotheses are formulated to guide this study as follows:

1. There is a significant relationship between Non-teaching staff participation in staff meetings and job satisfaction.
2. There is a significant relationship between free expression of opinions by non-teaching staff during such meetings and job satisfaction.
3. There is a significant relationship between employee participation in decision making of Abia State University non - academic staff and job satisfaction among them.

Literature review

The human relations approach by Elton Mayo will be adopted to guide this study on workers participation in management decision making and job satisfaction. The choice of this theory is based on the fact that it is, in the writers view, the best approach that explains the phenomenon under study. The approach is also seen as ushering in new era of organizational humanism, it also lays emphasis on the effect of work group, employee attitudes and manager- employee relationship on the organization. The human relations approach was associated with the name of Elton Mayo and his associate. The approach involved out of a series of studies carried out at the Hawthome plant of western Electric company between 1927 and 1932 in Chicago, United state of American (Girigiri, 2006).

The human relations theory stems from the understanding that the co-operation of workers in desirable for the attainment of the objectives of high productivity and industrial peace. It contends that workers would be better motivated if they are created like human beings rather than as irrational objects For instance, by making them have a feeling that the organization accords them recognition by involving them in the decision making process. In the light of the theory, the worker is to be perceived in tern of his membership of a social group rather than an individual.

Consequently, his behavior is seen as a response to group norms rather than simple being directed by financial considerations. Workers should be expected to react to group norms so that when they are giving the opportunity to take part in management decision making, they will be satisfied and are likely to respond positively to organizational issues.

Management must accept and co-operation with informal work groups since they provide a context in which many of the workers needs are satisfied. So managers must ensure that the norms of informal groups are in line with the goals of the organization. One way of accomplishing this objective is to invite groups of workers to participate in decision- making. This is based on the idea that workers will be more committed to their task if they have a voice in determining how those tasks are to be performed. By discovering ways of involving informal work group within the organization, this group can become a major driving force for the realization of organization goal. The Elton Mayo approach has been criticized for neglecting the place of organizational conflict and placing more emphasis on harmony. Base on this, its takes a systemic view in its analysis of organization. The proponents of group participation in decision - making overlook the implications of consequent increase in group domination of its members (Girigiri, 2006 and Iheriohanma (2002). The relevance of this theory to the study is: it has to bring to our knowledge that normal

interaction of workers at the work place always creates a social network called the informal group or organization. And group life is a source of social and emotional satisfaction for individual member. Management must ensure that informal norms are in agreement with the organization goal. In addition, by discovering ways of involving informal work groups within organization, this group can become a major driving force for the realization of organizational goals.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

The study made use of mixed research design. This is because it enabled the researcher obtain data through the questionnaire and In Depth Interview in order to interrogate the relationship between the Independent variable (participation in decision –making) and the independent variable (job satisfaction).

Scope of the study

The scope is limited to all the non-teaching regular staff of the University. The study conducted at Abia State University, Uturu. The focus was on the participation of the non-teaching staff of the University in decision making process and the effect of this on their job satisfaction.

Population of the Study

The population included all the regular non-teaching staff in all units of the University as listed in (Table 1). Five heads of the above departments were purposively selected for the In-Depth Interview (IDI). In addition the three union leaders of the Unon Academic Staff unions were interviewed.

Sample size and sampling techniques

The sample size for this study was obtained through the formula by Yamane (1969) for sample size determination. The formula is:

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

Where

n = sample size sought

N= Population

e = Alpha level

1= constant

Table 1: Population of study.

Department/Unit	No of Staff
Vice Chancellor	30
Registry	43
Bursary	45
Library	45
Security	150
Medical Centre	46
Works and Services	120
Physical Planning	30
Student Affairs	70
Directorates	53
Faculties and their departments	219
Total	851

Source: Personnel Unit ABSU

Table 2: Sample size of the study.

