

## IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION MAKING PROCESS ON AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES' TURNOVER IN INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING IBADAN, OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Abiona, B.G. Adeogun, S.O. and Oladipupo, P.O.

Department of Agricultural Administration, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta,  
PMB 2240 Ogun State, Nigeria

\*Corresponding author's email: [dolace6ng@gmail.com](mailto:dolace6ng@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*This study was designed to determine the implications of decision making process on employees' turnover in the Institute of Agricultural Research and Training Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. Simple random sampling technique was used to select 73 respondents from the study area with the use of a well-structured questionnaire. Data were collected primarily and were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical tools. Results showed the mean ages of employees to be 31 years, majority (56.9%) of them were male (48.6%) had B.Sc. as their educational qualification and 66.7% were married. The mean years of experience was 5 years and 59.7% were Christians. More so, decision was easier based on employee's opinions ( $\bar{x} = 3.65$ ), decisions are made by a set of people in the organization ( $\bar{x} = 3.28$ ) and important suggestions are neglected by supervisors ( $\bar{x} = 2.61$ ). Hierarchical decision making process (59.7%) was the major type identified. Furthermore, work life imbalance ( $\bar{x} = 3.32$ ), cost of training and recruitment ( $\bar{x} = 3.18$ ) and lack of growth opportunity ( $\bar{x} = 3.10$ ) are causes of employee turnover. Conflict ( $\bar{x} = 2.38$ ), unfavourable decision making process ( $\bar{x} = 2.13$ ) and job insecurity ( $\bar{x} = 2.22$ ) were major challenges affecting decision making process. The results also shows that level of decision making process with coefficient value of (0.476), age (-0.079), sex (-0.014), rank (-0.228), income (0.145) and challenges (-0.021) were variable influencing employee's turnover. This study concluded that employees' participation in decision making process will reduce employees' turnover. Growth opportunity in terms of training is highly recommended.*

**Key words:** implication, decision making, process, agricultural employees, turnover and research institute

### INTRODUCTION

In every organization, decisions have to be made constantly to ensure smooth running of an organisation (Abiona, 2016). Such decisions can be made by those at the higher level, the middle level and even down to the lowest level of an organisation (Management Study Guide, 2016). The type of decision made is a great determinant of the rate of employees' movement in an organisation. Decision making takes two forms, namely the top-down and bottom-up approach in order to achieve a better productive relationship in the organization (Barriger and Bluedom, 1999). Every organisation needs to make decisions at one point or the other as part of managerial process (Lee and Yu, 2004). Decisions are made in the best interest of the organization especially when deviations from the original goals are noticed. For that matter, decisions made by the organisation are to lighten the way forward. Also, decisions are taken to support organizational growth (Zivkovic *et al.*, 2009). As a matter of fact, critical decision is one of the many

attributes that every manager should imbibe be it at top or middle level. By nature human being during his existence and by virtue of his instinct makes decisions for his survival. In other word, managers are polished individuals who take decisions to affect others, i.e. the organisation's existence and growth thus leading to success of organisation which may affect employee's turnover.

Employee turnover is the ratio of the number of workers that had to be replaced in a given period to the average number of workers (Agnes, 1999). In simpler terms, employee turnover is the series of actions that it takes from the employee leading to his or her being replaced. It is often utilized as an indicator of company performance and can easily be observed negatively towards the organisation's efficiency and effectiveness (Glebbeck and Bax, 2004). It is defined as the ratio of the number of organisational members who have left during the period being considered divided by the average number of people in that organisation during the period (Price, 1977). Frequently, managers refer to

turnover as the entire process associated with filling a vacancy; each time a position is vacated, either voluntarily or involuntarily, a new employee must be hired and trained. This replacement cycle is known as turnover (Woods, 1995). However, in this study, the term "leaving" and "separating" are used to imply termination of an employment contract with a particular organization. It is the rate at which an employer gains and losses employees.

Thus, employee turnover is not a relatively new concept in management but a typical issue in human resources management that is presently attracting the attention of public administration and industrial relations management practitioners across the globe. Aside the cost of investment in employees, with globalisation, which is heightening competition, organisations must continue to develop tangible products and provide services, which are based on strategies created by employees (Ongori, 2007). Based on this, the study addressed the following specific objectives as to:

- i. describe the personal characteristics of the respondents;
- ii. determine the effects of employees' turnover on decision making process; and
- iii. identify various challenges faced by the respondents in the study area.

