



## **Management Theories and the Nigerian Work Organisation**

**Ebipiri Mahlon Timi, Dr Jasmine Okponanabofa Tamunosiki-Amadi, Baridei  
Tonbra**

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island,  
Bayelsa State. Nigeria

### **Abstract:**

The study aim to understand the possible adoption of management theories in the Nigerian work organisation. The research was done to have a better understanding of the universality in the application of management theories and principles despite cultural differences among nations which might influence the behavioural aspect of management within various context. To achieve the objective of this study an exploratory research design was used, analysis and discussion were based on existing literature of various research, books and reports related to the topic. The study considered just three (division of work, discipline and scalar chain of hierarchy) of the Fayol's fourteen principles of management. Also, three of the Hofstede cultural dimension: power distance, individualism and uncertainty avoidance. Findings from the work shows that division of work and scalar chain of hierarchy are effectively implemented and practiced in Nigerian organisation which promotes organisational performance. However, it was discovered that there is a high level of indiscipline in the Nigerian work organisation as a result of some environmental factors such as tribalism, ethnicity etc. Therefore, managers should effectively implement these principles for the realisation of set goals in the organisation.

**Key words:** Management, Culture, Organisation and Management theories

### **1. Introduction**

The concept of management has been in existence as old as man. However, the construct has drawn the attention of scholars from different field such as Henri Fayol (engineering), F.W. Taylor (engineering), Elton Mayo (Psychologist) etc to proffer solutions to the surrounding issues in organisation such as: productivity, employee motivation, remuneration, rewards etc (John, 2015).

**Citation:** Ebipiri Mahlon Timi, Dr Jasmine Tamunosiki-Amadi, Baridei Tonbra, Management Theories and the Nigerian Work Organisation, *International Journal of Current Business and Social Sciences*. 8 (1), 01-16, (2022).

Also, the evolution of management theories from the scientific to the modern school of thought resulted from the prevailing circumstance within the business organisation. However, various scholars identified challenges in different enterprises within their context and recommended theories and principles (Hannagan, 2005). These recommendations were to aid solve organisational problems to achieve maximum efficiency and effectiveness across variables within the work organisation.

Furthermore, the push for industrialisation and economics of scale amounted with the expanding trade/markets, growing population resulted to mass production via mechanised and systematic process. This led to diversity of organisational challenges in different context. As such, the traditional theories of management were developed in various countries to meet with the prevailing challenges of industrial revolution: promotion of greater efficiency, formal relations among an organisation's departments, productivity among workers (Sunday & Ayodele, 2015). These theories are categories into three which are scientific management, administrative management and bureaucratic management. The theories were all development between 1890s to early 1990s, however, the primary focus was increasing productivity within the factories where they operated in different context (Angus, 2015). Hence, in America, F.W Taylor (1856-1915) concentrated on the work rather than the structure or worker, introduced a piece rate system with an assumption that people work only to get wages. Thus, both managers and workers are to divide work into task to enable the use of minimum energy to achieve maximum output. This created room for authoritarian management which is tailored at maximum productivity with little or no consideration for the human capital of the organisation.

Henri Fayol (1916) a French trained engineer, in his position as a manager identified fourteen principles of management which he believed would solve the challenges of low productivity. This was designed to function effectively in single purpose and relatively stable environment. However, Drucker (1989) pointed out that most organisations have multiple purposes which warrant that they respond to changes within the environment. This implies that, working in the confines of these fourteen principles might be too rigid in a dynamic environment for the actualisation of set objectives. As such, Steiner & Steiner (2015) claims that the business environment across countries are dynamic, hence, it requires flexibility of strategies and policy for survival, competitiveness and growth among business organisations. Nonetheless, Fayol proposed 14 principle as a rule for managerial effectiveness and efficiency within the French context which is known greatly for respect to rules and structures (Hofstede, 2017). It entails that adoption of such rules and adherence to them would not be a challenge among managers operating in France as the culture makes provision for such practices. However, Adam and Suleiman (2018) argued that the application of Fayol's principles of management is essential to achieve set goals and organisations might experience difficulties if these principles are not adopted regardless of the context and industry. Also, Adeagbo, Mohammed & Abdulkadir (2019) analysed Henri Fayol's 14 principles of management and pointed out that there is significant correlation between the application of these principles for the management of human resources in a construction site. Thus, these principles might be of great benefit to any organisation across the globe if applied for the achievement of set goals.

It's been identified that management functions and roles across culture are similar for the achievement of set goals for either a manager or supervisor irrespective of the organisation (Hick & Gullet, 1981). Also, Koontz & O'Donnel (1980) pointed out that management functions and practices

are universal and the possibility of transfer of management approaches from one nation to another and from one organisation even to another. Hence, the convergence of management practices among countries and organisation despite difference in context and values within settings.

