

## EMPLOYEE EMPOWERMENT IN NIGERIAN ESTATE SURVEYING AND VALUATION FIRMS

Samson Oluseun Ojekalu<sup>1\*</sup>, Timothy Tunde Oladokun<sup>2</sup>,  
Adekunle Sunday Adeogun<sup>1</sup>, and Halim Yusuf Agava<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Estate Management, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria, Obafemi,

<sup>2</sup>Department of Estate Management, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile- Ife, Nigeria

\*Corresponding Author's Email: ojekalu.so@unilorin.edu.ng

### Abstract

*This paper examined employee empowerment practice of estate surveying and valuation firms in Nigeria with a view to improving its extent of adoption and firm performance. Primary data were used for the study. Questionnaire was administered to practicing Estate Surveyors and Valuers (ESV) in Lagos, Abuja, and Port Harcourt. Estate Surveyors and Valuers Registration Board of Nigeria Directory showed there were 272, 143, and 67 firms in the three cities respectively. Seventy per cent in each of the cities were selected using a simple random technique. Hence, 190, 100, and 47 ESV were selected in Lagos, Abuja, and Port Harcourt respectively and 149, 83, and 42 copies of the questionnaire were retrieved. Information on empowerment practice in terms of types and extent of adoption was measured using scales developed in the literature. The data were analysed using mean ranking. The study found that the types of empowerment practiced in Nigeria by estate surveying and valuation firms were psychological empowerment (2.85) and structural empowerment (2.74). The extent of adoption of empowerment practices was moderate. Competence attribute of psychological empowerment was moderately practiced in Nigeria (3.43) and Lagos (3.44) whereas in Abuja and Port Harcourt, it was practiced highly with mean values of 4.49 and 3.74 respectively. Similarly, the impact attribute of psychological empowerment was practiced little across the three cities. The structural empowerment practiced was little in Lagos (1.99), Abuja (2.39), and Nigeria (2.31) but was moderate in Port Harcourt (2.85) while the reward system (2.31) of structural empowerment was rarely practiced in Nigeria. The study concluded that employee empowerment practice of Nigerian Estate Surveyors and valuers is moderate and that they should be more committed to the implementation of both psychological and structural empowerment in order to enhance employees' commitment and loyalty. The estate surveying and valuation firms should incentivise their employees either financially and non-financially when they are instrumental to the facilitation and consummation of real estate transactions to boost their morale which in effect leads to quality service delivery.*

**Keywords:** Employees, Empowerment, Estate Surveying, Valuation, Firm and Extent of Adoption.

### 1.0 Introduction

Globally, the development of nations depends on natural resources at her disposal, level of technological advancement and quality of human resource among others. Human capital is germane to a country's quest for economic development because of its importance in harnessing other factors driving economic growth and development. In other words, the quality of the workforce of any nation is tangential to her overall economic wellbeing, and ditto for firms and organisations. Buttrressing this view, Yin, Wang and Lu (2019) opined that human resource is an engine for organisational development. Hence, for organisations or firms to grow especially those in the service industry, committed workforce is a necessity.

Employees are vital input to estate surveying and valuation firms (ESVFs) being service firms and labour and knowledge-intensive industry. ESVFs in service industry of Nigeria provide a range of services to clients such as valuation for all purposes, property management, and investment analysis among others and these services are performed by their employees. Hence, to provide quality services, employees need to be fully harnessed through empowerment. This study is crucial to estate surveying and valuation firms in Nigeria because of frequent employee turnover currently experienced in the profession (Peter, Oni, Ogunowo, & Fateye, 2019).

The term employee empowerment means ensuring employees have the skills, knowledge, good reward system and autonomy to make relevant decisions within their capabilities and authority that would otherwise be made by management (Kim, Lee & Jang, 2017). Employee Empowerment (EE) has been conceptualised into psychological empowerment (PE) and structural empowerment (SE). First, PE is four motivational constructs composed of meaning, self-determination, competence and impact (Spreitzer, 1995). Meaning is the value of career goals attached to workplace and job duty which depends on employees' perceptions or standards (Jha, 2010). Competence is an employee's capability to perform a work role with skill or dexterity (Randolph & Kemery, 2011). Self-determination is the autonomy an employee has in performing job duties. The impact is the degree employees influence strategy and management in the production of career outputs in an organisation (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011). Second, SE (behavioural) involves information sharing, good rewards system, knowledge, and the power to make decisions in the workplace (Bowen & Lawler, 1995).