Department	No of Staff	Sample Size
Vice Chancellor	30	10
Registry	43	14
Bursary	45	14
Library	45	14
Security	150	48
Medical Centre	46	15
Works and Services	120	38
Physical Planning	30	10
Student Affairs	70	22
Directorates	53	17
Faculties and their departments	219	70
Total	851	272

Source: Personnel Unit ABSU

The sample size for the study is 272. Five heads of department listed on (Table 2) together with three union leaders of the Non Academic Staff were involved in the qualitative study (In Depth Interview). It followed therefore that the total sample size of the study is 280. Multi stage sampling techniques was adopted in selecting the respondents for the quantitative data. Specifically, stratified random sampling technique was adopted in the choice of staff that served in the quantitative study. Additionally, proportionate stratified sampling which ensured proportionate representation of the units in the sample was used. Again, purposive sampling was involved in the choice of five staff that will serve in the qualitative study. The purpose was to select heads of units who are knowledgeable in administrative issues and are in charge of coordinating workers' activities in the units.

Instruments for data collection

The questionnaire served as the primary source and major instrument for data collection. The questionnaire were in two sections; A and B. Section A is on the socio-demographics of the respondents. Section B deals with substantive issues of the research derived from the objective of the study. The questionnaire were structured

to elicit the necessary information from the respondents. The responses were made on a continuum from “very high extent” to “very low extent” with “high extent” and “low extent” in-between. The study also made use of in-Depth Interview (IDI) for getting qualitative data.

Administration of instruments

The questionnaires were administered to the 272 respondents on face-to-face basis by the researcher and two research assistants. The research assistants were given basic orientation on the key issues of the study to enable function well in the field work. The IDI was conducted by the researcher. The respondents were purposively selected to include the heads of the various units being studied and the union leaders of the Non-teaching staff.

Method of data analysis

Simple descriptive statistical tools like percentages and frequency tables were used for the analysis of socio-demographic characteristics of respondents, as well as data on the substantive issues of the study. Chi-Square statistic was used for the test of hypotheses.

Table 3: Participation of staff in debate commendable.

Options	Frequency	Percent	Total Score	Mean Score	Criterion Score
Strongly Agree (4)	99	39.1	396		
Agree (3)	60	23.7	180		
Disagree (2)	60	23.7	120	2.9	2.5
Strongly Disagree (1)	34	13.4	34		
Total	253	100	730		

Field survey: 2023

Table 4: Distribution of respondents by whether staff participate in debate meetings.

Options	Frequency	Percent	Total Score	Mean Score	Criterion Score
Strongly Agree (4)	20	7.9	80		
Agree (3)	72	28.5	216		
Disagree (2)	131	51.8	262	2.3	2.5
Strongly Disagree (1)	30	11.9	30		
Total	253	100	588		

The qualitative data were analyzed QDA Miner. The data were carefully edited/cleaned, sorted, translated and transcribed and the responses arranged thematically in the study.

RESULTS

Research Question One: “To what extent do non-teaching staff participate in staff meetings?”

The responses are presented in (Tables 3 and 4). Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents on participation of staff in debate as commendable. The data revealed that 99 (39.1) of the respondents strongly agreed; 60 (23.7) agreed; 60 (23.7) disagreed while 34 (13.4) strongly disagreed. The weighted score of these responses are shown on the table and the mean score is 2.9. This is above the criterion mean of 2.5, indicating that the non-teaching staff participation in debate is commendable. This also corroborated the qualitative data as more of the respondents believe that participation of staff in debate is commendable. For example, an IDI respondent narrated as thus: “The decisions and views expressed during meetings affect decision-making in the units. All views and opinions debated during meetings are taken as decisions that guide the workplace” (Male, Head of unit, and 49 years old). Table 4 shows the distribution of respondents by whether staff participate in debate meetings. The data revealed that 20 (7.9) of the respondents strongly agreed; 72 (28.5) agreed; 131(51.8) disagreed while 34 (11.9) strongly disagreed. The weighted scores of these responses are shown on the table and the mean score is 2.3. This is below the criterion mean of 2.5, indicating that the non-teaching staffs of ABSU do not participate in Debate Meetings very often. This also corroborated the IDI data.

Research Question Two: “To what extent is there free expression of opinions by non-teaching staff during staff meetings?”