Furthermore, on the bases of the inefficiency and ineffectiveness in the universal application of the different principles of management pioneered by the scientific and classical school of thought, Eltyon Mayor conducted an experiment on different work groups to examine what stimulates employee performance. The study discovered that intangible rewards, group acceptance, loss of group approval greatly influences worker's performance. This immensely inspired behaviourist into the development of motivational theories to solve problems of human relations and work place behaviour with an organisation this include hygiene theory (Herberg, 1974), Social system theory (Emery & Trist, 1960) and Hierarchy of needs (Maslow,1987). Notwithstanding, these theories failed to address the managers influence on the adopted approach to employee motivation and outcome. As suggested by McGregor (2006) who claimed that a manager's understanding of an employee's approach to work would determine the motivational incentive. In this light, Burns and Stalker (1994) argued that a manager's personal style was an essential variable in the success for technological companies. Hence, there might be biases to the motivational incentive adopted for different individuals in an organisation as to what stimulate A, B and C at different intervals could vary. There seem to be a disjoint in the effectiveness of the various theories of management across different environment against the presumed universality to the application of these thought. This implies that different variables across nations might propel level of divergence of managerial principles among nations and the acceptance of the theories. As such, Farmer and Richman (199) concluded in their research on comparative management that it will be difficult to introduce management methods in societies with strong cultural influence on behaviour. This is because culture defines the entirety of an individual from the general society to even to the organisation. Hofstede (2001) defines culture as the collective programming of the mind, life, and belief of individuals in a society which differentiate one from the other. Also, societal culture is perceived to directly influence organisational culture through values, motives of organisational members and religious principles (House, Javidan, Hanges & Dorfman, 2002). These shared variables from the culture often plays within the organisation since behaviour of an employee is a formation of the surrounding factors within the environment. Hence, culture shapes the way of life of individuals within the organisation and the organisation itself. Because the humans factor of the firm immensely coordinate the rest factors of production to the actualisation of set goal (Armstrong, 2008). Therefore, societal culture directly patterns how employees behave which at a long run crops into the work organisation and influences the way things are done.

Despite the development of the management theories and adoption across the globe there are still challenges of slow growth, dissatisfaction, demotivation, labour turnover and increase in waste among Nigerian organisations (Ancichebe & Agu, 2013). Hence, this might be from inappropriate application of the theories within the Nigerian society or environment which could have resulted to failure in achieving the purposes of the different theories despite the context. However, Ekeg et al (2009) claimed that culture is an essential element within the organisation which significantly impact on the level of organisational productivity. Similarly, Hofstede (2001) argued that there is an interplay between human nature, culture, human behaviour and values which is a major reason for the variance in managerial practices. This implies that the national culture is a principle factor to the application of management theories. Therefore, culture should be considered in the application of the management theories across various context. However, the development of an indigenous management theories to

the achievement of organisational goals has not be a success. This is because, scholars within the African society are faced with challenges such as inadequate fund, lack of sponsors etc. (Akpor-Robaro,2018). It is against this backdrop that this research aim to examine the possible adoption of management theories in the Nigerian work organisation using culture as mediating variable to investigate this. In addition, it will consider the trending challenges and proffer recommendation via findings. To achieve the objective this study, the Henri Fayol theory of management and Hofstede cultural dimension which will form the theoretical framework as not all theories of management can be extensively examined in a study of this kind.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

The industrial revolution created an opportunity for the mass production via mechanised and systematic process. In the quest to solve identified issues such as inefficiency, low productivity, tasks and processes and formal relations among an organisation's departments, within the work organisation various theories where developed. The scientific, administrative and bureaucratic where the first theories of management pioneered by work engineers assumed the worker are rational people and will consider economic gain in every given opportunity. Hence, aim was to boost production and achieve efficiency by developing work place principles. These theories are classified as the classical school of thought in management. However, Cole (2004) pointed out that on the bases of criticism and the limitation of the theories to ensure universal application, more theories were developed which are neoclassical theory of management (Hawthorne Experiment, Human relations movement and organisational behaviour), Modern management theory (system approach, contingency approach and quantity theory). Hence, the ability to fully adopt a particular management theory could be limited to some cultural variable across context (Hofstede 2001). It implies that culture is identified as a major determinant of organisational practices such as leadership, performance management, motivation etc. Culture is described as the way of life a people which determines to a great extent the totality of their organisation, practices and ethics (Kotter & Heskett, 1992 and Schein, 1995). Therefore, the adoption of managerial practices from one organisation to another or one country to another might be interfered by culture. On the bases of these lapses the administrative school of management will be examined alongside culture of the Nigerian society. Thus, the Hofstede dimension of culture will be used as the theoretical framework to the investigated culture in the Nigerian work organisation.

