TIME MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: A STUDY OF MANUFACTURING COMPANIES IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA.

FRANCIS, NKIRU WENDY
Department of Management,
University of Port Harcourt,
Rivers State, Nigeria.
wendyfrancix@yahoo.com

OLORI, WILLIAMS O.
Department of Management,
University of Port Harcourt,
Rivers State, Nigeria

Abstract

The study investigates the relationship between Time Management and Organizational effectiveness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. The study adopted quasi-experimental research design since it is a cross sectional survey. The population of the study is 192, and the study focused on the population since the population size is small. The data were analyzed using Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient Statistic through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings revealed a positive and significant relationship between Time Management and Organizational effectiveness. Hence, the study therefore concludes that Time Management affects Organizational effectiveness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt, and recommended that management should actively engage in prioritizing that will facilitate and improve organizational effectiveness in the organization. They should also delegate responsibility in order to improve customer's satisfaction and organizational effectiveness. They should encourage proper scheduling of work to various units in the organization to ensure organizational effectiveness. Effective organizational structure should be set up for proper control of the organizational resources that will ensure organizational effectiveness in the organizations. The research study could not cover the service organizations. Hence, there is need to examine the extent to which time management affect organizational effectiveness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

Keywords: Time management, organizational effectiveness, prioritizing, delegating, scheduling, profitability, customer satisfaction, increased market share.

I. INTRODUCTION

The goal of every organization is to achieve effectiveness in all the sectors of business endeavour. Effectiveness refers to doing the right things or occupying oneself with the right things (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2003). The concept of effectiveness is linked to the assumption that organizations are goal-oriented. Kinicki and Kreitner (2003) argued that effectiveness is essential for improving results; and in order to perform effectively, clarity is needed. In another development, Dwight (2012) viewed effectiveness as a qualitative characteristic that indicates the extent to which targeted problems are addressed and the degree to which preset goals and objectives are achieved by employees. Nwadukwe and Court (2012) contended that if workers do not know what results are expected of them, there is a risk that they will work but will not perform effectively, which means that they are not doing the right things and so their contribution will be that of the opposite. Organizational effectiveness is a clear sign of a good business performance, although these variables are interdependent (Dwight, 2012). But not only do the variables influence each other; they also influence and are influenced by other factors. As long as workers know what their tasks are and what the priority for each task is, they will feel less pressure while working and will be more productive (Nwadukwe & Court, 2012). Agburu (2012) carried out a study on customer satisfaction and organizational profitability in the millennium: an overview of the Nigerian private sector. The findings of his study indicate that there is a strong relationship between customer satisfaction and organization profitability. He opined that long term corporate profitability must consistently be driven by high customer satisfaction tempo. Oyedapo, Akinlabi and Sufian (2012) examined the impact of sales promotion on organization effectiveness in Nigerian manufacturing industry. The results of their study show that adoption of sales promotion strategies significantly influence the effectiveness of beverage drink industry. Despite several studies on organizational effectiveness, there is lack of empirical evidence on how organizational culture moderates the relationship between time management and organizational effectiveness. Thus, this has prompted this study to examine the relationship between time management and organizational effectiveness and how organizational culture moderates this relationship in manufacturing companies operating in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of time management

Time management refers to numerous techniques and skills that can help a person to make use of the available time in the most efficient way and to accomplish goals, tasks and projects within the predetermined period of time. Time management skills vary from, but are not limited to, prioritizing tasks, planning, scheduling, organizing and the delegation of functions. However, it also includes an analysis of the time spend for different activities as well as close monitoring that allows one to improve his time management skills.

According to Hisrich and Peters (2002), “time is a unique quantity, an entrepreneur (manager) cannot store it, rent it, and buy it. Everything requires it and it passes at the same rate for everyone. Time management Involves investing time to determine what one wants out of his activities. Effective time management is the investment of time in such a way that optimal result is gotten from activities consuming a specific time quantity. Time management hinges on the principle that it is more important to do the right things than to do things right.