The hypotheses of the study are stated in null form:

**H<sub>01</sub>** There is no significant relationship between personal characteristics of the respondents and employees' turnover.

**H<sub>02</sub>** There is no significant relationship between decision making process and employees' turnover.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study was conducted in the Institute of Agricultural Research and Training (IAR&T). IAR&T is a national Agricultural Research Institute with headquarters at Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. Its history dates back to 1956 when the then western regional government established a University at Ife, the institute became part of the University and was fully integrated in 1973. In 1975, the Institute was given a national mandate and was later funded by the Federal Ministry of Science and Technology and then the Federal Ministry of Agriculture. The agency like few other research institutes has undergone various supervisory changes. The Institute conducts research on various cereals and legumes such as maize, jute, kenaf and sisal hemp, soil and also on fertilizer use and farming systems. The population of this study comprise of agricultural employees of the Institute of Agricultural Research and Training (IAR&T) in Oyo State, Nigeria. Simple random sampling techniques were used to select the respondents from the study area. The research was carried out among 73 respondents and the data for the study were obtained using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was structured

into sections to generate information about personal characteristics, implication of decision making and its effect on employees' turnover were measured using 5 points Likert rating scale of: strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, undecided = 3, disagree = 2 and strongly disagree = 1. Challenges to employees' turnover was measured with 3 point rating scale of very severe = 3, severe = 2 and not severe = 1. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis. Descriptive statistics included frequencies, percentages, mean, standard deviation and regression analysis. The mean of employees turnover were pooled together to determine the implication of decision making process on employees turnover.

$$\text{Prob}(Y = 1) = \sum (p_i - \pi_i) = T_1X_1 + T_2X_2 + T_3X_3 + T_4X_4 + T_n + X_n$$

where Y is employees turnover either 1 if 'Yes' or 0 if 'No' X<sub>1</sub> is age of employees (years), X<sub>2</sub> is sex (1 for male, 0 for female), X<sub>3</sub> is income (Naira), X<sub>4</sub> is farming experience (years), X<sub>5</sub> is marital status (1 if married, 0 otherwise), X<sub>6</sub> is educational status (years of schooling), X<sub>7</sub> is decision making process (1 if yes otherwise 0), and X<sub>8</sub> is challenges (1 if severe otherwise 0).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Personal Characteristics of Respondents**

The mean age of the employees was 31.3 years, with less than half (31.9%) of the employees within the range of less than or equal to 30 years (Table 1). This means that the employees were still at their youthful and vibrant age for work. This result supports the findings of FAO (1997) and Onu *et al.* (2005) who reported that most of the Agricultural employees in Nigeria were in the age range of 20-40 years. Also, more than half (56.9%) of the employees were male while 41.7% were female. This implies that male researchers dominate the population in the institute. The results show that 48.6% of the employees had B.Sc. while 15.3% had M.Sc. as their educational qualification. This implies that employees have one certificate or the other that enable them to work in the study area. The mean years of experience was 3 years and this is supported by Armstrong (2001) who observed that long-term employees generally have higher productivity and efficiency on the job than newer employees, due to their length of experience with the firm. In addition, majority (66.7%) of the employees were married while 27.8% were single which implies that there are more married women and men compared to singles in the study area. This supports the findings of Fapojuwo (2010) that great importance is still placed on the institution of marriage especially in our society. More than half (59.7%) of the employees were Christians while 37.5% were Muslims. The mean monthly income was ₦90,444.00 per month. It is worthy to note that respondents are on medium income level.

**Table 1:** Distribution of respondents by socio-economic characteristics ( $n = 73$ )

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Age (years)			
≤ 30	23	31.9	31.3
31 – 35	12	16.7	
36 – 40	17	23.6	
Above 40	13	18.1	
Sex			
Male	41	56.9	
Female	30	41.7	
Educational status			
SSCE	1	1.4	
OND/NCE	8	11.1	
HND	10	13.9	
BSc	35	48.6	
MSc	11	15.3	
PhD	6	8.3	
Marital status			
Single	20	27.8	
Married	48	66.7	
Religion			
Christianity	43	59.7	
Islam	27	37.5	
Working experience (years)			
≤ 5	37	51.4	
6 – 10	19	26.4	2
> 10	9	12.7	
Rank			
Junior staff	25	34.7	
Senior staff	44	61.1	
Monthly income (Naira)			
≤ 50,000	19	26.4	₦90,444.00
51,000 – 100,000	21	29.2	
101,000 – 150,000	15	20.8	
151,000 – 200,000	6	8.3	
> 200,000	4	5.6	

Source: Field Survey 2016

**Table 2:** Distribution of respondents by types of decision making process ( $n = 73$ )

Statement	Yes	No
Hierarchical decision-making process	16 (22.2)	23 (31.9)
Majority decision-making process	43 (59.7)	8 (11.1)
Consensus decision-making process	19 (26.4)	16 (22.2)
Proportional decision-making process	16 (22.2)	13 (18.1)

Source: Field Survey 2016

Note: Figures in parenthesis were percentages.