### **The Henri Fayol Management theory**

To achieve the objective of this study the Henri Fayol fourteen principles of management will be adopted because it enables a better understanding of management within any context (Shiela, 2020). Fayol was a French engineer whose focused was to the personal duties of management. He believed that management has five basic roles which are to; plan, organise, command, co-ordinate and control (Fayol, 1949). Also, Fayol developed fourteen principles: division of labour, centralisation, authority, hierarchy, discipline, order, unity of command, equity, unity of direction, stability of staff, subordination of individual interest, initiative, remuneration, and Espirit de corps. His theorising was about administration developed from personal observation and experience of what worked in the organisations which he was familiar with (Daniel, 2009). Additionally, managers must be involved in the application of certain functions such as planning, organising, leading, staffing and controlling to effective utilise organisational resources (Fells, 2000). This demands effective communication,

motivation, and leadership to utilise organisational scarce resource for the attainment of set goals. Hence, the convergence of such managerial practices across nations regardless of variance in culture and other determining variables. This brings the clause of the possibility of attaining optimisation with same principles in some different organisation outside what Fayol used as the bases to build such principles. Irrespective of the variance across context Fayol's principles has been greatly adopted by managers across the globe to control cost of production and attain efficiency in managerial functions (Angus, 2014., Witzel, 2003 & Wren., Bedeian & Breeze, 2002). Additionally, management researchers claim that Fayol's 14 principles have transformed the present-day organisation as most organisation today in some ways implement these principles (Achinivu, Okwu, Wey, Akpan & Fasan, 2017). This describes the relevance of the Fayol's theory to the modern organisation in attainment of set goals regardless of cross-cultural difference which creeps into the organisation. Considering the Fayol's principles as the bases of analysing this study only three principles will be extensively examined in relation to the Nigerian work organisation. Because, a single variable can be considered to have proper understanding of the relationship between the concepts (Creswell, 2014).

## **CULTURE**

Every society is known by their norm, values, sets and communication which is bedded in its culture. Schein (1990) defines culture as the collection of different values and behaviours which might be regarded as a principle to success. Also, Savignon & Sysoyev (2002) defined culture as the establishment of a system of beliefs, meanings, customs, norms etc which is handed over from one generation to another identified in every groups, organisation and setting across context. Therefore, culture is an important instrument which shapes the daily behavioural conduct of individuals within the work organisation. it also implies that culture is knowledge, beliefs, behaviour and communication at every time and place. However, the variable which defines what is acceptable across setting might defer on the bases of cultural variance among nations. Notwithstanding, the concept of culture and cross cultural management and implication on management have been extensively analyses by different scholars: Hall (1990), Hofstede (2001), Trumpenaars (1997), Schein (1990) etc. These scholars were able to identify variable that explains culture and managerial implication across nations. However, the Hofstede dimension will be used to examine as the theoretical framework for culture in this study. Because it provides precise reasons for distinction in culture among regions and countries in the globe (Mashal & Saima, 2014). Although, its faced with criticism which is not different from any other theory across disciplines. Hence, the Hofstede dimension of culture will be explicitly unveiled below.

### **Hofstede Cultural Dimension**

The variance in the managerial practices among different environment may result to undesirable consequences because of culture (Francesco and Gold, 2005). Hence, it is of great importance to understand culture and cross-cultural differences. As such, Hofstede (1980) carried out a cross-cultural study in 50 countries and 3 regions of IBM multinational company in other to identify the basic difference among national cultures. Hofstede identify four dimensions which are uncertainty avoidance, power distance, individualism-collectivism and masculinity-femininity. However, they were extended to include long-term versus short term orientation (Naija, Jurica & Vjekoslav, 2006). Nigeria has a high index of 80% on power distance, 60% on masculinity, 55% uncertainty avoidance, 16% on long term orientation and 30% on individualism. These variables substantially explain dominate culture in any society which influence other aspect of life within the context. Notwithstanding this

study would consider just three of the dimensions which are uncertainty avoidance, power distance and individualism. This is because not all variables can be extensively examined in a single research of this kind (Creswell, 2014). Also for a better understanding of the relationship between the dimensions and management theories in the Nigerian work organisation.

### **Power Distance**

This dimension explains the extent to which individuals in a context accept and expect that power is unequally distributed (Hofstede, 2001). The power parity could be high or low depending on what is acceptable with the society. This could affect employee's reaction in a particular way towards his supervisor, rules and regulation. As such, in a low power distance society employees accept responsibility because they believe it's the right thing and the best way to get things done (Hofstede, 2001). Hence, in a high-power distance society employees perform their task because their manager or supervisor are around and require high level of instructions and supervision. Also, organisations within a high-power distance society are characterised by large number of superior supervisor, centralised authority, many hierarchical levels etc. on the other hand, countries with low power distance are known to have small proportion of supervisory staff, lack of acceptance of authority and decentralised decision making etc. Examples of high power distance society includes Brazil, China, Nigeria etc and low power distance countries are Denmark, Austria, USA (Hofstede, 2001).