The ability to choose between the important and the unimportant and be persistent on the correctly chosen sequence is the key determinant of effectiveness in time management.

Prioritizing

Prioritizing skills are the ability to see what tasks are more important at each moment and give those tasks more of attention, energy, and time (Green and Skinner, 2005). Organization focuses on what is important at the expense of lower value activities (Major, Klein and Ehrhart, 2002). Organization has many things to do, and they never have time and energy to do them all. Many things will be left undone, no matter how hard organizations try. Prioritizing is a way to solve difficult problems (Farmer & Seers, 2004). Claessens, et al. (2004) submitted that one key reason why prioritizing works very well is the 80/20 Rule. The 80/20 Rule states that 80 percent of our typical activities contribute less than 20 percent to the value of our work. So, if you do only the most important 20 percent of your tasks you still get most of the value. Then, if you focus most of your efforts on those top value activities, you achieve much more than before, or you will have more time to spend with your family. Prioritizing is about making choices of what to do and what not to do. To prioritize effectively needs to be able to recognize what is important, as well as to see the difference between urgency and importance (Ancona et al 2001). The important or high priority, tasks are the tasks that help us achieve our long-term goals or can have other meaningful and significant long-term consequences.

Kelly (2002) argued that many of the tasks we face during a day seem equally urgent and important. Yet, if you take a closer look, you will see that many of the urgent activities we are involved are not really important in the long run. At the same time, things that are most important for us, like improving ourselves and our skills, getting a better education, spending time with family, often are not urgent. Green and Skinner (2005) contended that with good prioritizing skills, a manager can finish as soon as possible all the important urgent tasks, the ones that would get them into a crisis or trouble otherwise, then, focus attention and try to give more and more time to those most important, but not urgent tasks, the ones that are most rewarding in the long run.

Delegating

Delegation is the transfer of authority to make decisions and complete specific tasks (Alonso, Dessein and Matouschek, 2008). Learning how to delegate is one of the most important skills for managers and leaders to possess. Strong delegation techniques can help managers save time, motivate people, and train people, as well as these techniques can enable managers to take on new opportunities (Ghosh, Lafontaine and Lo, 2012). However, the lack of delegation practices often leave people frustrated, unmotivated, and under-trained, while the manager remains overworked. Delegation is a skill that enables managers to achieve more without burning themselves out. Delegation is a tool for developing people while also freeing up time for the manager to take on new responsibilities and to develop himself or herself (Colombo and Delmastro, 2004). In the organizations, delegation is often the first step toward electing a successor. This technique allows the successor to slowly learn the job and enables the manager to move on to a higher position. In addition, effective delegation is essential to developing high quality leaders. By delegating work, managers are able to coach, train, and develop competent employees, making them more valuable to the organization (Ziss, 2001). All of these reasons emphasize the positive outcomes associated with delegation. On the other hand, while delegation sounds good in theory, it can also be one of the biggest challenges for any manager, leader, or owner (Dessein and Santos, 2006). As the famous saying goes, "if you want it done right, do it yourself." This is how many people feel. It is often difficult to find the right person to handle the delegated task, coupled with finding the free time to train the person on how to do the job. All of these items are hurdles that each manager must overcome in order to delegate effectively.

Scheduling

From the inception, organization set their goals to achieve something; they will need to begin properly managing the time in order to work towards the goals. After firms have created a to-do list, the next thing is to create a schedule which will allow them to complete all the important tasks within a given period of time (Orlikowsky & Yates, 2002). No matter how organizations are smart, they will only have a certain amount of time to get something done. Mitchell and James (2001) argued that setting up a schedule will allow firms to develop a systematic time frame which will allow them to complete the project on time. The use of a schedule is very significant for time management because it can allow firms to know what they can do in a certain period of time (Sabelis, 2001). There is large number of devices available in the market that can allow firms to schedule important tasks. The one that they choose will be based on their taste, budget, or style. Some people purchase organizers, while others use PDAs or software. No matter which device one chooses, the goal should always be the same. Firm's goal should be to create a schedule which will allow them to complete tasks within a given time frame.