The empowerment practice of ESVFs is construed as the types and extent of adoption of employee empowerment. This paper specifically focused on the extent of implementation of both psychological and structural empowerment of ESVFs in Nigeria. This is because the extent of adoption of empowerment initiatives could serve as a pointer to employee commitment to ESVFs in Nigeria and its concomitant effect on the performance of the firms. Also, there are insufficient previous studies in Nigeria especially in the real estate sector that have investigated the empowerment practice of ESVFs. Previous studies that examined EE practice focused on the quantity surveying profession (Liu, Chiu & Fellows, 2007), the manufacturing industry, (Baird & Wang, 2010), and banking sector (Narenji&Nojabae, 2015). Yet, little or nothing is known about the EE practice of ESVFs in Nigeria. Also, there is proliferation of employees' turnover in the Nigerian real estate sector which is detrimental to firm performance because new staff recruits need time to familiarise themselves and acclimatize to the new job environment. The high employee turnover in the profession (Peter, 2019) can be linked to insufficient empowerment practices and this necessitates the study. The next subsection contains the review of related literature.

## **2.0 Review of Related Literature**

Employee empowerment (EE) is polarised into two in the literature. These are psychological (PE) and structural empowerment (SE). It is pertinent to examine the types of empowerment being practiced by ESVFs

### **2.1 Employee empowerment**

The definition of empowerment has sparked a lot of discussion in the literature because there are diverse views about it. As such, no universally accepted definition of EE. For example, Greasley *et al.* (2008) defined EE as giving employees more flexibility and freedom to make decisions about their work while Menon (2011) defined EE as a personal state of employees characterised by competence, skill set, and employee's ability to perform job duties effectively and with autonomy. Again, Kim, Lee, and Jang (2017) defined empowerment as ensuring employees have the skills, knowledge, good reward system, and autonomy to make relevant decisions within their capabilities and authority that would otherwise be made by management. Empowerment is polarized into psychological and structural empowerment in the literature and this was discussed in turn.

## 2.2 Psychological Empowerment

Empowerment has been conceived as four task motivations of meaningfulness, competence, choice and impact (Thomas & Velthouse 1990). First, meaningfulness connotes the value of career goal judged against individual's standards (Spreitzer, 1995). Second, competence is the worker's belief in their ability to perform activities with dexterity. Third, autonomy refers to employee's having a choice in initiating and regulating actions on how to perform job roles. Fourth, impact is the degree to which employees influences the strategic and administrative outcome in the workplace (Spreitzer, 1995). The scale developed by Spreitzer to measure psychological dimension is contained in Table 1.

**Table 1: Psychological Empowerment Scale**

| S/N | Self-determination/ Autonomy                                               |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1   | My input is valued in the workplace decision-making process.               |
| 2   | Freedom to choose how I accomplish my job.                                 |
| 3   | I have the authority to direct how my work is carried out in my workplace. |
|     | <b>Impact</b>                                                              |
| 4   | I have complete control over how my job is done                            |
| 5   | I can influence my firm's activities                                       |
| 6   | I have control of activities in my workplace                               |
|     | <b>Meaningfulness</b>                                                      |
| 7   | My work is vital to me.                                                    |
| 8   | My work is important to me.                                                |
| 9   | What I do at work is important to me.                                      |
|     | <b>Competence/ self-efficacy</b>                                           |
| 10  | My responsibilities are fully within my capabilities.                      |
| 11  | Confident in my abilities to perform my duties.                            |
| 12  | I've mastered the skills required for my profession.                       |

**Source:** Spreitzer, 1995

## 2.3 Structural Empowerment

Scholars in human resource management conceptualised structural empowerment (SE) into four components. These are information sharing, good reward system, knowledge and the power to make decisions (Bowen and Lawler, 1995). First, information sharing relates to enabling employees to have necessary information before they make a decision on a given task. SE refers to practices that grant employees latitude to make decisions and exercise influence concerning their work and their workplace (Greasley *et al.*, 2008). As such, SE is viewed as a model of power redistribution that ensures power equality. Power sharing led to increase trust and collaboration among firms' workers. Previous studies supported the relevance of information sharing decision-making as one of the dimensions of structural empowerment, and it has been proven. This suggests that the element of empowerment could be dependent on sufficient knowledge and skills of employees and this information is critical in every organisation and firms.