### Types of Decision-Making Process

Major types of decision making process identified by the respondents were: majority decision-making process, consensus decision-making process, hierarchical decision-making process and proportional decision-making process (Table 2). The result shows that irrespective of the hierarchy in the studied organization, majority of the employees' opinion still counted, that is, all parties participated in decision-making process. For consensus decision making process, it requires a group to reach a decision that has been agreed upon by other members (Schaubroeck *et al.*, 2000). Unlike proportional decision-making where a superior or a group has a greater say than others about issues in an organisation. This is an

indication that they have stronger connection or higher level of responsibilities which has given them upper hand than other staff (Avey, 2008). Different types of decision making process identified in this study may also be connected to different organisational organogram where management staff are found at the top. Decision made at top for group of people in an organisation are later passed to other staff at lower level which is also a reflection of hierarchical decision making process (Cohen *et al.*, 1997).

### Decision-Making Process of the Employees

Decision-making process of the organisation is shown in Tables 3 and 4. A major decision process identified is that other employees' opinions make it easier to make important decisions ( $\bar{x} = 3.65$ ). This is in line with the assertion of Kemelgor (2002) that giving an employee's opportunities of contributing their ideas and suggestions in decision-making increased organisation performance may result in maximizing organisational goals. Decision makers try to meet based on members concerns ( $\bar{x} = 3.60$ ), Opinions of other staff are summarized, identified and implemented ( $\bar{x} = 3.57$ ), Administrators involve other staff even in deliberation of paramount decisions ( $\bar{x} = 3.57$ ). This result is supported by the assertion of Noah (2008) which said that decision making is a special form of delegation in which employees gain greater freedom and control in bridging gap of communication between management and workers. Also, Kemelgor (2002), Sagie and Aycan (2003), and Zivkovic *et al.* (2009) supported the result in which they are of the opinion that participation of the employees in decision making will facilitate innovation for recognition of opportunity for the organization. Also, negative and positive comments from staff is taken before making final decision ( $\bar{x} = 3.39$ ). Decisions are made by just a set of people in my organization ( $\bar{x} = 3.28$ ). Staff members collective decision supersedes sole administrator decision ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ).

This result is in line with the report of Sagie and Aycan (2003) who opined that no individual could make decision except a collective action of the group. Opinion of the superior counts more than lower level staff ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ). This result is supported by Barringer and Bleudorn (1999) that decision making involves the top management only. Interested employees are given due consideration in decision-making process ( $\bar{x} = 3.04$ ). On the other hand, my supervisors disagree with employees with better view ( $\bar{x} = 2.78$ ), important matters relating to subordinate are neglected ( $\bar{x} = 2.74$ ), suggestions of other staff in decision-making are discarded ( $\bar{x} = 2.61$ ), superior opinion cannot be changed ( $\bar{x} = 2.60$ ), decision makers only listen to those that have close relationship with them ( $\bar{x} = 2.57$ ), my supervisors

make decisions that they deem right at the expense of other staff ( $\bar{x} = 2.44$ ). This result is supported by the assertion of Abiona (2016) that most of the workers in this organisation work together before decisions are been made which also give room for open suggestions which is likely to affect the behavior of the staff positively.

**Causes of Employee's Turnover in the Study Area**

Employees turnover that was identified in the study area were: reputation of the organization ( $\bar{x} = 3.81$ ), work life imbalance on the employee ( $\bar{x} = 3.32$ ), lack of improvement on existing salary scale ( $\bar{x} = 3.19$ ). This result is line with the report of Elliot (1991) that employee productivity is high with higher salary. Another cause of employees turnover was cost of training and recruitment ( $\bar{x} = 3.18$ ). This also is in line with the finding of Beer (1981) who observed that employee turnover incurs opportunity

costs to employers that is experienced workers are replaced by new hires which may drop productivity. Inadequate training of employees ( $\bar{x} = 3.11$ ). This result corroborates the finding of Armstrong (2001) who says experience employees also improve operational processes and training of new employees. Furthermore, lack of growth opportunities ( $\bar{x} = 3.10$ ), loss of competition within the organisation ( $\bar{x} = 2.78$ ) were among other causes identified. This result is supported by Becker *et al.* (1997) who noted that departure of one employee may result to mistake in the work performed by those taking over. This situation may occur when individual taking over lacks the requisite skills to perform the job or is overburdened by work in his or her substantive position. Organisational instability ( $\bar{x} = 2.71$ ), inadequate skill of the employee ( $\bar{x} = 2.07$ ) are other types identified.