The responses are presented in (Tables 5 and 6). Table 5 shows the distribution of respondents on if members are encouraged to express their opinion during meetings. The table shows that 126(49.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed, 43 (17.0) agreed, 63 (24.9) disagreed while 21(8.3%) strongly disagreed. The weighted scores of these responses are shown on the table and the mean score is 3.1. This is above the criterion mean of 2.5. This implies that the staff members are encouraged to express their opinions during meetings. This corroborated the IDI data. One of the respondents, for example, said: “the staff is usually at a very great extent given full opportunity to express themselves during meetings” (Female, Head of unit, 53 years old). Another respondent also said: “In my department, the staffs are really given full opportunity to express their opinions” (Male, Unit Head, and 57 years).

Table 6 shows the distribution of respondents on whether they are satisfied by being encouraged to express their opinion in meetings. The data revealed that 20(7.9%) of the respondents strongly agreed; 65(25.7%) agreed; 106(41.9%) disagreed; while 20(7.9%) strongly disagreed. The weighted scores of these responses are shown on the table and the mean score is 2.2. This is below the criterion mean of 2.5 indicating that encouraging staff to speak in meetings does not lead to staff satisfaction. This also corroborated the IDI data.

Research Question Three: “How is employee participation in decision making of Abia State University Non-academic staff leading to job satisfaction among them?”

Table 5: Members are encouraged to express their opinion during meeting.

Options	Frequency	Percent	Total Score	Mean Score	Criterion Mean
Strongly Agree (4)	126	49.8	504		
Agree (3)	43	17.0	129		
Disagree (2)	63	24.9	126	3.1	2.5
Strongly Disagree (1)	21	8.3	21		
Total	253	100	780		

Field survey: 2023

Table 6: Encouraging members to express their opinion gives satisfaction.

Options	Frequency	Percentage	Total score	Mean score	Criterion score
Strongly Agree (4)	20	7.9	80		
Agree (3)	65	25.7	195		
Disagree (2)	106	41.9	212	2.2	2.5
Strongly Disagree (1)	62	24.5	62		
Total	253	100	549		

Field survey: 2023

Table 7: Frequency of meetings ensures job satisfaction.

Options	Frequency	Percent	Total score	Mean score	Criterion Mean
Strongly Agree (4)	55	21.7	220		
Agree (3)	108	42.7	324		
Disagree (2)	55	21.7	110	2.7	2.5
Strongly Disagree (1)	35	13.8	35		
Total	253	100	689		

Field survey: 2023

Table 8: Distribution of respondents by staff being satisfied with decision making.

Options	Frequency	Percent	Total score	Mean score	Criterion Mean
Strongly Agree (4)	35	13.8	140		
Agree (3)	35	13.8	105		
Disagree (2)	85	33.6	170	2.0	2.5
Strongly Disagree (1)	98	38.7	98		
Total	253	100	513		

Field survey: 2023

Table 9: Distribution of responses by whether attendance to meetings is satisfactory.

Options	Frequency	Percent	Total score	Mean score	Criterion mean
Strongly Agree (4)	30	11.9	120		
Agree (3)	31	12.3	93		
Disagree (2)	141	55.7	282	2.2	2.5
Strongly Disagree (1)	51	20.2	51		
Total	253	100	546		

Field survey: 2023

The responses are presented in (Tables 7, 8 and 9). Table 7 shows the distribution of respondents by whether the frequency of meetings ensures job satisfaction. The data reveal that 55(21.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed; 108(42.7%) agreed; 55(21.7) disagreed while 35(13.8%) strongly disagreed. The weighted scores of these responses are shown on the table and the mean score is 2.7. This is above the criterion mean of 2.5 indicating that the frequency of meetings ensures job satisfaction. This corroborated the IDI data. Table 8

shows the distribution of respondents according to their ratings on whether staff are satisfied with decision making. The table shows that 35(13.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed; 35(13.8%) agreed; 85(33.6%) disagreed; while 98(38.7%) strongly disagreed. The weighted scores of these responses are shown on the table and the mean score is 2.0. This is below the criterion mean of 2.5 indicating that staff are not satisfied with decision making. This corroborated the IDI data. One of the respondents, for example, said: “the

Table 10: Cross tabulation between non-teaching staff participation in meetings and job satisfaction.