The Concept of Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness has been defined as the extent to which organizations achieve their mission through their core strategies (McCann, 2004). More specifically, organizational effectiveness has been defined as the amount of physical output produced for each of the units of productive input (Miller, 2004). Organizational effectiveness has also been defined as successful achievement of financial performances such as increased sales, profitability and market share (Agu and Anichebe, 2015). Profitability is a measure of the effectiveness of business as it indicates what profit the business has made from its sales or money invested in the firm (Harvey, 2007). Profit maximization, return on investment and shareholders' wealth are regarded as the primary objectives of businesses, while secondary objectives include productivity, business growth, sales maximization, safety and security and socioeconomic goals (Bosch, Tait & Venter, 2006). The achievement of these objectives is therefore a measure of organizational effectiveness. The increase or decrease of the market share a firm controls is another important indicator of a firm's financial performance and therefore its organizational effectiveness (Shaw and Merrick, 2005). Market share is a measure of how dominant a firm is in its industry, and Porter (1990) argues that this gives a firm a competitive edge in the industry to know when a schedule should be created.

Profitability

Profitability is one of the most important objectives of financial management since one goal of financial management is to maximize the owners' wealth, and, profitability is very important determinant of performance. A business that is not profitable cannot survive. However, a business that is highly profitable has the ability to reward its owners with a large return on their investment. Hence, the ultimate goal of a business entity is to earn profit in order to make sure the sustainability of the business in prevailing market conditions. Pandey (2005) defined profitability as the ability of a business, whereas it interprets the term profit in relation to other elements. Profitability is the ability to make profit from all the business activities of an organization, company, firm, or an enterprise (Hijazi and Tariq, 2006). It shows how efficiently the management can make profit by using all the resources available in the market. Dong and Jhy-tay, (2010) also viewed profitability as the 'the ability of a given investment to earn a return from its use'. Profitability is an index of efficiency; and is regarded as a measure of efficiency and management guide to greater efficiency. Though, profitability is an important yardstick for measuring the efficiency, the extent of profitability cannot be taken as a final proof of efficiency (Hifza, 2011).

Market Share

The percentage of an industry or market's total sales that is earned by a particular company over a specified time period is termed market share (Miniter, 2002). Market share is calculated by taking the company's sales over the period and dividing it by the total sales of the industry over the same period (Johnson & Kevan, 2002). This metric is used to give a general idea of the size of a company to its market and its competitors. Investors look at market share increases and decreases carefully because they can be a sign of the relative competitiveness of the company's products or services (Ancona et al., 2001). As the total market for a product or service grows, a company that is maintaining its market share is growing revenues at the same rate as the total market. A company that is growing its market share will be growing its revenues faster than its competitors. Market share increases can allow a company to achieve greater scale in its operations and improve profitability (Abramson, Currim & Sarin, 2005). Besanko, David and Mark (2000) submitted that companies are always looking to expand their share of the market, in addition to trying to grow the size of the total market by appealing to larger demographics, lowering prices, or through advertising. Dawes (2000) contended that investors can obtain market share data from various independent sources (such as trade groups and regulatory bodies), and often from the company itself, although some industries are harder to measure with accuracy than others.

Customer satisfaction

Those who buy the goods or services provided by companies are customers. In other words, a customer is a stakeholder of an organization who provides payment in exchange for the offer provided to him by the organization with the aim of fulfilling a need and to maximize satisfaction. Sometimes the term customer and consumer are confusing. A customer can be a consumer, but a consumer may not necessarily be a customer (Sureshchandar, Rajendran & Anantharaman, 2002). Another author explained this difference. i.e. a customer is the person who does the buying of the products and the consumer is the person who ultimately consumes the product (Negi, 2009).