Second, power sharing connotes empowering employees to a great degree in an organisation to make some decisions that would otherwise be made by top management. This is particularly important because it will provide employees with greater latitude and authority in performing job duties effectively. It is also believed to enable employees to have sufficient freedom to contribute ideas immensely at the top management level of organisation. Power sharing gives employees more confidence and encouragement in achieving firm's objectives and goals. Power sharing of structural empowerment is a better strategy that makes employees creative in new working environments and consequently leads to effectiveness in job place (Bowen & Lawler, 1995). Sharing power dimension of structural empowerment enables resources of organisations deployed optimally. The knowledge of employees will ensure

increased job satisfaction and commitment to organisation where empowerment is practiced and appreciated. Third, structural empowerment in term of rewards system is important to achieving organisational goal. This dimension of empowerment relates to pecuniary in terms of salary, compensation, and promotion in workplace. This is used as a tool for increasing employee motivation in firms and organisations. The scale developed to measure structural empowerment is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Structural Empowerment Scale**

| S/N | Power sharing                                                                                                     |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1   | I have the authority to make judgments about my work assignments.                                                 |
| 2   | I have a lot of say in how I carry out my duties.                                                                 |
| 3   | In my position, I have the authority to make independent decisions.                                               |
| 4   | I have the ability to express myself.                                                                             |
| 5   | My job autonomy grows as a result of power sharing.                                                               |
|     | <b>Knowledge</b>                                                                                                  |
| 6   | Organisation's work procedures would be improved if knowledge is shared.                                          |
| 7   | Knowledge has a beneficial impact on my performance since the more I learn, the better I will be able to perform. |
| 8   | If I am trained in new skills relating to my job responsibilities, I will perform better.                         |
| 9   | In the future, I aim to share my knowledge with other members of the organisation on a more regular basis.        |
|     | <b>Information sharing</b>                                                                                        |
| 10  | Information is readily available in my workplace                                                                  |
| 11  | Information which helps me work together in a team                                                                |
| 12  | data that can assist me in working in a group.                                                                    |
| 13  | It is critical to share information in order for a team to work well.                                             |
|     | <b>Rewards system</b>                                                                                             |
| 14  | I am pleased with the rewards program that I am offered.                                                          |
| 15  | If I do something to better my work, I will be rewarded.                                                          |
| 16  | My remuneration incentivizes me to raise the standard of my work.                                                 |

Source: Adapted from Rajalingam, Jauhar and Abdul Ghani (2015)

## 2.4 Theory of Employee Empowerment

In this subsection, two theories on employee empowerment that underpin the study were reviewed and these theories include equity theory and two-factor theory and these are discussed in turn.

### 2.4.1 Equity theory

Equity theory was postulated by Smith (2000). The theory postulated that employees would be motivated by increased wages or incentives rather than starvation. Incentivising employees would encourage private initiative, competition, and innovation among them. This would consequently lead to self-interest in achieving company's vision and mission statement. The theory opined that an employees who are well rewarded based on their contributions will be willing to put in more effort and vice versa. For instance, underpaid or irregularly paid employees of an estate firm may feel hostile towards the organisation and the clients which could hamper employee's performance.

In the same vein, reneging on promises by the principal partners of an estate firm to employees in terms of commissioning fees when a transaction is consummated could be lethargic to an employee which could lead to concomitant employee turnover, taken client instructions out of the company and less extra role behaviour. This suggests that adequate rewarding of employees is vital. Commenting on the importance of rewarding employees, Milkovich *et al.* (2010) opined that congratulating employees for their work performance will produce a sense of satisfaction, making the person feel valuable, and so leading to a better attitude and work

outcomes. This meant that when employees of an estate surveying and valuation agency does their job professionally and they are recognized, it will engender better service. Also, underpaying employees will result in lesser motivation and, in the long run, equal effort and altitude from the employee. As a result, underpaid employees will exhibit behaviour such as absenteeism, insincerity, and a lack of focus on the job. In essence, the estate surveying and valuation firms should reflect on better ways of rewarding employees in order to guarantee employees' retention. The next theory used in the study is two-factor theory.

#### **2.4.2 Two-Factor Theory**

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) looked at what motivates people at work. Two-factor theory emanated from the research conducted on engineers and accountants by Herzberg *et al.* (1959). Engineers and accountants were interviewed about work-related occurrences for the study. Specifically, information about the employees' experience with positive and negative feelings at work was gathered. The author stated that achievement and pride are positive feelings associated with one's job. From the information obtained, the theory proposed the motivator-hygiene theory and it is generally called two-factor theory. It is postulated that there were two types of needs. These are hygiene needs (HNs) and motivator needs (MNs). HNs are inherent factors peculiar to the work consisting security, providing status, cordial relationships between supervisors and subordinates, salary, work conditions, and the company policy and administration. For example, the salary structure of an estate firm could determine the level of commitment an employee will exhibit and ditto other hygiene factors will influence the employee's level of commitment. MNs consisted of opportunities for employee's advancement, more responsibility, personal growth, and recognition of the successes of employee of ESVFs.