**Table 3:** Distribution of respondents by types of decision-making process ( $n = 73$ )

Statement	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean	Std dev
Other employees opinions make it easier to make important decisions	6(8.3)	10(13.9)	10(13.9)	23(21.9)	23(21.9)	3.65	1.29
Decision makers try to meet concerns of all staff members as much as possible	4(5.6)	9(12.5)	14(19.4)	30(41.7)	15(20.8)	3.60	1.12
Opinion of other staff are summarized and the best is identified and implemented	12(16.7)	5(6.9)	3(4.2)	34(47.2)	18(25.0)	3.57	1.38
Administrators involve other staff even in deliberation of paramount decisions	10(13.9)	5(6.9)	12(16.7)	24(33.3)	21(29.2)	3.57	1.35
Underlying issues as well as issues everyone can see are dealt with before final decision is made	8(11.1)	9(12.5)	4(5.6)	43(59.7)	8(11.1)	3.47	1.19
Negative and positive comments from staff is taken before making final decision	10(13.9)	10(13.9)	11(15.3)	24(33.3)	17(23.6)	3.39	1.36
Decisions are made by just a set of people in my organization	17(23.6)	8(11.1)	8(11.1)	16(22.2)	23(31.9)	3.28	1.59
Staff members collective decision supersedes sole administrator decision	7(9.7)	17(23.6)	11(15.3)	24(33.3)	13(18.4)	3.26	1.28
A group of employee in the top level have greater say than their contemporary on issues that concern other employees	10(13.9)	24(33.3)	6(8.3)	8(11.1)	24(33.3)	3.17	1.53
Interested employees are given due consideration in decision making process	4(5.6)	18(25.0)	19(26.4)	23(31.9)	6(8.3)	3.04	1.18
My supervisors never agree on who has the better point of view among them	10(13.9)	23(31.9)	21(29.2)	9(12.5)	9(12.5)	2.78	1.21
My supervisors neglect important matters relating to their subordinate	10(13.9)	28(38.9)	10(13.9)	19(26.4)	5(6.9)	2.74	1.20
My supervisors neglect the suggestions of other staff members in decision making	16(22.2)	22(30.6)	15(20.8)	12(16.7)	7(9.7)	2.61	1.27
My supervisors poor decisions cannot be changed by other staff members	19(26.4)	25(34.7)	2(2.8)	18(25.0)	8(11.1)	2.60	1.40
Decision makers only listen to those that have close relationship with them	23(31.9)	18(25.0)	11(15.3)	7(9.7)	13(18.1)	2.57	1.48
My supervisors make decisions that feel right to them at the expense of other staff	11(15.3)	30(41.7)	20(27.8)	10(13.9)	1(1.4)	2.44	0.96

**Source:** Field Survey 2016. Note: Figures in parenthesis were percentages.  
SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, Std dev - Standard Deviation

**Table 4:** Distribution of the employees by turnover ( $n = 73$ )

Statement	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean	Std dev
Overall organisational reputation	10(13.9)	5(6.9)	1(1.4)	29(40.3)	27(37.5)	3.81	1.38
Work life imbalance on the employee of this organisation	10(13.9)	15(20.8)	8(11.1)	20(27.8)	19(26.4)	3.32	1.42
Lack of improvement on existing salary scale	18(25.0)	3(4.2)	16(22.2)	17(23.6)	18(25.0)	3.19	1.51
Cost of training and recruitment	24(30.6)	4(5.6)	7(9.4)	17(23.6)	22(30.6)	3.18	1.66
Inadequate training of employee	16(22.2)	14(19.4)	2(2.8)	26(36.1)	14(19.4)	3.11	1.50
Lack of growth opportunity	9(12.5)	12(16.7)	28(38.9)	9(12.5)	14(19.4)	3.10	2.26
Loss of competition within the organisation	6(8.3)	14(19.4)	18(25.0)	18(25.0)	8(11.1)	2.78	1.48
Organisational instability	11(15.3)	12(16.7)	17(23.6)	11(15.3)	13(18.1)	2.71	1.61
Inadequate skill of the employee	31(43.1)	23(21.9)	9(12.5)	59(12.5)	22(30.6)	2.07	1.30
Lack of timely delivery of work by employee	19(26.4)	21(29.2)	16(22.2)	6(8.3)	2(2.8)	1.99	1.24