When a consumer and/or customer is contented with either the product or services it is termed satisfaction. Satisfaction can also be a person's feelings of pleasure or disappointment that results from comparing a product's perceived performance or outcome with their expectations (Kotler and Keller, 2009). As a matter of fact, satisfaction could be the pleasure derived by someone from the consumption of goods or services offered by another person or group of people; or it can be the state of being happy with a situation. Satisfaction varies from one person to another because it is utility. One man's meal is another man's poison an old adage stated describing utility; thus highlighting the fact that it is sometimes very difficult to satisfy everybody or to determine satisfaction among group of individuals (Wicks & Roethlein, 2009).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The cross-sectional survey of the quasi-experimental design was adopted for the study. The target population for this study covers all Managers and Supervisors in the thirty one (31) registered manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt according to the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN). Since the unit of analysis of this study is at the organization level, the Managers and Supervisors of the selected manufacturing firms will constitute the accessible population. The number of managers and supervisors in the seven (7) manufacturing companies is 192, the researcher decided to collect data from all management staff, therefore the sample for this study equals to population. The simple random sampling technique was used in selecting the respondents. The Spearman's Rank Order Coefficient statistical tool was used to test the hypotheses formulated with the aid of statistical package for social science (SPSS).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis I.

Ho_1: There is no significant relationship between Prioritizing and Profitability of manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt.

Table 1. Correlation analysis showing the relationship between prioritizing and Profitability.

Correlations

			Prioritizing	Profitability
Spearman's rho	Prioritizing	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.588**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Profitability	Correlation Coefficient	.588**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Prioritizing and profitability correlate at .588**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between prioritizing and profitability

Hypothesis II.

Ho_2: There is no significant relationship between prioritizing and customer satisfaction of manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt.

Table 2. Correlation Analysis showing the relationship between prioritizing and customer satisfaction.

Correlations

			Prioritizing	Customer satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Prioritizing	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.540**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Customer satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.540**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Prioritizing correlate with customer satisfaction at .540** when the p-value is .000 < 0.01. This indicates that there is a moderate relationship. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant and moderate relationship between prioritizing and customer satisfaction.

Hypothesis III.

Ho$_3$: There is no significant relationship between prioritizing and increased market share of manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt.

Table 3 Correlation Analysis Showing the relationship between prioritizing and increased market share.

Correlations

			Prioritizing	Increase Market share.
Spearman's rho	Prioritizing	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.535**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Increase Market share.	Correlation Coefficient	.535**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the analysis of hypothesis three, prioritizing correlates with increased market share at .535** when P-value is 0.00 < 0.01. This implies a moderate relationship. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that, there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between prioritizing and increased market share.

Hypothesis IV

Ho₄: There is no significant relationship between delegating and Profitability in Manufacturing Companies in Port Harcourt.

Table 4. Correlation analysis showing the relationship between delegating and Profitability.

Correlations

			Delegating	Profitability
Spearman's rho	Delegating	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.500**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Profitability	Correlation Coefficient	.500**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Delegating and profitability correlate at .500**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and profitability in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

Hypothesis V

Ho$_5$: There is no significant relationship between delegating and Customer satisfaction of manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt.

Table 5. Correlation analysis showing the relationship between delegating and Customer satisfaction.

Correlations

			Delegating	Customer satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Delegating	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.577**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Customer satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.577**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Delegating and customer satisfaction correlate at .577**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and customer satisfaction

Hypothesis VI

Ho$_6$: There is no significant relationship between delegating and Increase Market share in manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt.

Table 6. Correlation analysis showing the relationship between delegating and Increase Market share.

Correlations

			Delegating	Increase Market share.
Spearman's rho	Delegating	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.755**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Increase Market share.	Correlation Coefficient	.755**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Delegating and increased market share correlate at .755**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and increased market share

Hypothesis VII

Ho$_7$: There is no significant relationship between Scheduling and Profitability of manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt.

Table 7. Correlation analysis showing the relationship between Scheduling and Profitability.