Motivators, or items that provide employees satisfaction are the important thrust of two-factor theory. This suggests that motivating employees leads to employee satisfaction and consequently higher performance from ESVFs personnel. Furthermore, dissatisfaction causes employees to become drowsy. As a result, according to the theory, managers must provide hygiene factors in terms of good and prompt payment of salary, security of tenure, cordial relationships, better working conditions, word class policies among others to reduce dissatisfaction. As a result, workers will be more motivated because they are advancing in the workplace, recognised for performance and accomplishments. As a result, the two-factor theory is a veritable gem.

#### **2.5 Empirical Review**

Having examined how psychological and structural empowerment is conceptualized and measured, plethora of scholars have adopted or adapted the scale in various disciplines to examine empowerment practice and the relevant theoretical underpinning the study, the paper looks at available few empirical papers on employees' empowerment practice from various service industries because there are no or little literature in real estate profession. For instance, Baird and Wang (2010) investigated the degree to which employee empowerment practice in the Australian manufacturing sector was implemented using a 7-point Likert scale. The study found that employee empowerment practices in Australian manufacturing are moderate. Despite achieving the stated objective of the study, the research is foreign country, conducted in an advanced economy, and in another service industry. Based on the Pardo del Val *et.al.* (2003) instrument, the extent to which EE was examined and found that the extent of adoption of employee empowerment was low. Similarly, Randolph (1995) found that for empowerment to be successfully implemented, information sharing, autonomy, and teamwork are important and a prerequisite and its implementation was also moderate.

Furthermore, Korkmaz (2012) investigated the differences in perceptions of Turkish Coal Institution employees based on their demographic characteristics in relation to the types and extent of adoption of empowerment practices. The result found out that, implementation of psychological empowerment was higher than structural empowerment. Similarly, Men (2011) examined perceptions of EE on the quality of the organisation in terms of employee relationships. The study showed that competency and authority positively predict organisation

employee relationships. Meyerson and Dewettinck (2012) posited that to generate beneficial ideas that lead to improved business functionality, companies must have an effective reward system in place. Greasley, Bryman, Dainty, Price, Soetanto, and King (2008) found that business owners' adoption of empowerment was moderate as a result of their reluctance to relinquish power due to a lack of trust in their employees.

### 3.0 Methodology

Primary data were used for the study through questionnaire administration. The study population were the employees of estate surveying and valuation firms in Nigeria. The employees were selected as the target population because they were the beneficiaries of employee empowerment practices and they could give objective assessments of empowerment practices in their respective firms or offices. The sampling frame for this study were the 482 ESVFs in Lagos (272), Abuja (143), and Port Harcourt (67) obtained from the Estate Surveyors and Valuers Registration Board of Nigeria directory (2018). Simple random technique without replacement was adopted to select 70% of ESVFs amounting to sample size of 190, 100 and 47 in Lagos, Abuja, and Port Harcourt respectively and totaling 337 respondents. The 70% of the sampling frame for homogenous population (Ogunbameru, 2000) and this sample size have been adopted in the literature by scholars such as Marshall, Cardon, Poddar and Fontenot (2013). The empowerment scale developed by Spreitzer (1995) was used to measure psychological and structural scales. The data were collected using a 5-point Likert scale of no empowerment (1), little empowerment (2), moderate empowerment (3), high empowerment (4) and extreme empowerment (5). The data were analysed using mean ranking.

## 4.0 Presentation and Discussion of Results

### 4.1 Extent of Adoption of Psychological Empowerment Practice

The data on the extent of adoption of psychological empowerment were analysed and the result is presented in Table 3

**Table 3: Extent of Adoption of Psychological Empowerment Practices of Estate Surveying and Valuation Firms**

| Psychological Empowerment Dimensions                               | Lagos       |                 | Abuja       |                 | Port Harcourt |                 | Nigeria     |                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
|                                                                    | Mean        | R               | Mean        | R               | Mean          | R               | Mean        | R               |
| <b>Self-identification</b>                                         |             |                 |             |                 |               |                 |             |                 |
| I have freedom in determining how to do my job                     | 2.28        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.86        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.62          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.53        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| My opinion counts in the work group decision making                | 2.18        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.80        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.76          | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.46        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| I have freedom to use personal initiative in doing work in my firm | 1.89        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.11        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.43          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.34        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| <b>Average mean</b>                                                | <b>2.12</b> |                 | <b>2.93</b> |                 | <b>2.60</b>   |                 | <b>2.44</b> |                 |
| <b>Impact</b>                                                      |             |                 |             |                 |               |                 |             |                 |
| I have influence over what happens in my work group                | 2.17        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.65        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.43          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.35        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| I decide how to go about doing my work                             | 2.14        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.06        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.64          | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.50        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| I have a great deal of control over my job                         | 1.87        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.92        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.62          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.31        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| <b>Average mean</b>                                                | <b>2.06</b> |                 | <b>2.88</b> |                 | <b>2.56</b>   |                 | <b>2.39</b> |                 |
| <b>Meaningfulness</b>                                              |             |                 |             |                 |               |                 |             |                 |
| My job activities are meaningful to                                | 3.16        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 4.38        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.93          | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.43        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |

|                                                                                                  |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| me                                                                                               |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| I care about what I do on my job                                                                 | 2.48        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.43        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.55        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.92        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| My work is important to me                                                                       | 2.44        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 4.57        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.83        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.04        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| <b>Average mean</b>                                                                              | <b>2.70</b> |                 | <b>3.43</b> |                 | <b>3.77</b> |                 | <b>3.13</b> |                 |
| <b>Competence</b>                                                                                |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| My job is well within the scope of my abilities                                                  | 4.07        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 4.72        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 4.60        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 4.05        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| I have mastered the skills to do my job                                                          | 3.28        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 4.20        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 3.50        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.29        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| I am confident about my ability to do my job                                                     | 3.23        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 4.58        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.81        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.43        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| Sponsored by my firm to attend Mandatory Continuing Professional Development /Workshop regularly | 3.18        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 4.46        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.05        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.94        | 4 <sup>th</sup> |
| <b>Average Mean</b>                                                                              | <b>3.44</b> |                 | <b>4.49</b> |                 | <b>3.74</b> |                 | <b>3.43</b> |                 |
| <b>Aggregate mean</b>                                                                            | <b>2.58</b> |                 | <b>3.43</b> |                 | <b>3.17</b> |                 | <b>2.85</b> |                 |

**Source:** Authors work, 2023

The result in Table 3 showed the extent of adoption of psychological empowerment in the Lagos, Abuja, and Port Harcourt study areas in particular and in Nigeria in general. The study found that the competency dimension of psychological empowerment was practiced highly in Abuja and Port Harcourt study areas with mean values of 4.49 and 3.74, respectively, using a 5-point Likert scale, while in Lagos and Nigeria study areas, employee empowerment was moderately practiced with mean ratings of 3.44 and 3.43, respectively. This result could be attributed to the fact that ESVPs in Abuja and Port Harcourt may be more aware of the strategic value of empowerment practices than those in Lagos. This result is consistent with the finding of Yin (2021) that the higher degree of competence dimension of empowerment was adopted by multinational enterprises in China. The aggregate means of 2.58, 3.43, 3.17, and 2.58, in Lagos, Abuja, Port Harcourt in particular, and Nigeria in general, indicated that employee empowerment was moderately practiced in the study area. This could be attributed to the level of appreciation for the values inherent in human resource practices such as employee empowerment in the real estate profession.

Moreover, regarding the self-identification dimension of employee empowerment, the study found that the average mean values in the Lagos study area in particular and Nigeria in general were 2.12 and 2.44, respectively, because these figures are closer to 2 than 3. This suggests that the extent of adoption of the self-identification dimension of empowerment was limited. This was evidenced by low mean ratings across the three locations in particular and Nigeria in general. This result could be attributed to employers' lack of trust in their employees, which makes them skeptical about giving them autonomy to make decisions in the workplace.

Similarly, in the Abuja and Port Harcourt study areas, the study found that the average mean values for self-identification were 2.93 and 2.60, respectively, because these figures are closer to 3 than 2. This suggests the extent of adoption of the self-identification dimension of psychological empowerment was moderately practiced. This could be attributed to the fact that the proprietors of the estate firms were careful about relinquishing too much power to the employees, probably because of a lack of trust or previous experience. This finding is in tandem with the studies of Greasley, Bryman, Dainty, Price, Soetanto, and King (2008) which found that business owners' adoption of empowerment was moderate as a result of their reluctance to relinquish power due to a lack of trust in their employees. Having analysed psychological empowerment, the next section focused on the analysis of extent of the adoption of structural empowerment.