	Satisfied with the job				Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree	24(17.6%)	65(47.8%)	18(13.2%)	29(21.3%)	136
Agree	10(19.6%)	23(45.1%)	5(9.8%)	13(25.5%)	51
Disagree	17(25.8%)	21(31.8%)	12(18.2)	16(24.2%)	66
Total	51	109	35	58	253

$\chi^2 = 6.037$

(N = 235),

df = 6

P = 0. 0359

Table 11: Cross tabulation between expression of opinion by staff and job satisfaction.

	Satisfied with the job				Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree	31(19.5%)	74(46.5%)	25(15.7%)	29(18.2%)	159
Agree	6(21.4%)	13(46.4%)	2(7.1%)	7(25.0%)	28
Disagree	11(25.0%)	16(36.4%)	5(11.4%)	12(27.3%)	44
Strongly Disagree	3(13.6%)	6(27.3%)	3(13.6%)	10(45.5%)	22
Total	51	109	35	58	253

$\chi^2 = 11.605$

(N = 235),

df = 9,

P = 0. 049

staff feels so satisfied with their job because they are given room to make and implement decisions in their departments" (Female, head of unit, 53 years old). Table 9 shows the distribution of respondents by whether attendance to meetings is satisfactory. The table shows that 30(11.9%) of the respondents strongly agreed; 31(12.3%) agreed; 141(55.7%) disagreed while 51(20.2%) strongly disagreed. The weighted scores of these responses are shown on the table and the mean score is 2.2. This is below the criterion mean of 2.5 indicating that attendance to meetings is satisfactory. This also corroborated the IDI data.

Test of research hypotheses

Hypothesis One: There is a significant relationship between meetings held in the various non-teaching staff units/departments and job satisfaction among respondents in the University.

The result of the test in (Table 10) shows there is a slight statistical significance $p = 0.035$ indicating that the hypothesis is accepted.

There is, therefore, a statistical significance between non-teaching staff participation in meetings and job satisfaction among staff respondent.

Hypothesis Two: There is a significant relationship between free expression of opinions by non-teaching staff during such meetings and job satisfaction.

The result of the test in (Table 11) shows there is a slight

statistical significance $p = 0.049$ indicating that the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Three: There is, therefore, a slight statistical significance between staff expression of their opinion in meetings and job satisfaction among staff respondents.

The result of the test in (Table 12) shows there is no statistical significance $p = 0.853$ showing therefore, that the hypothesis is rejected. There is, therefore, no statistical significance between employee participation in decision making of Abia State University Non-academic staff and job satisfaction among them.

DISCUSSION

The extent non-teaching staff participates in staff meetings

The first item that was treated here was on whether participation of staff in debate is commendable and it was found that the non-teaching staff participation in debate is commendable. This corroborated the IDI data. The related hypothesis, that is, hypothesis 2, also corroborated the finding as the result of hypothesis shows that there is, a statistical significance between non-teaching staff participation in meetings and job satisfaction among staff respondents at $p > .035$. This is partly in consonant with the view of Gollan and Xu (2016) that there is need for interdisciplinary re-examination of the legitimacy of employee participation- when and how it works well for both employers and employees in

Table 12: Cross tabulation between employee participation in decision making and job satisfaction.

	Satisfied with the job				Total
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Strongly Agree	28(21.5%)	52(40.0%)	19(14.6%)	31(23.8%)	130
Agree	17(22.4%)	32(42.1%)	11(14.5%)	16(21.1%)	76
Disagree	3(20.0%)	6(40.0%)	3(20.0%)	3(20.0%)	15
Strongly Disagree	3(9.4%)	19(59.4%)	2(6.3%)	8(25.0%)	32
Total	51	109	35	7	253

$\chi^2 = 6.564$
 (N = 235),
 df = 9,
 P = 0.853

changing organizational and societal context. This, however, is in full support of the idea of the Human Relations Approach of Elton Mayo (1880-1849) that work groups, employee attitudes and manager-employee relationships affect the organization.