Correlations

			Scheduling	Profitability
Spearman's rho	Scheduling	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.332**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Profitability	Correlation Coefficient	.332**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Delegating and increased market share correlates at .332**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a weak correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is a significant and a weak positive relationship between delegating and Profitability.

Hypothesis VIII

Ho$_8$: There is no significant relationship between Scheduling and customer satisfaction in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

Table 8. Correlation analysis showing the relationship between Scheduling and Customer satisfaction.

Correlations

			Scheduling	Customer satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Scheduling	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.486**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Customer satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.486**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Scheduling and customer satisfaction correlates at .486**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and increased market share

Hypothesis IX

Ho$_9$: There is no significant relationship between Scheduling and Increased Market share of manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

Table 9. Correlation analysis showing the relationship between Scheduling and Increased Market share.

Correlations

			Scheduling	Increase Market share
Spearman's rho	Scheduling	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.589**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	154	154
	Increased Market share	Correlation Coefficient	.589**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	154	154

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Delegating and increased market share correlates at .598**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and increased market share.

Hypothesis X

Ho$_{10}$: Organizational Culture does not moderate the relationship between Time management and Organizational effectiveness in manufacturing companies in Rivers State.

Table 10. Partial correlation Analysis showing the moderating influence of organizational competence on operations management activities and organizational Sustainability.

Correlations

Control Variables		Time management	Organizational Effectiveness	Organizational structure
Time management	Correlation	1.000	.736	.636
	Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
	Df	0	154	154
Organizational effectiveness	Correlation	.736	1.000	.662
	Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
	Df	154	0	154
Organizational structure	Correlation	. 636	.662	1.000
	Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
	Df	153	153	0

Source: SPSS Data Output, (2016).

Time management and organizational effectiveness correlates at .736**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a strong correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a strong and positive relationship between Time management and Organizational effectiveness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. However, at the same time Organizational structure moderates this relationship at 636 which signified a strong moderating effect. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that the there is significant and a strong positive moderating effect on the relationship between time management and organizational effectiveness.

The findings from hypothesis one revealed that prioritizing and profitability correlate at .588**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between prioritizing and profitability in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Macan (1994), Green and Skinner (2005), as they asserted that better time management can be achieved if goals have been set and then all future work is prioritized based on how it moves the individual or organization towards meeting the goals. The value of time management lies in the fact that people have too many tasks they need to do but not enough time for the things that they want to do. Time management helps identify needs and wants in terms of their importance and matches them with time and other resources (Macan, 1994).

The findings from hypothesis two showed that prioritizing correlate with customer satisfaction at .540** when the p-value is .000 < 0.01. This indicates that there is a moderate relationship. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant and moderate relationship between prioritizing and customer satisfaction in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Agburu (2012); (Nwadukwe and Court, 2012). Agburu carried out a study on customer satisfaction and other variables and found out that customer satisfaction is under pressure from other variables. But as Nwadukwe and Court (2012) stated that, as long as workers know what their tasks are and what the priority for each task is, they will feel less pressure while working and will be more productive (Nwadukwe and Court, 2012).

From the analysis of hypothesis three, prioritizing correlate with increased market share at .535** when P-value is 0.00 < 0.01. This implies a moderate relationship. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that, there is a moderate, positive and significant relationship between prioritizing and increased market share in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Ancona et al. (2001). They argued that to prioritize effectively needs to be able to recognize what is important, as well as to see the difference between urgency and importance (Ancona et al., 2001). Therefore, the important or high priority, tasks are the tasks that help us achieve our long-term goals or can have other meaningful and significant long-term consequences. Prioritizing skills are the ability to see what tasks are more important at each moment and give those tasks more of attention, energy, and time (Green and Skinner, 2005). Organization focuses on what is important at the expense of lower value activities (Major, Klein and Ehrhart, 2002). Organization has many things to do, and they never have time and energy to do them all. Many things will be left undone, no matter how hard organizations try. Prioritizing is a way to solve difficult problems (Farmer and Seers, 2004). Claessens, et al (2004) submitted that one key reason why prioritizing works very well is the 80/20 Rule. The 80/20 Rule states that 80 percent of our typical activities contribute less than 20 percent to the value of our work. So, if you do only the most important 20 percent of your tasks you still get most of the value. Then, if you focus most of your efforts on those top value activities, you achieve much more than before, or you will have more time to spend with your family.