#### 4.2 The Extent of Adoption of Structural Employee Empowerment Practice

The extent of adoption of structural employee empowerment practice of ESVFs in Lagos, Abuja, Port Harcourt and entire Nigeria was analysed using mean rating and the result is presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Extent of Adoption of Structural Empowerment of Estate Surveying and Valuation in the Study**

| Location                                                                                                                    | Lagos       |                 | Abuja       |                 | Port Harcourt |                 | Nigeria     |                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Structural Empowerment Dimensions                                                                                           | Mean        | R               | Mean        | R               | Mean          | R               | Mean        | R               |
| <b>Power</b>                                                                                                                |             |                 |             |                 |               |                 |             |                 |
| I am allowed to make decisions on my job undertakings in my firm                                                            | 2.52        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.43        | 5 <sup>th</sup> | 2.76          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.71        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| I have opportunities to express my ideas in my firm                                                                         | 2.48        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.18        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.90          | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.86        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| I have a lot of control over how I do my job in my firm                                                                     | 2.30        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.66        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.52          | 5 <sup>th</sup> | 2.57        | 4 <sup>th</sup> |
| Existence of power sharing increases my work autonomy in my firm                                                            | 2.11        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 3.18        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.81          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.77        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| I have authority to make autonomous decisions in my firm                                                                    | 1.95        | 5 <sup>th</sup> | 2.75        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.55          | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.47        | 5 <sup>th</sup> |
| <b>Average mean</b>                                                                                                         | <b>2.27</b> |                 | <b>2.71</b> |                 | <b>2.71</b>   |                 | <b>2.68</b> |                 |
| <b>Knowledge</b>                                                                                                            |             |                 |             |                 |               |                 |             |                 |
| I intend to share my knowledge with other members of my firm                                                                | 3.19        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.38        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.26          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.24        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| Existence of knowledge sharing improved work processes in my firm                                                           | 3.06        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.49        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.21          | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 3.22        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| I am trained on new skills related to my job undertakings always                                                            | 3.00        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.36        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 3.64          | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.20        | 4 <sup>th</sup> |
| Existence of knowledge sharing have positive influence on my performance because the more I know, the better I can perform. | 2.95        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 3.48        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.55          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.20        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| <b>Average mean</b>                                                                                                         | <b>3.05</b> |                 | <b>3.43</b> |                 | <b>3.42</b>   |                 | <b>3.21</b> |                 |
| <b>Information sharing</b>                                                                                                  |             |                 |             |                 |               |                 |             |                 |
| I have access to the information needed to perform my job in my firm                                                        | 2.58        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.77        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 4.05          | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.11        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |
| I can easily store information which help me work as a team in my firm                                                      | 2.38        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.04        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 3.19          | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.68        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| I can easily share information to other staff in my firm.                                                                   | 2.36        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.78        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.90          | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.58        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| Existence of information sharing engender positive team performance in my firm                                              | 2.18        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 3.05        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.21          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.58        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| <b>Average mean</b>                                                                                                         | <b>2.37</b> |                 | <b>3.16</b> |                 | <b>3.34</b>   |                 | <b>2.74</b> |                 |
| <b>Reward system</b>                                                                                                        |             |                 |             |                 |               |                 |             |                 |
| My pay encourages me to improve the quality of my work in                                                                   | 2.20        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.96        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 3.05          | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.55        | 1 <sup>st</sup> |

|                                                                       |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| my firm                                                               |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |             |                 |
| I will receive a reward if I do something to improve work in my firm. | 2.07        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 2.53        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3.10        | 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2.38        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> |
| I am satisfied with the rewards system in my firm                     | 1.99        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.01        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.29        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.19        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
| My firm always renege on incentive agreement                          | 1.72        | 4 <sup>th</sup> | 2.40        | 5 <sup>th</sup> | 2.95        | 3 <sup>rd</sup> | 2.13        | 4 <sup>th</sup> |
| <b>Average mean</b>                                                   | <b>1.99</b> |                 | <b>2.39</b> |                 | <b>2.85</b> |                 | <b>2.31</b> |                 |
| <b>Aggregate mean</b>                                                 | <b>2.42</b> |                 | <b>2.92</b> |                 | <b>3.08</b> |                 | <b>2.74</b> |                 |

**Source:** Authors work, 2023

From Table 4, the information sharing dimension of structural empowerment was practiced little in the Lagos study area with an average mean value of 2.37 using a 5-point Likert scale, while in Abuja, Port Harcourt, and the entire study area of Nigeria, the information sharing dimension of structural empowerment was moderately practiced with an average mean value of 3.16, 3.34, and 2.74, respectively. This could be linked to the unwillingness of practitioners in real estate sector to divulge business information to competitors to have a competitive advantage. This suggests that there was no free flow of information among employees of the firms. This could be attributed to the fact that employers in the real estate sector are not willing to reveal information so that competitors in the sector will not steal their business ideas. This result confirmed the study of Baird and Wang (2010) that there was a moderate adoption of employee empowerment practice of information sharing in Australian manufacturing industry.