### **Uncertainty avoidance**

This is the extent to which members of a society feels threatened by unforeseen and unknown circumstance (Hofstede, 2001). It indicates the degree of acceptance and threat of ambiguous situations and the extent to which they try to avoid or face uncertain situations. Societies with high uncertainty avoidance, individuals are concerned about security and feel absolute need for written rules and mostly likely not to take risks. on the contrary, a low uncertainty avoidance society reflect lesser degree for security, rules and are more likely to take risk (Hofstede, 1980). A high uncertainty avoidance index indicate respect for authority, standardised procedures, avoidance of risk etc. on the contrary, a low uncertainty avoidance society is characterised by flexibility, promotion based on merit, risk taking, tolerance of differing behaviours an opinion etc. Examples of countries with high uncertainty avoidance are Portugal, Japan, China, Greece etc and those with low uncertainty avoidance are Britain, Ireland, USA etc (Hofstede, 2001).

### **Individualism Versus Collectivism**

Individualism explains a society where ties are loosed between persons (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, people are expected to look after themselves which promotes competitiveness among individuals within that context. On the other hand, collectivism refers to a society where individuals are integrated into groups from birth that leads to high level of loyalty (2001). As such, from the index, some countries tend to be low, others high and some in the middle (Hofsteds, 1980). Societies with collectivist culture are characterised with shared resources, ability to sacrifice individual interest to group interest, member of the group, Collectivistic countries include China, Nigeria and India etc. and there is high level of loyalty which makes provision for autocratic leadership. Also, members are controlled through external social pressure-shame and individualism does that vial internal pressure-guilt.



Source: Hofstede and Minkov (2005)

### **The Nigerian Work Organisation**

Individuals work in different units and departments known as organisation. Aluko, (2003) defined organisation as the structure for carrying out responsibilities on a regular basis by people. However, organisation do not work in a vacuum it exists in an environment which influenced by cultural or socio-cultural variables. Employees work within the confines of the organisation to achieve set goal, nevertheless, work attitude and behaviour is influenced by level of cultural factors from the environment. To this end, Ahiauzu (1986) argued that the patterns of employee behaviour and management styles in an organisation is greatly restricted to cultural influence. In Nigeria, the work organisation is characterised by some traits from employees that make both private and public enterprise exhibit similar attitude, norms and values. Such attributes include respect for loyalty, leaders, obedience and acceptance of hierarchy within the society also in the workplace (Joshua, Marc & Tess, 2019). These attitudes of individuals in the environment as evidence in the culture also play out inside the organisation. As such, organisational culture gives a better explanation to the level of similarity in culture and what is obtainable inside the firm as well.

The Nigerian organisation is characterised by a high level of indiscipline among employees and management (Ochai, 1984). Such behaviours include; lack of commitment, refusing to accept responsibility, tribalism, drunkenness, embezzlement, misuse of organisational property and loafing. These are referred to as unethical act or act of indiscipline within the organisation. According to Osezua, Abah & Gbervbie (2009) indiscipline is the condition of disorderliness, lack of respect for rules and regulations and disregard for organisational norms and ethic. Hence, the work environment is characterised by some level of discipline despite employee's level of obedience and loyalty cropped from the culture.

On the other hand, Joshua, Marc & Tess, (2019) study revealed that there are factors that are responsible for indiscipline among Nigerian worker. Such factors include; management, socio-cultural, economic and socio-political factors. Additionally, Baridam & Nwibere (2008) noted that introduction of change in Nigerian organisation is often faced with a high level of difficulty. This is because

employees view the future as uncertain which and such changes with the setting might affect their coping ability, competencies and usually resist change except it has a personal benefit if done. Thus, the drive to introduce change in every aspect of the organisation becomes an issue for manager (Obiekwe & Lawrence, 2020).

### **Division of Work and the Nigerian Work Organisation**

Fayol described the first principle of management as division of labour. By this, he refers to a state of job specialisation, division of work, task, responsibilities into smaller element (Uzuegbu & Nnadozie, 2015). Fayol claimed that the ability of every single employee to carry out an individual responsibility at a time will ensure efficiency and effectiveness. Similarly, the system theory argues that the organisational effectiveness is a function of the collective effort from the units (Johnson, Kast & Rosenzweig, 1964). This is done via division of labour across department, units and employees in the organisation. An application of this within some socio-cultural setting such as France where it was built could produce maximum result, as the culture makes provision for such.

