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Abstract

This paper considered the effect of micromanagement on Employees Job Performance in organisations in Ogun State, Nigeria. Micromanagement was considered on three dimensions of job performance; altruism, conscientiousness and task performance (Rosman, Azlah and Anwar, 2014). The study employed a descriptive research design. The population consists of all employees presently in the services of Dangote Cement Ibesse and Lafarge Cement, Ewekoro in Ogun State, Nigeria, sample of one hundred and ninety-eight (198) employees were randomly selected from the three division of Dangote Cement and Lafarge Cement, Ibesse and Ewekoro respectively. The main instrument adapted for data collection was a validated questionnaire for micromanagement tagged Construct and Validation of Micromanagement Questionnaire by Sulphey and Upadhyay (2019) and Assessing Reliability and Validity of Job Performance Scale by Rosman, Azlah and Anwar (2014) for job performance. Product moment correlation and multiple regression analyses were used in analyzing the data collected. The research result shows that there exist a positive relationship between Micromanagement and Job Performance (that is, Altruism, Conscientiousness and Task Performance). It was found that Micromanagement being a negative loaded word in management is not all bad if the concept is applied under certain conditions and circumstances. The concept can be fully understood by both managers and subordinates to ease the flow of operation in organizations.
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Introduction

Today, organisations operate in highly competitive and dynamic environment, in such situation, companies look for individuals to lead its employees. Therefore, the concept of leadership attracts the limelight that some managers like to direct and control every move and task performed by their subordinates. This attitude sometimes creates a sense of insecurity and disengagement among the employees. This system of leadership has been widely termed as micromanagement. It often includes planning of minor details and making the employees feel that they are being observed (De-Caro, 2011).

Chambers (2009) defines micromanagement as the excessive, unwanted, counterproductive interference and disruption of people or things. Knight (2015) characterizes a micromanager as a boss who lasers in on details, prefers to be on emails, and is rarely satisfied with team work (Knight, 2015). Furthermore, Richard (2010) describes a micromanager as the bothersome boss who second-guesses every decision a subordinate makes. He states that micromanagers typically complain about font-sizes, monitor e-mails, frustrating and demoralizing their subordinates. Moreover, a micromanager wants to be in control of everything, even the smallest of details. This can damage the whole organisation, and in the long-run risk the Company’s competitiveness (Richard, 2010).

Micromanagement is about interference and disruption. It occurs when influence, involvement, and interaction begin to subtract value from people and processes. It is the perception of inappropriate interference in someone else activities, responsibilities, decision-making, and authority. It can also be any activity that creates interference with process, policies, systems and procedures. Basically, micromanagement is the excessive, unwanted,
counterproductive interference and disruption of people or things. Micromanaging may be beneficial for organizations where the interference of managers may be necessary to improve productivity. This may be because the employees may be inexperienced or technically incapable of performing the particular task. However, in the present corporate world, such situations are highly unlikely. Therefore, such a leadership style could be in fact a hindrance to the progress of the organization as a whole. It also affects the employees by disengaging them from their work and pressurizing them (Chamber, 2009).

Micromanagement is a method of managing an individual by closely observing and controlling in the performance of their duties. The positive management and support can ensure that employees perform to their potential by allowing the business to achieve peak performance. Nevertheless, the negative management may create a negative atmosphere in the company causing the employees to work mechanically. Micromanagement may sometimes turnout to be bad for the health of the employee. Highly demanding jobs through micromanagement are likely to make the employees depressed. Employees hate to serve when micromanaged, while depression causing jobs will have negative impact on employees’ health. Micromanagement sometimes disempowering the employees, ruin their confidence, hurt their performance and frustrate them to the point of quitting the job. Unhealthy work environments create negative consequences on employees’ health. People in micromanaged job will be more stressed and depressed, so employee develops unhealthy behaviours to cope with the stress.

Micromanagement normally occurs when a new manager believes that he is in charge, and it is only him that can bring new ideas to the organisation. However, this is not limited to new managers alone, as there are many diehard micromanagers. Such people watch things ‘extra closely’ as they are ‘highly confident’ about their capabilities and capacities. Micromanagement has various dimensions, which could range from scrutiny to unreasonable insistence of periodic status reports. Though status reports are a requirement and a necessity in the course of business, the quantum of details and the frequency at which it is sought can constitute micromanagement (Sulphey, 2019). Micromanagers are intense scrutinizers and the minutest detail could hold the greatest importance to him. Micromanagers seldom fully trust their subordinates, they tend to constantly question subordinate actions, closely monitor every move and dictate every task. However, there is a flipside of it, micromanagers may make effective training managers, as they have the immense capacity and capability to train employees for new tasks. Micromanagement is a very subjective term, there is a significant gray area between what one person sees as interference, another sees as support and interaction.

Rozman, et.al. (2014) propounded three dimensions of job performance that is, altruism, conscientiousness and task performance. Altruism literally means the disinterested and selfless concern for the well-being of others. Altruism is the principle and moral practice of concern for happiness of other human beings or animals, resulting in a quality of life both material and spiritual. Conscientiousness on the other hand means the quality of wishing to do one’s work or duty well and thoroughly. Conscientiousness is the personality trait of being careful, or diligent. It implies a desire to do a task well, and to take obligations to others seriously. Task performance can be defined as the effectiveness with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organisation’s technical core either directly by implementing a part of its technological process or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services. These three dimensions were considered as variables of job performance in this study.