The reward system dimension of structural empowerment in Lagos, Abuja, and the entire study area was practiced little, with average mean values of 1.99, 2.39, and 2.31, respectively. These figures were closer to 2 than 3. This suggests that the extent of adoption of employee empowerment was limited using the 5-point Likert scale. This could be linked to the inability of real estate practitioners to appreciate the importance of a reward system for enhancing employee morale and organisational performance. Whereas, in Port Harcourt study area, the study found that the reward system was moderately practiced with an average mean value of 2.85. This result could be attributed to the meagre salary payment system being implemented by the real estate firms in the study area. This finding could be responsible for the high employee turnover currently being experienced in the real estate sector in Nigeria. The reason for turnover and turnover intention is not far-fetched. If employees are not well remunerated, they will be less committed and vice versa.

In the Abuja study area, the average mean value for the reward system was 2.39. This figure is closer to 2 than 3. This suggests that the extent of empowerment adoption in the Abuja study area was limited. This result could be attributed to the meagre salaries being paid to the employees in the real industry and the general economic climate in Nigeria. This suggests that for employees of the firms to be empowered structurally, the reward system needs to be improved upon by the chief executive officers of the firms. The firms need to improve their incentive schemes in order to enhance employees' commitment and organisational performance because the study found that their reward system is low. Therefore, employees of ESVMs need to be adequately remunerated and incentivized. In the same vein, the average mean for the knowledge dimension of structural empowerment in Lagos, Abuja, and Port Harcourt in particular and in the entire Nigeria in general was 3.05, 3.43, 3.42, and 3.21, respectively, and these figures are closer to 3 than 4. This suggests that the knowledge dimension of structural empowerment was moderately practiced in these study areas. This could be attributed to the educational and professional qualifications of the employees of the firms in the study area.

Similarly, the study found that the power dimension of structural empowerment was practiced little in the Lagos study area, with an average mean value of 2.27. Meanwhile, in Abuja, Port Harcourt, and the entire study area of Nigeria, the average mean values were 2.71, 2.71, and 2.68, respectively. This suggests that the power dimension was moderately practiced in

these study areas. This result could be attributed to the fact that the employees of ESVFs in these study areas might have the power to make some decisions, such as negotiating valuation fees with clients, which they rated moderately among others.

### **5.1 Discussion of Results**

The employee empowerment practiced by the Nigerian by Estate Surveyors and Valuers were psychological empowerment and structural empowerment but the extent of adoption of empowerment practices was moderate. This is in tandem with the study of Baird and Wang (2010) that empowerment practice of Australian manufacturing industry is moderately practiced. The result further found that competence attribute of psychological empowerment was highly practiced in Nigeria. This is because real estate services being provided by the estate surveyors and valuers required specialised skills and expertise to provide quality service to clients. Therefore, the estate surveyors and valuers prioritized this attribute and see it as being key to client's retention. This result is consistent with the finding of Yin (2021) that the higher degree of competence dimension of empowerment was adopted by multi-national enterprises in China.

The study again found that the impact attribute of psychological empowerment was practiced little in Nigeria. This could be attributed to lack of trust of the employees by the employers probably due to previous bitter experience of given employees of making decision such as negotiating valuation fees with clients. This finding corroborated the study of Greasley, Bryman, Dainty, Price, Soetanto, and King (2005) and Denham *et al.* (2007) that impact dimension of psychological empowerment of employees were practiced little. Information sharing dimension of structural empowerment was practiced little in Nigeria. This could be attributed to the fact that employers in the real estate sector are not willing to reveal information so that competitors in the sector will not steal their business ideas. This result confirmed the study of Baird and Wang (2010) that there was a low level of employee empowerment practice of information sharing in Australian manufacturing industry.

The reward system dimension of structural empowerment in the study area was practiced little. This result could be attributed to the meagre salaries being paid to the employees in the real industry and the general economic climate in Nigeria. This suggests that for employees of the firms to be empowered structurally, the reward system needs to be improved upon by the chief executive officers of the firms. The finding is in tandem with Meyerson and Dewettinck (2012) posited that to generate beneficial ideas that lead to improved business functionality, companies must have an effective reward system in place.