However, Millian & Gonzalez (as cited in Kumar and Bihar, 2015) argued that the universal application of management theories is limited to cultural boundary across nations. Hence, the transferability of management principle such as division of labour between countries might be difficult and undergo some level of moderation by the culture of the environment. Thus, Culture is the major source of managerial differences between developed and developing countries (Hoskisson, Eden, Lau & Wright, 2000). Culture describes the general way of life of a people, which obviously could be different across countries. This implies that practices among nations might vary because of cultural influence on the way and manner things are done individually and in groups. As such, Barret and Brass (1976) claimed that managerial behaviour in developed and developing countries are a function of cultural differences. On the contrary, Nigerian is a collectivist society, hence, people are tired to groups and believes in dependence of one another for the achievement of a given task. (Kovacic, 2005). Therefore, the adoption of division of labour might be possible as individuals often take responsibilities in groups that could be divided into various units for the achievement of set goals. As the principle suggest that work should be divided among individuals to avoid overloading, adequate utilisation of potentials, ensure concentration and efficiency. Research by Maryam (2017) Shows that the application of Henri Fayol's managerial principle of division of work would be of great benefit to management in secondary schools. Also, the study identified the practical implement of this principle across various stakeholders in secondary schools. Additionally, Abdulkadir, Adeagbo, Mohammed & Nurudeen (2020) studies shows that division of labour is effective in the management objective of building construction projects. Despite the variance in culture, employees embraced this principle which is affirmed to be effective in the attain of set goals in the various organisations. On the contrary, Uzuegbu (2015) study indicates that current management practices in Nigeria libraries no longer support Fayol's principle of division of work, as staff are often reshuffle in a way to start fresh task. The division of work principle is in the sense that job should not be done by all staff at a time. To achievement optimum result employees should be assigned different responsibilities at a time for a collective result. Hence, reshuffle of different staff from one job to another is also an aspect of division to prevent fatigue and ensure organisational learning through interaction with one another (Wang & Ahmed, 2003).



### **Discipline and the Nigerian Work Organisation**

This principle aims at promoting a strict adherence to clearly-defined rules and regulations by employees in an organisation. As such, Fayol's (1949) identified the natural tendencies of the human behaviour to be lawless if strict guidance by norms, regulations and rules are not set within an organisation. It implies that for the achievement of set goals within an organisation regardless of the context and organisational policy, strict rules would enable the effective and efficient realisation of set goals. On the other hand, Ajumogobia (2007) argued that discipline is not strict and technical observance of rules and regulation for the survival of an organisation. Instead, it is an atmosphere where workers are expected to collaborate and behave in a normal and orderly way. However, to achieve set objectives in an organisation certain level of behaviour is expected from employees which can be tailored via rules and regulations for optimal performance. As such, Torrington and Chapman (1979) posit that discipline refers to keeping order and control among some set of employees through procedures that builds morals and obedience as demanded in the structure of the firm. Nevertheless, the success of this principle within the Nigerian society and work environment might face some challenges as a result of some factors such as; socio-cultural, management, economic and socio-political which patterns the way employee's response to organisational rules and regulation. Onah (1995) pointed out that there is a high rate of indiscipline within Nigerian enterprises among staff. Also, Magama (2006) noted that discipline is the most complicated and unpleasant aspect of an organisation for worker to comply with. This claims of inappropriate behaviour from employees within the Nigerian work environment where tied to late release of funds for salary payment which prompt predispose acts of indiscipline. Thus, leading to attitude such as, indolence, absenteeism, and other unruliness in the organisation.

These are predisposed factors within the Nigerian society that influences the way and manner things are done even inside the work organisation despite the set objective of the principle of discipline. Nevertheless, the Hofstede index of uncertainty avoidance shows Nigeria has a high score of 55% which indicate avoidance of risk and adherence to rules and regulations. Being a society with such score, it is expected that individuals would comply with standards. On the contrary, the Nigerian society known to violate set standards and policy (Chidiebere, 2010). Additionally, Tega (2012) pointed out that in the Nigerian society, formal rules and regulations are often disregarded and are only obeyed if people think they are essential. Hence, there is a tendency for high level of indiscipline among Nigerian employees in the work organisation. This tend to contradict Fayol's principle of discipline and the universal application of management principles. Furthermore, Kiggundu (1988) claims that the African society and culture are not interested in managerial rules thus, they have a high degree of uncertainty avoidance and would prefer little managerial direction, routines and secureness. In addition, many government policies and rules have been violated and neglected by stakeholders across states in the country (Eze, 1995). Therefore, the possibility of convergence in the application of management theories across nations might not be realistic since different variable rooted in culture and society could determine the level adoption of such practices in various context. Thus, there might be a tendency for the objection of the rules and regulation set among organisations within the Nigerian work environment being contrary to the assumptions of the Fayol's principles. Nevertheless, Magama (2006) suggested effective communication as tool for effective implementation of discipline in an organisation there. Also, discipline can be attained via proper supervision, monitoring at all level of the organisation and managers should be discipline to inculcate such behaviour on subordinate (Uzuegbu & Nnadozie, 2015). Furthermore, Ubah, Onyebueke & Omodu (2019) noted that discipline is essential

for attainment of growth and high performance in Nigerian organisation. Therefore, despite the high level of discipline in Nigerian organisation strict compliance to rules by superiors might promote collective efforts by employees which is a necessity for the achievement of set goals.