**Source:** Field Survey 2016. Note: Figures in parenthesis were percentages.  
SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, Std dev - Standard Deviation

**Challenges Faced by Employees (n = 73)**

Table 5 shows respondent’s opinion based on the challenges that affect decision making process and employees turnovers in the studied area. Major challenges identified were: Employees expectations were not met ( $\bar{x} = 2.47$ ), conflict among employees ( $\bar{x} = 2.38$ ), unfavorable decision making process ( $\bar{x} = 2.35$ ), job insecurity ( $\bar{x} = 2.22$ ), Insufficient training to carry out duties ( $\bar{x} = 2.22$ ). This result is in line with the assertion of Adeniji (2011) that if member of staff are not well trained it will definitely affect the organisation goals. Other notable challenges were unfavorable government policy ( $\bar{x} = 2.13$ ), lack of motivation ( $\bar{x} = 2.11$ ), lack of transparency and accountability ( $\bar{x} = 2.06$ ), employees are underpaid ( $\bar{x} = 2.00$ ).

**Hypothesis of the Study**

The result of regression in Table 6 shows that age of the employees had coefficient 0.041 and significant at 5 percent level of probability. The

coefficient of age indicates that economic age of the respondents tends to increase the rate at which they participate in decision making process in the studied organisation. Sex was found to have a positive coefficient (0.034) and significant at 5 percent level of probability. These results also corroborate the earlier finding that there are more male than female employees working in the studied organization. This will enable the male employees to make a reasonable decision without any family conflict. Also, income also found to have a coefficient (0.048) and also significant at 1 percent level of probability. This implies that increase in income will increase employees’ turnover. Decision making process had a positive coefficient (0.023) with employee’s turnover and was statically significant at 5% level of probability. Decision making of the superior can be a proxy for employees turnover thus one expected management should able be to handle technical issues relating to staff and this will reduce the employee’s turnover. On the other hand challenges had a coefficient (0.023) and significant at 1% of probability.

**Table 5:** Distribution of respondents by challenges faced in the study area (n = 73)

Statement	N	NS	S	VS	Mean	Std dev
My expectations were met after I joined this organisation	15(20.5)	10(13.9)	21(29.2)	20(27.8)	2.47	1.32
Supervisory conflict with employees often occur	9(12.5)	22(30.6)	18(25.0)	16(22.2)	2.38	1.24
The type of decision making process implemented in this organisation is not favorable	19(26.4)	11(15.3)	16(22.2)	20(27.8)	2.35	1.35
Insufficient training to carry out duties	10(13.9)	26(36.1)	22(30.6)	8(11.1)	2.22	1.09
There is job insecurity in this organisation	21(29.2)	15(20.8)	15(20.8)	16(22.2)	2.22	1.28
Unfavorable government policy	15(20.8)	20(27.8)	14(19.4)	14(19.4)	2.13	1.30
Lack of motivation	19(26.4)	16(22.2)	19(26.4)	11(15.3)	2.11	1.24
Lack of transparency and accountability	21(29.2)	21(29.2)	11(15.3)	13(18.1)	2.06	1.23
Employees are underpaid	17(23.6)	18(25.0)	21(29.2)	7(9.7)	2.00	1.20
The work environment is not conducive	20(27.8)	30(41.7)	13(18.1)	5(6.9)	1.93	0.98
Employees are unappreciated in this organisation	27(37.5)	14(19.4)	15(20.8)	9(12.5)	1.89	1.22
Inadequate communication	24(33.3)	19(26.4)	10(13.9)	11(15.3)	1.89	1.24

**Source:** Field Survey 2016. Note: Figures in parenthesis were percentages.  
 N - Not at all; NS - Not severe; S - Severe; VS - Very severe; Std dev - Standard deviation