The findings from hypothesis four revealed that delegating and profitability correlate at .500**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and profitability in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Alonso, Dessein and Matouschek, (2008). They argued that delegation is the transfer of authority to make decisions and complete specific tasks (Alonso, Dessein and Matouschek, 2008). Therefore learning how to delegate is one of the most important skills for managers and leaders to possess. However, the lack of delegation practices often leave people frustrated, unmotivated, and under-trained, while the manager remains overworked.

The findings from hypothesis five showed that delegating and customer satisfaction correlate at .577**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and customer satisfaction in manufacturing firms in Port

Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Ghosh, Lafontaine and Lo (2012) as they asserted that Strong delegation techniques can help managers save time, motivate people, and train people, as well as these techniques can enable managers to take on new opportunities (Ghosh, Lafontaine & Lo, 2012).

The findings from hypothesis six indicates that delegating and increased market share correlate at .755**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and increased market share in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Ziss, (2001). Ziss, (2001) argued that, in the organization, delegation is often the first step toward electing a successor. This technique allows the successor to slowly learn the job and enables the manager to move on to a higher position. In addition, effective delegation is essential to developing high quality leaders. By delegating work, managers are able to coach, train, and develop competent employees, making them more valuable to the organization (Ziss, 2001). This will help to satisfy the customer's demand. When a consumer and/or customer is contented with either the product or services it is termed satisfaction (Kotler & Keller, 2009).

The findings from hypothesis seven indicates that scheduling and profitability correlate at .332**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a weak correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a weak positive relationship between delegating and profitability in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Abramson, Currim and Sarin, 2005). Market share increases can allow a company to achieve greater scale in its operations and improve profitability (Abramson, Currim & Sarin, 2005). Besanko, David and Mark (2000) submitted that companies are always looking to expand their share of the market, in addition to trying to grow the size of the total market by appealing to larger demographics, lowering prices, or through advertising. Dawes (2000) contended that investors can obtain market share data from various independent sources (such as trade groups and regulatory bodies), and often from the company itself, although some industries are harder to measure with accuracy than others.

The findings from hypothesis eight indicates that scheduling and customer satisfaction correlates at .486**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and increased market share in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Mitchell and James (2001) as they argued that setting up a schedule will allow firms to develop a systematic time frame which will allow them to complete the project on time. The use of a schedule is very significant for time management because it can allow firms to know what they can do in a certain period of time (Sabelis, 2001). There is large number of devices available in the market that can allow firms to schedule important tasks. The one that they choose will be based on their taste, budget, or style. Some people purchase organizers, while others use PDAs or software. No matter which device one chooses, the goal should always be the same. Firm's goal should be to create a schedule which will allow them to complete tasks within a given time frame. Strongman and Burt (2000) argued that the device that organization chooses should easily allow them to create a schedule. In addition to obtaining a device that can allow firms to create a schedule, it is also important to know when a schedule should be created.

The findings from hypothesis nine indicates that delegating and increased market share correlates at .598**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a moderate correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a moderate positive relationship between delegating and increased market share in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. This finding is supported by the work of Besanko, David and Mark (2000) who submitted that companies are always looking to expand their share of the market, in addition to trying to grow the size of the total market by appealing to larger demographics, lowering prices, or through advertising.

The findings from hypothesis ten revealed that Time management and organizational effectiveness correlates0at .736**, when the p-value is 0.000 < 0.01. This signified a strong correlation. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a strong and positive relationship between Time management and Organizational effectiveness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt. However, at the same time Organizational structure moderates this relationship at 636 which signified a strong moderating effect. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis and accept that there is significant and a strong positive moderating effect on the relationship between time management and organizational effectiveness in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt.