### **Scalar Chain of Authority and the Nigerian Work Organisation**

This aspect of the principles holds that there should be a single flow of instruction from top to lower level. In every organisation hierarchy is represented as each employee reports directly to a superior or may contact another manager for the purpose of emergency without distorting the flow of authority from top to bottom (Andulkadir, Adeagbo & Mohammed, 2020). The Nigerian culture is described to be highly power distance which creates an avenue for respect and acceptance of hierarchy within the organisation and society at large (Hofstede, 2005). There is a great level of followership, loyalty, and obedience to superiors or leaders. Thus, the adoption of scalar chain might not be a challenge within this context as the culture makes provision for respect to superiors and people of higher Cardale in a socio setting. Additionally, Iwuji (1968) described the traditional Nigerian society as highly hierarchical with an organised communal work form, male dominated leadership, and long term oriented-resource management by heads of families to assure the constant provision of housing, food and security, to members of the family both external and internal. In the Nigerian culture children are obligated to obey their parents and seniors and any attempt to confront them is regarded as an offence which might attract some level of punishment. This is also seen within the work organisation as superiors and managers are given more preference than subordinates who are also mandated to obey them to the later (Tega, 2012). Hence, the acceptance of the principle of scalar chain within the Nigerian work organisation is feasible as culture might promote an easy adoption.

Given the possible applicability of the scalar chain principle in a cross-cultural setting, it will also not be inappropriate to consider the effectiveness of its application in an organisation. To this end Uzuegu & Nnadozie (2015) argued that a horizontal or flat arrangement or hierarchy enables a faster decision making. In this lights, Braham (1989) argues that a three-layer organisational hierarchy works faster and better than twelve-layer hierarchy. Additionally, a research conducted in a US-based organizations reveals that one-layer hierarchy systems works better than those who adapted a three-layer system and above (Hinterhuber & Popp 1992). The environmental factor might have contributed to the attainment of such level of impact via a flat organisational hierarchy. because the cultural variable individualism intervenes even with the organisation of any US organisation

On a contrary, in Nigerian work constitutes a high level of hierarchy as culturally the power distance intensifies factors such as status, age and class. To this end, Mofope (2013) noted that most organisational structure in Nigeria are hierarchical both private and public. On March 13, 2013, a Nigerian security and civil defence Lagos commandant was interviewed and asked to provide important information of the organisation for the benefit of viewers which were assumed to be fake websites. He maintained that he cannot realise such detail without the permission of his boss (Kareem 2013). Power distance in the culture is high and prevalent even in the work organisation. This fosters ineffectiveness in the realisation of organisational goal (Mofope, 2013). Nevertheless, studies reveal that managers in high power distance society tend to engage the rules and procedure than those in low-power distance context (Peterson and Smith, 1995). Being that subordinates are often loyal to superiors. However, this allows every subordinate to have a direct relationship with his or her superior, hence order and equity is attained as each employee will be given equal attention in the organisation (Maryam, 2017).

### **3. Methodology**

The research used only secondary source of data through adequate review of literature. Information where gathered from journals, published books etc. The study is based on exploratory research design as it enables the researcher draw insight from the analysis of existing literature related to the topic under investigation. Gummesson (2002) argued that not all research problems demand the collection of data but requires the analysis and interpretation of already existing findings make a meaning. The information gotten were examined and discussed qualitatively for better understanding of the phenomena.

### **4. Results**

The study found out that the Fayol's principle of division of work and scalar chain of hierarchy are effectively adopted in Nigerian work organisation. Also, the Hofstede dimension of power distance and collectivism shows that Nigerian society is high in these indexes and it often influence the behavioural aspect of individuals in the workplace. As such, people grow from childhood to respect seniors, those in authority, give honour to people of higher class in the society and work in group with strong family tie. Hence, making it easy for the implementation of the principle of division of work and scalar chain of hierarchy in the organisation. Furthermore, the study discovered that there is a high level of indiscipline in Nigeria organisation which is prompted by some environmental factor such as tribalism, ethnicity etc. Disputing the universality in the application of management theories. However, the findings shows that an effective application of these principle would result to a high level of performance and growth in Nigerian organisation.

### **5. Conclusions**

The universality of management practices in different concept, organisation and context seems visible within the Nigerian work environment despite variance in cultural practices from its place of origin. However, the principle of discipline has not been effectively implemented within this setting as a result of some environmental factors such as economic, political, tribalism etc. The country is made of difference ethic groups and languages which compels individuals to view instructions differently and have vary interest. however, and Magama (2006), Uzuegbu & Nnadozie (2015) suggested that effective communication and leadership by example policy will promote discipline within the Nigerian organisation. Therefore, organisations should thrive towards effective implementation of the Fayol's principles of management for the achievement goals among Nigerian organisations. This is to promote employee involvement and effectiveness in the attainment of goals within the organisation.

### **6. Recommendation**

This study recommends that managers in Nigerian organisations should ensure the effective implementation of the Fayol's principles of management for the realisation of set gaols such as growth, high performance, discipline, employee commitment, engagement etc. Furthermore, rules and regulations in the organisation should be strictly adhere to by all beginning from the managers down to subordinates to ensure easy compliance. Also, mangers should understand the basic factors such as ethnicity, tribalism, political etc. promoting indiscipline among Nigerian employees and

develop measure such as effective communication and leadership by example to promote discipline in the organisation.