The last item on this research question was whether staff participate in Debate Meetings very often. It was found that the non-teaching staffs of ABSU do not participate in Debate Meetings very often. This corroborated the qualitative data. This is at variance with the related hypothesis, that is, hypothesis 2, as the result of hypothesis shows that there is, a statistical significance between non-teaching staff participation in meetings and job satisfaction among staff respondents at $p > 0.035$. It could be that there are other factors other than participation in argumentative meetings that keep the staff going with regards to their job satisfaction. In fact, given the group mean of 2.6 which is greater than the criterion mean of 2.5, it was found that the extent non-teaching staff participate in staff meetings is highly commendable. The related hypothesis being hypothesis 2, fully supports this finding as the result of hypothesis, as already noted, shows that there is, a statistical significance between non-teaching staff participation in meetings and job satisfaction among staff respondents at $p > 0.035$. This, therefore, supports the idea of the Human Relations Approach of Elton Mayo (1880-1849) that work groups, employee attitudes and manager-employee relationships affect the organization

Extent of free expression of opinions by non-teaching staff during staff meetings

With regard to whether encouraging staff to speak in meetings lead to job satisfaction, it was found that the staff members are encouraged to express their opinions during meetings. This corroborated the IDI data. This supported the related hypothesis, which is, hypothesis 3, which result shows that there is a slight statistical significance at $p > .049$ indicating that there is, therefore, a slight statistical significance between staff expression of

their opinion in meetings and job satisfaction among staff respondents. This agrees with the study of Fatemah (2010) that the concept of job satisfaction is the result of employees evaluation of the work environment and how it fulfills his/her needs. Based on whether the staff are satisfied by being encouraged to express their opinion in meetings, it was found that encouraging staff to speak in meetings does not lead to staff satisfaction. This corroborated the IDI data. This agrees with the study of Yoerger, Crowe and Allen (2015) that participation in decision-making in meetings is associated with employee engagement. It is also in tandem with the study of Tracy and Dimock (2003) that a meeting can be an opportunity for employees to participate in decision-making,- to share information, foster work relationships, and plan for the future. Similarly, the study agrees with view of Hinkel & Allen, (2013) that meetings where individual openly participate in decision making may promote more positive outcomes for meeting attendees. Given that the group mean of 2.7 is greater than the criterion mean of 2.5, it found that there is free expression of opinions by non-teaching staff during staff meetings. This corroborated the qualitative data. This supported the related hypothesis, that is, hypothesis 3, which result shows that there is a statistical significance at $p > 0.049$ indicating that there is, therefore, a statistical significance between staff expression of their opinion in meetings and job satisfaction among staff respondents. This, as already noted, agrees with the study of Fatemah (2010) that the concept of job satisfaction is the result of employees evaluation of the work environment and how it fulfills his/her needs.

Employee Participation in Decision Making of Abia State University Non-Academic Staff Leads to Job Satisfaction among them

On whether the frequency of meetings ensures job satisfaction, it was found that the frequency of meetings ensures job satisfaction. This corroborated the IDI data. This is in tandem with the study of Rogelberg, Allen,

Shanock, Scott and Shuffler (2010) who found that satisfaction with meetings was positively related to and significantly predicted overall job satisfaction ($p < .05$). The authors also found that the relationship between meeting satisfaction and job satisfaction depends in part, upon the number of meetings typically attended and this supported the finding of this study under discussion.

On whether staff are satisfied with decision making, it was found that staff are not satisfied with decision making. This corroborated the qualitative data. The result of the related hypothesis, that is, hypothesis 6, shows that there is, therefore, no statistical significance between employee participation in decision making of Abia State University Non-academic staff and job satisfaction among them. This finding is at variance with the study of Xia, Zhang and Zhao (2016) who found that employees participation in decision making positively affected their job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.32, p < 0.001$).

Based on whether attendance to meetings is satisfactory, it was found that attendance to meetings is satisfactory. This corroborated the IDI data. This finding is in consonant with the study of Abdulrahman (2016) who found that if employees are to understand the need for creativity and commit to changing their work behaviours in new and improved ways, they must be involved in taking decisions. Again, the study is supported by the study of Yoerger, Crowe, Allen (2015) who found that employees who contribute their thoughts and ideas in meetings with organizational leaders will also have a desire to engage in their work more fully (i.e employee engagement).