**Table 6:** Contribution of independent variables to employee’s job turnover

Variables	Standard error	Coefficient	t	Sig
(Constant)	7.610		3.328	.001
Sex	1.838	-.014	-.117	.034
Educational status	.973	-.172	-1.210	.231
Marital status	1.577	.082	.610	.544
Religion	1.652	.017	.148	.883
Age	.266	-.079	-.615	.041
Rank	.993	-.228	-1.658	.025
Income	.000	.145	1.026	.048
Decision making process	.106	-.021	-.177	.023
Challenges	.090	.476	4.208	.000
R <sup>2</sup>	0.277			
R	0.526			
F ratio	2.598			

**Source:** Field Survey 2016

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

From this study, it was found that decision making process affect the rate of employees’ turnover which indicates that if the decision making process is not favorable employees commitment to their job will be reduced. Also, top-down decision making is the most prominent all the decision-making processes implemented in the organisation. That is, decision making is more of bottom-up than top-down, hence employees are part of the planning/implementation of various activities in the organisation and so they do not feel neglected. Based on this, the following recommendations were made:

- The organisation should meet the expectations of the employees.

- Decision making should cut across all levels in the organisation, improving communication and participation among all employees and thus reducing the rate of employees' turnover in the organization.
- The organisation should improve on the overall organisational reputation so as to add more value to the organization.
- Growth opportunities in terms of training are highly recommended.
- Finally the organisation should identify factors affecting employees' turnover and find possible solutions.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The author appreciates the cooperation of the entire staff of the Institute of Agricultural Research and Training (IAR&T) Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria during the research.

### **REFERENCES**

- Abiona, B.G. (2016). Decision styles and organisation behaviour: Implication for academia in research institutes, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Moor plantation* 17 (1): 15-22
- Adeniji, G.A. (2011). *Assessment of Organizational Conflict in Agricultural Research Institutes in Oyo State, Nigeria*. Unpublished M.Agric. Thesis submitted to the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria
- Agnes, M. (1999). *Webster's New World College Dictionary* (4th Edition). New York: Macmillan USA
- Armstrong, M. (2001). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management and Practice*, 8th Edition. Bath Press Ltd
- Avey, J.B., West, B.J. and Crossley, C.D. (2008). The association between ethnic congruence in the supervisor subordinate dyad and subordinate organisational position and salary. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 81: 551-566
- Barringer, B.R. and Bluedorn, A.C. (1999). The Relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 421-444
- Becker, B.E. (1997). Human resources as a source of shareholder value: research and recommendations. *Human Resource Management*, 36 (1): 39-47
- Beer, M. (1981). Performance appraisal: dilemmas and possibilities. *Organization Dynamics*, 9 (1): 24-36
- Cohen, S., Chang, L. and Ledford, G. (1997). A Hierarchical construct of self-management leadership and its relationship to quality of work life and perceived work group effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 50: 275-308
- Elliot, R.F. (1991). *Labour Economics*. McGraw Hill, Maidenhead
- FAO. (1997). Review of the state of World Aquaculture. FAO Fisheries Cir. 886 (Rev.1)
- Fapojuwu, O.E. (2010). Influence of socio-economic characteristic on modern cassava processor in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Sociological Science*, 24 (1): 43-50
- Glebbeeck, A.C. and Bax, E.H. (2004). Is high employee turnover really harmful? An empirical test using company records. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47: 277-286
- Kemelgor, B.H. (2002). A comparative analysis of corporate entrepreneurial orientation between selected firms in the Netherlands and the USA. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 14: 67-87
- Lee, K.J. and Yu, K. (2004). Corporate culture and organisational performance. *Journal of Management Psychology*, 19 (4): 340-359
- Management Study Guide (2016). Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM), Erasmus University Rotterdam. Internet: www.erim.eur.nl
- Noah, Y. (2008). A study of worker participation in management decision making within selected establishments in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science*, 17 (1): 31-39
- Ongori, H. (2007). A review of the literature on employees' turnover. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4: 49-54
- Onu, M.O., Madukwe, M.C. and Agwu, A.E. (2005). Factors affecting job satisfaction of front-line extension workers in Enugu State Agricultural Development Programme. *Agro-Science*, 4 (2): 19-22
- Price, J.L. (1977). *The Study of Turnover*, 1st Edition. Iowa State University Press, IA pp. 10-25
- Sagie, A. and Aycan, Z. (2003). A cross-cultural analysis of participative decision-making in organizations. *Human Relations*, 56 (4): 453-473
- Schaubroeck-Wood, A. (1995). How trade hurt unskilled workers. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9 (3): 57-80
- Zivkovic, Z., Mihajlovic, I. and Prvulovic, S. (2009). Developing motivational model as a strategy for HRM in small enterprises under transitional economy. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 4 (1): 1-27