## 7. Further Research

Findings from the study cannot be generalised because of its theoretical nature and not all variables of the principle and theory under investigation were examined. Therefore, an empirical study can be conducted on this subject to understand the level of application of Fayol's 14 principles of management in different sectors of the economy also in other African nations. Further, research can still be done considering the adoptability of modern management theories and principles within this context.

## 8. Reference

- 1) Abdulkadir, S.A., Adeagbo, D.O & Mohammed, S. (2020). *Exploring the Impact of Fayol's Management Principles on Project Success in Building Construction of Nigeria*. International Journal of Education and Evaluation. Vol 6. No. 5.
- 2) Achinivu, G., Okwu E.H., Wey, A.A, Akpan E.E & Fan O.J (2017). *Application of the Henri Fayol Principles of Management in Startup Organisations*. Journal of Business and Management. Vol.19.
- 3) Adam, A. K. & Suleiman, E. A. (2018). *A Contextual Framework of Henry Fayol's 14 Principles of Management for Public Sector Efficiency and Effectiveness of Policy Responsibilities by a Government*. ARBMS, 11(1), 46-61.
- 4) Adeagbo, D. O., Mohammed, S., & Abdulkadir, S. (2019). *Principles of Management Application in Building Construction Projects: Perspectives of Project Managers*. Path of Science, 5(12), 4001-4007
- 5) Ahiauzu, A.I (1986). *The African Thought-system and the Work Behaviour of the African Industrial Man*. International Studies of Management and Organisation. Vol. 16.
- 6) Akpor-Robaro, M.O.M, (2018). *Challenges in Developing Indigenous Management Theories in Africa and the Implications for Management Practice*. International Journal of Business and Management Review. Vol.6.
- 7) Aluko, M.A.O (2003). *The Impact of Culture on Organisational Performance in Selected Textile Firms in Nigeria*. Nordic Journal of African Studies. Vol 12.
- 8) Anichebe, N. & Agu, O (2013). *Effect of Inventory Management on Organisational Effectiveness*. Information and Knowledge Management, 3(8), 92-101.
- 9) Armstrong, M. (2010). *Essential Human Resource Management Practice: A Guide to People Management*. Replika Press Pvt Ltd. New Delhi.
- 10) Baridam D.M. & Nwibere, B.M. (2008). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*. Sherbrook Associate. Port Harcourt.
- 11) Barrat & Bass. (1976). *International Business*. University of South Carolina Press South Carolina.
- 12) Burns, T & Stalker G.M (1994). *The Management of Innovation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 13) Chidiebere, C. O (2010). *Cultural Issues About Doing Business in Nigeria: Case Study for Thurmo Of Thesis Central Oostrobothnia University of Applied Sciences*. PhD Thesis. University of Bedford.
- 14) Cole, G.A (2004). *Management Theory and Practices*. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, Thompson Learning Bedford Row, London.
- 15) Creswell, J.W (2014). *Research Design, Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*.

- 4<sup>th</sup> edition. University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- 16) Drucker, P. F. (1989). *What business can learn from nonprofits?* Harvard Business Review, 67(4), 88–93.
  - 17) Elton Mayo (1946). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. 2nd edition, Boston, Mass: Harvard University.
  - 18) Elton Mayo (1949). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. London.
  - 19) Emery, F.E & Trist. (1960). *Socio-Technical Systems in Management Science Models and Techniques*. Pergaman Press. Oxford.
  - 20) Fayol, H. (1916/1917). *Administration Industrielle et Generale* Dunod, Paris. Originally published in the Bulletin de la Societe de l'Industrie Minerale, 5th series Vol. 19.
  - 21) Fayol, H. (1923). *La doctrine administrative dans l'etat, Comptes Rendus des Seances du Iie Congres Internationale des Sciences Administratives*. Coemaere, Bruxelles.
  - 22) Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management*. Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, London (translated by Constance Storrs).
  - 23) Fells, M, J. (2000). *Fayol Stands the Test of Time*. Journal of management history. Vol 6, No. 8, pp. 345- 360.
  - 24) Gummesson, E. (2002). *Total Relationship Marketing: Marketing Management, Relationship Strategy and CRM Approaches for the Network Economy*, 2nd ed., Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
  - 25) Hall, E. T., & Hall, M.R. (1990). *Understanding Cultural Differences. Germans, French and Americans*. Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.
  - 26) Hannagan T. (2005). *Management Concepts and Practices*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. FT Prentice Hall. Pp.349-355.
  - 27) Herberg (1974). *Motivation-Hygiene profiles: Pinpointing what ails the Organisation*. Organisational Dynamics, 3(2), 18-19.
  - 28) Hicks H.G & Gullet C.R (1981) *Management*. McGraw Hill, New York.
  - 29) Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultures Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing.
  - 30) Hofstede, G. (1983). *The Cultural Relativity of Organizational Practices and Theories*. Journal of International Business Studies.
  - 31) Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organisations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
  - 32) Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  - 33) Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
  - 34) Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2005). *Culture & Organizations, Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*. London, New Delhi, New York: McGraw-Hill.
  - 35) Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J. & Minkov, M. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-hill. (Vol. 2).
  - 36) Hoskisson, E.R., Eden, L., Lau, C & Wright, M. (2000). *Strategy in Emerging Economies*. Academy of Management Journal.
  - 37) House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Gupta, V., & GLOBE Associates. (2004). *Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