Given that the group mean of 2.3 is less than the criterion mean of 2.5, it was found that employee participation in decision making of Abia State University Non-Academic Staff does not lead to job satisfaction among them. This is supported by the result of the related hypothesis (hypothesis 6), which showed that there is, therefore, no statistical significance between employee participation in decision making of Abia State University Non-academic staff and job satisfaction among them at $p > 0.853$. This finding is at variance with the study of Nwoke and Emole (2017) who found that as a management tool, employee participation in decision making is believed to enhance the achievements of the shared goals of employees and managers.

Conclusion

The study investigated employee participation in decision-making and job satisfaction among Non-teaching staff of Abia State University, Uturu. The findings showed that even though the staff participation in meetings are commendable; the free expression of opinions during meetings not hindered, yet the non-teaching staff participation in decision-making does still lead to job satisfaction. It could, therefore, be drawn from

the findings of this study that the issue of job satisfaction may linger and continue to be an issue in future in Abia State University, Uturu, unless the Non-teaching staff are continually involved not only in making decisions but in implementing decisions on the issues that concern them.

Recommendations

The non-teaching staff should be made to participate actively in staff meetings of their units/departments.

The ongoing practice of allowing the staff to freely express of opinions during meetings should not stop rather be intensified.

This will make the non-teaching staff to continually proffer solutions to some of the problems in their units/departments.

The management should device inclusive implementation strategies to ensure that decisions reached in meetings translated into job satisfaction

REFERENCES

- Adu-Amankwah, K. & Kester, G. (1999). *How to make democratic participation a success*. An African trade union challenge. Rotterdam: Textual.
- Ajayi, M.O. & Owoye, C.C. (2005). *Worker participation in decision-making in the Nigerian construction industry*.
- Ajayi, K.A. (1983). The relationship between job satisfaction and productivity among junior workers in a service, *Journal of Land Use and Development studies*, 1(1): 28 – 35.
- A-saadi, K. (1996). *The root of satisfaction. the case of Sultan Qaboos University: A New University in a Development Country* (Unpublished) Thesis (Ph.D), Exeter University.
- Chukwudi, A. & Aworo, O.P. (2001). *Organizational Commitments and Job Satisfaction of Library Workers in Academic and Public Libraries in Delta State University, Nigeria*. International Journal of Labour and Organizational Psychology 2, (1&2) 50-51.
- Eugene, T. (2007). *Principle of Human Resource Management*. Delhi Vrinda Publication (P) Ltd.
- Fatemah, A. (2010). Job satisfaction among female head teachers in Saudi Arabia Secondary schools: a qualitative perspective. Available at: <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk>.
- Fashoyin, T. (1992). *Industry Relations in Nigeria*. London: Longman.
- Girigiri, B. K. (2006). *Industrial Organizations: A Sociological perspective*, Owerri: Springfield Publishers.
- Iheriohanma, E.B.J. (2002). *Contemporary Issues in Organization*. Theory and Management Development.
- Kelby, P. (1969). *Industrialization in Open Economy: Nigeria 1945-1966* Cambridge University Press.
- Kester, G. & Pinaud, H. (Eds) (1996). *Trade Unions and Democratic Participation in Europe*. Aldershot: Avebury Press.
- Litterer, J.A. (1987). *Management concepts and Controversies*, Canada: John Wiley and Sons Inc. Pp 265
- Locke, L.A. & Luthans, G. P. (1990): *Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance*, Engle Wood: Cliffs, L.J. Prentice Hall.
- Mankidy, J. (1994). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Monser, K. (1997). Commitment in Organization. *Psychologies* 41 (4): 160-170.
- Mullins L. J. (2005). *Management and Organizational Behaviour*. 7th

- Edition, London: Pitman Publishing.
- Noah, Y.(2008): *A Study of Worker Participation in Management Decision Making*:Journal of Social Sciences, Vol 17, No 1, 31-39
- Roos , W., & Van Eeden, R (2008)). The relationship between employee motivation, job satisfaction and corporate culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(1): a420. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v34i1.420>
- Schneider, B. & Snyder, R.A. (1975). Some relationships between job satisfaction and organizational climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(3):318-328.
- Stander, M.W., & Rothmann, S. (2009). Leadership, Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management* 7(3), 6-13
- Verma, R.K. & Syha, P.R (1991). *Workers Participation in Management* NewDelhi: Oxford Publication Co.