Micromanagement is a concept that has been developed over the year to control employees’ attitude, performance, productivity and relationship. Mahswavi (2017) focused on how micromanagement causes depression and low morale for employees with little attention to their job performance. Sumi (2012) considered micromanagement on the performance of IT Professionals with no attention to other areas of commerce. Employees at all cost in the manufacturing sector wishes to get the job done and meet the rushing needs of their products and services with little consideration to the effect of their leadership style on the employees and how it affects their attitude and performance. For better achievement of organisational goals and objectives, employers and employees need to be collaborative in their efforts. Therefore, the study intends to measure the effect of micromanagement as a leadership style on the job performance of employees in manufacturing companies.

Research Hypotheses

H0: There is no significant relationship between micromanagement and altruism among employees in Dangote Cement Plc. Ibese and Lafarge Cement Plc. Ewekoro
H02: Micromanagement has no significant contribution on conscientiousness among employees in Dangote Cement Plc. Ibese and Lafarge Cement Plc. Ewekoro

H03: There is no significant relationship between micromanagement and task performance among employees in Dangote Cement Plc. Ibese and Lafarge Cement Plc. Ewekoro.

Methodology

A survey design was adopted for the study where questionnaire was the instrument used to elicit information from the group. The target population consists of employees of Dangote Cement Plc, Ibese and Lafarge Cement Plc. Ewekoro Ogun State. A total number of 198 employees were selected randomly from the three functional areas of Dangote Cement Plc. Ibese and Lafarge Cement Plc. Ewekoro (i.e. Cement, Agro-Sack and Transportation). The sample size decision was based on Yamane (1967) sample size determination. The main instrument adapted for data collection was a validated questionnaire for micromanagement tagged Construct and Validation of Micromanagement Questionnaire by Sulphey and Upadhyay (2019) and Assessing Reliability and Validity of Job Performance Scale by Rosman, Azlah and Anwar (2014) for job performance. Product moment correlation and multiple regression analyses were used in analyzing the data collected. This was measured at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Table 1  
Relationship between Micromanagement, Altruism and Task performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Micromanagement</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
<th>Task performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>.338**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researchers Field Survey, 2020

The table above examines the relationship between micromanagement, altruism and task performance. Pearson Correlation coefficient was used to determine the correlation between altruism and task performance.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.249*</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1.687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The table above determines the relationship between of micromanagement and conscientiousness, the result indicates that there exists weak positive relationship of 0.249.
Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>18.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.308</td>
<td>6.430</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>276.197</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>294.505</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researchers Field Survey, 2020

Table 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.233</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>11.680</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micromanagement</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Discussion of Results

The first hypothesis was tested to show the relationship between micromanagement and altruism among employees in Dangote Cement Plc, Ibese and Lafarge Cement Plc, Ewekoro, using correlation analysis to test the relationship. The correlation coefficient is 0.225 with p-value of 0.225, which indicates that the test is not significant because the p-value is greater than the significance value of 0.05. However, the null hypothesis is accepted and we conclude that there is no significant relationship between micromanagement and altruism. This implies that micromanagement does not in any way affect the happiness of other staff resulting in a quality of life both material and spiritual. This is against Harry’s (2009) findings that micromanagement may be beneficial for organisation where interference of managers may be necessary. Therefore, micromanagement is not all bad, it does have benefit over staff and their performance on the job. If done in a proper manner, it can be beneficial to an organization.

The second hypothesis was tested to show the contribution of micromanagement and altruism among employees of Dangote Cement Plc., Ibese and Lafarge Cement Plc. Ewekoro, using regression analysis to test the effect. The analysis shows regression coefficient of 0.105 with P-value of 0.113. This result suggests that for every unit increase in micromanagement there is 10.5% unit increase in altruism. However, the p-value is greater than the significance level of 5%, hence the null hypothesis is accepted and we concluded that micromanagement has no significant effect on altruism. This means that the quality of wishing to do one’s work or duty well and thoroughly cannot be affected by a manager who micromanaged. However, the findings were contrary to those of De-Caro (2011) that micromanagement creates a sense of insecurity and disengagement among the employees of an organisation. The desire to do a task well and to take obligations to others seriously cannot be affected by micromanaging.

The third hypothesis was tested to show the relationship between micromanagement and task performance using correlation analysis. The correlation coefficient is 0.338 with p-value of 0.331, which indicates that the test is not significant because the p-value is greater than the significance value of 0.05. However, the null hypothesis is accepted and we conclude that there is no significant relationship between micromanagement and task performance. This explains that the technical core and provision of needed materials and service would be save with micromanagement. Staff can perform effectively the activities that contribute to the development of the organisation regardless of micromanagement. This negates the findings of White (2010) that states that micromanagement damages the whole organisation and in the end risk the company’s competitiveness.
Conclusion

Micromanagement has many advantages, depending on the context of its application. It does have its benefits in certain circumstances and conditions. If done in a proper manner, it can be beneficial to an organization and the desire to do a task well and to take obligations to others seriously cannot be affected by micromanaging. The technical core and provision of needed materials and service would be save with micromanagement. Staff can perform effectively the activities that contribute to the development of the organisation regardless of micromanagement. Micromanagement after being tested on the three dimensions of job performance that is altruism, conscientiousness and task performance, it was found that there exist a negative relationship between the independent and dependent variables in the study. It can be deduced from the findings that the result of the findings negates the original proposition of the research. The concept should be fully understood by both managers and subordinates to ease the flow of operation in organizations.
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