- 38) House, R. J., Javidan, M., Hanges. P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). *Understanding Cultures and Implicit Leadership Theories across the Globe: An Introduction to Project GLOBE*. Journal of World Business 37: 3-10.
- 39) Iwuji, E. (1968). *International Handbook of Industrial Relations*. Contemporary Developments & Research (First edition.). Aldwych Press. UK.
- 40) Johnson, R.A., Kast, E.F and Rosenzweig (1964). *Systems Theory and Management*. Journal of Management Science, Vol,10.
- 41) Joshua, C., Marc, C., & Tess, C (2019). *Empirical investigation of factors that impact E-Government Adoption in Nigeria*. International Conference ICT, Society and Human Beings.
- 42) Kareem, A (2013, March 15). *My Oga at the top* (full interview of Lagos Commandant, Shem Obafaye). Last cited May 18, 2013 from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IJ3nHdBnPE4>
- 43) Koontz, H. (1980). *The Management Theory Jungle Revisited*. Academy of Management Review, pp 175-187.
- 44) Koontz, H. & O' Donnell, C. (1976) *Management: A Systems and Contingency Analysis of Managerial Functions*. McGraw – Hill Inc. New York, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition.
- 45) Kotter, J.P & Heskett, J.I (1992). *Corporate Culture and Performance*. Free press, New York.
- 46) Kovacic, Z.J. (2005). *A Brave New e-world? An Exploratory Analysis of Worldwide E-Government Readiness, Level of Democracy, Corruption and Globalization*. International Journal of Electronic Government Research (IJEGR), 1(3), pp.15-32.
- 47) Maryam, A.G (2017). *Application of Henri Fayol's Managerial Principles In Nigerian Secondary Schools: Stakeholders perceptions*. Internal Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary field. Vol 3.
- 48) Maslow, A.H (1987). *Motivation and Personality*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Harper and Row Publisher.
- 49) McMillan, C & Gonzalez, R.W. (cited in Kumar, R & Bihar, M 2015). *Management- The Universal Process*. International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management. Vol.4.
- 50) Mofope, A (2013). *The Applicability of Management Theories in Nigeria: Exploring the Cultural Challenge*. International Journal of Business and Social Science. Vol. 4.
- 51) Obiekwe, O & Lawrence I.N (2020). *Management Challenges of Nigerian Workplaces: A Critical Analysis*. Journal of Business and Management. Vol 22.
- 52) Ochai, B. (1984). *War against Indiscipline in Nigeria*. In New Nigerian Newspaper of 19<sup>th</sup> May, 1984.
- 53) Osezua, M., Abah. E.O., & Gberevbie, D.E (2009). *Staff Indiscipline and Productivity in the Public Sector in Nigeria*. An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal. Ethiopia. 3 (4).
- 54) Reider, J. (1985). *Canarsie: The Jews and Italians of Brooklyn against Liberalism*. MA: Harvard University Press. Cambridge,
- 55) Rodrigues, C. A. (2001). *Fayol's 14 principles of management then and now: A framework For Managing*. Management Decisions. Vol. 39(10), 880–889
- 56) Schein, E. (1983). *Organizational psychology*. Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- 57) Shiela, A. D.B (2020). *Henri Fayol's Principles of Management and Its Effect to Organisational Leadership and Governance*. Journal of Critical Reviews. Vo.7
- 58) Sunday, A.E & Ayodele, I.O, (2015). *Introduction to Management*. 2nd Edition. Blessjoe Print
- 59) Taylor, F.W. (1947). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. W.W. Norton, New York, NY.
- 60) Tega, D.P (2012). *Relationship between National Cultural Distance and the Performance of Multinationals in the Nigerian Petroleum Sector*. Journal of Business and Management. Vol,1, PP

21-29.

- 61) Torrington, D & Chapman, J. (1979). *Personnel management, London*. Prentice Hall Inc.
- 62) Trompenars, F & Hampden- Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the Waves of culture, Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- 63) Trompenars, F. (1993). *Riding the Waves of Culture*. The Economist Books, London.
- 64) Uzuegbu, C. P., & Nnadozie, C. O. (2015). *Henry Fayol's 14 Principles of Management: Implications for Libraries and Information Centers*. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*, 3(2), 58–72.
- 65) Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2003). *Organisational learning: A Critical Review*. *The Learning Organization*, 10(1), 8-17.
- 66) Wiston, O (1963). *Cross Cultural Perspective on Management Principles*. *The Academy of management Journal*. Vol 6.
- 67) Wren, D. A., Bedeian, A. G., & Breeze, J. D. (2002). *The Foundations of Henri Fayol's Administrative Theory*. *Decision*, 40 (9), 906-918. *Management Decision* 40 (9), 906-918.