Alan (2009), while recognizing the nexus between time management and organizational effectiveness posited that the key to successful time management is planning and protecting the planned time, which often involves re-conditioning your environment, and particularly the re-conditioning the expectation of others. Time management is about making changes to the way you spend your time. For effective time management to be sure, you have to apply a time management system that will help you see where changes needed to be made, which means that the first step of time management is to analyze how you can determine what changes you want to make (Susan, 2012). According to Donaldson (2011), good time management enables an organization to achieve the lifestyle balance it wants. This therefore suggests that good time at work means doing high quality work, not high quantity. As revealed from the foregoing, time management represent the skills, tools, and abilities of doing the right thing at the right time, with minimum effort, and resources, effectively and efficiently, thereby achieving organizational goals and the things they prioritized and value.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the analyses of the data gathered for this study, it is obvious that time management actually affects organizational effectiveness in manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt. The manifestations of these effects in the manufacturing companies are evidenced in unsatisfied customers and decrease in market share. The essence of business existence is to satisfy customers while making profit and occupying a market space, but the reverse is the case in the Nigerian manufacturing industries. Apart from the epileptic power supply that has crippled the Nigeria manufacturing sector, most companies do not consider effective time management in their day-to-day activities. Therefore organizations that lack time management equally lack effectiveness in their mission statement.

VI. RECOMMENDATION.

Based on our findings and conclusions, it is recommended that:

1. Management in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt should actively engage in prioritizing that will facilitate and improve organizational effectiveness in the organization.
2. They should also delegate responsibility in order to improve customer's satisfaction and organizational effectiveness.

3. They should encourage proper scheduling of work to various units in the organization to ensure organizational effectiveness.

4. Effective organizational structure should be set up for proper control of the organizational resources.

REFERENCES

Abramson, C., Currim, L.S. & Sarin, R. (2005). *An experimental investigation of the impact of information on competitive decision making, Management Science, 51*(2), 195-207.

Agburu J.I. (2012). Customer satisfaction and organizational profitability in the millennium: an overview of the Nigerian private sector. *Journal of Business and Organizational Development*, 4.

Agu, O.A. &Anichebe, N.A. (2015). Improving organizational effectiveness in Nigeria public enterprise, *International Journal of Development Research*, 5(06), 4811-4818.

Alonso, R., Dessein, W.& Matouschek, N.(2008). When does coordination require centralization? *American Economic Review*, 98, 145-179.

Ancona, D.G., Goodman, P.S., Lawrence, B.S. & Tushman, M.L. (2001). Time: a new research lens, *Academy of Management Review*, *26*, 645-63.

Besanko, D., David, D., & Mark, S. (2000).*Economics of Strategy* (2nd Edition). John Wiley & Son.

Bosch, J.K. Trait, & Venter (2006).*Business management–An entrepreneurial perspective*. Cape Town, Van Schaik

Claessens, B.J.C., van Eerde, W., Rutte, C.G. & Roe, R.A. (2004). Planning behavior and perceived control of time at work, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 937-50.

Colombo, M.G.& Delmastro, M.(2004).Delegation of authority in business organizations: An Empirical Test, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, *52*, 53-80

Dawes, J. (2000). Market orientation and company profitability: Further evidence incorporating longitudinal data,*Australian Journal of Management*, *25*(2), 173-199.

Dessein, W. & Santos, T. (2006). Adaptive organizations, *Journal of Political Economy*, *114*, 956-995.

Dong, H.Ph.,&Jhy-tay, S. (2010).The Relationship between Working Capital Management and Profitability. A Vietnam case. International *Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 49.

Donaldson, Fielder (2011). *Preventing Stress in Organizations*. Retrieved from ebookstore.sony. com>Home>Psychology>Applied Psychology.

Dwight, M. (2012).*The importance of organizational effectiveness*. Retrieved from http://effectivemanagers.com/dwight-mihalicz/the-importance-of-organizational-effectiveness.

Farmer, S. & Seers, A. (2004).*Time enough to work: employee motivation and entrainment in the workplace, Time & Society,13, 265-84.*

Ghosh, M., Lafontaine, F.& Lo, D.(2012). *Delegation and pay-for-performance: Evidence from industrial sales force*, working Paper, University of Arizona.

Green, P., & Skinner, D. (2005). Does time management training work? An evaluation. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 9, 124–139.

Harvey, A. (2007). *A training programme contributes to business success*. Saskatchewan, Sage

Hifza, M. (2011). Determinants of insurance companies' profitability: An analysis of insurance sector of Pakistan. *Academic Research International*, 1(3)

Hijazi, S.T., & Tariq, Y.B., (2006). Determinants of Capital Structure: A case of Pakistani Cement Industry. *The Lahore Journal of Economics*, 11(1), 63-80.

Hisrich& Peters (2002). Effective time management for high performance in organizations, *Journal of Nigerian Institute of Management*, 44(3), 21- 26.

Johnson, G.& Kevan, S. (2002).*Exploring corporate strategy: Text and Cases*, (6th Ed.), Financial Times-Prentice Hall.

Kelly, W.E. (2002). Harnessing the river of time: a theoretical framework of time use efficiency with suggestions for counselors, *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 39, 12-21

Kinicki, A. & Kreitner, R.(2003). *Organizational behavior: Key concepts, skills and best practices*. McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Kotler, P. & Keller, K.L. (2009).*Marketing management* (13th end). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc, Upper Saddle River.

Macan, T. H. (1994). Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 381–391.

Major, V.S., Klein, K.J. &Ehrhart, M.G. (2002).Work time, work interference with family, and psychological distress, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 427-36.

McCann, J. (2004). Organizational effectiveness: Changing concepts for changing environment. *Human Resource Planning*,3(2), 42-50

Miller, H. (2004). *Organizational effectiveness*. U.S.A Miller, H. Inc

Miniter, R. (2002).The *myth of market share*.Crown.

Mitchell, T.R. & James, L.R. (2001).Building better theory: time and the specification of when things happen, *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 530-47.

Negi, R. (2009). Determining customer satisfaction through perceived service quality: A study of Ethiopian mobile users, *International Journal of Mobile Marketing*, 4(1),31-38.

Nwadukwe, U. C & Court, O.T.(2012). Management styles and organizational effectiveness: an appraisal of private enterprises in eastern Nigeria.*American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, (2), 9.

Orlikowsky, W.J. & Yates, J. (2002). It's about time: temporal structuring in organizations, *Organization Science*, (13), 684-700.

Oyedapo, W.O., Akinlabi, B.H.& Sufian, J.B. (2012). The impact of sales promotion on organization effectiveness in Nigerian manufacturing industry, *Universal Journal of Marketing and Business Research*, 1(4), 123-131.

Pandy, I.M. (2005). *Financial Management* (10th ed.). Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd.

Porter, M.E. (1990). *Competitive advantage, creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York, Free Press

Sabelis, I. (2001). *Time management: paradoxes and patterns, Time & Society*,387-400.

Shaw, R. & Merrick, D. (2005).*Marketing payback: Is your marketing profitable?* New York, Financial Times.

Strongman, K.T. & Burt, C.D.B. (2000).Taking breaks from work: an exploratory inquiry, *Journal of Psychology*, 134, 229-42.

Sureshchandar G.S., Rajendran C, & Anantharaman R.N. (2002). The relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction – a factor specific approach, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 16(4), 363 – 379.

Susan, W. (2012). *A Time Management System that Really Works*. http://www.sbinfocanada.about.com/cs/ timemanagement.

Wicks, A. M., & Roethlein, C. J. (2009). A satisfaction-based definition of quality *Journal of Business & Economic Studies*, 15(1) 82-97.

Ziss, S. (2001). Horizontal mergers and delegation. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 19 (3–4), 471–92.