### **5.2 Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study investigated the empowerment practice of estate surveying and valuation firms in Nigeria in terms of the types and extent of adoption of empowerment practice. This was with a view to providing information that could improve empowerment implementation that would engender organisational commitment. The study specifically found that both psychological and structural empowerment were practiced by estate surveying and valuation firms in Nigeria. The study further found that both psychological and structural empowerment were moderately practiced in Nigeria. This suggests that employee empowerment initiative and its implementation should be properly embraced by estate surveying and valuation firms in Nigeria such that employee morale would be boosted and therefore engender improved service offerings to clients.

Again, on the first hand, competence attributes of psychological empowerment were highly practiced by estate surveying and valuation firms in Nigeria. The competencies of the employees should be maintained and improved by estate surveying and valuation firms by ensuring employees are trained through seminars and workshops on current and best practices in the profession to ensure quality service. On the other hand, the reward attribute of structural empowerment was rarely practiced. The estate surveying and valuation firms should improve on the reward system by adequately and promptly paying salaries and emolument of their employees. The firms should not renege on promised compensation when employees facilitate and consummate real estate transactions. This will make employees do more than required to

deliver qualitative service to clients thereby projecting the firm's image in a good light. In conclusion, estate surveying and valuation firms must improve empowerment implementation to boost employee's morale to provide quality service to clients and employee commitment to the firms. The study recommended that Nigerian estate surveyors and valuers should see to empowering their employees as organizational responsibility that needs to be implemented with vigor for enhanced organisational performance.

## References

- Baird, K. and Wang, H. (2010). Employee empowerment: extent of adoption and influential factors. *Personnel Review*, 39 (5), 574-599.
- Bowen, D. E., and Lawler, E.E. (1995). Empowering Service Employees. *Sloan Management Review*, 36 (4), 73-84.
- Fernandez, S. and Moldogaziev, T. (2011). Empowering public sector employees to improve performance: Does it work? *American Review of Public Administration*, 41 (1), 23-47.
- Greasley, K., Bryman, A., Dainty, A., Price, A., Naismith, N. and Soetants, R. (2008). Understanding empowerment from an employee perspective; what does it mean and do they want it? *Team performance management*, 14(1/2), 39-55.
- Herzberg, M. and Mausner, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. 2nd Edition, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 20, 141-147.
- Jha, S. (2010). Influence of psychological empowerment on affective, normative and Continuance commitment: A study in Indian industry. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15 (1), 53-72.
- Kim, P.B., Lee, G. and Jang, J. (2017). Employee empowerment and its contextual determinants and outcome for service workers: a cross-national study. *Management Decision*, 55 (5), 1022-1041.
- Korkmaz, O. (2012). Differences in employees' perception of employee empowerment practices. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 34 (1), 43-57.
- Liu, A. M.M., Chiu, W.M. and Fellows, R. (2007). Enhancing commitment through work empowerment. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 14 (6), 568 – 580.
- Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A. and Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research? A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 54 (1), 11-22.
- Men, L.R. (2011). How employee empowerment influences organisation–employee relationship in China, *Public Relations Review*, 37, 435– 437.
- Menon, S. T. (1999). Psychological empowerment: Definition, measurement, and validation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 31(3), 161-164.
- Meyerson, G. and Dewettick, B. (2012). Effect of empowerment on employee's performance. *Advanced Research in Economic and Management Sciences*, 2, 40-46.
- Milkovich, G.T., Newman, J.M. and Ratnam, C.S.V. (2010). *Compensation*. 10 Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Narenji, N. and Nojabae, S.S. (2015). Identification of factors affecting employees' empowerment in Airports of Mazandaran Province. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (3), 747-753.
- Ogunbameru, O.A. (2000). *Introducing social research and report writing*. Ibadan: Pat-Mag Press.
- Pardo del Val, M. and Lloyd, B. (2003). Measuring empowerment. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 24 (2), 102-108.
- Peter, N.J., Oni, A.S., Ogunowo, O.E. and Fateye, O.B. (2019). As assessment of workers' satisfaction in estate surveying and valuation firms in Lagos State, Nigeria, *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology*, 10 (3), 964-977.
- Randolph, W. A. (1995). Navigating the journey to empowerment. *Organisational Dynamics*, 23 (4), 19-32.

- Randolph, W. A., & Kemery, E. R. (2011). Managerial use of power bases in a model of managerial empowerment practices and employee psychological empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, 18 (1), 95-106.
- Smith, A. (2000). 1776 and All That: A Short Guide to the History of Economic Thought
- Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: construct definition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (5), 1442-1465.
- Thomas, K.W. and Velthouse, B.A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: an interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation. *The Academy of Management Review*, 15, (4), 666-681.
- Yin, Y. (2021). What determines the adoption of employee empowerment practices by MNE subsidiaries in China? An institutional perspective. *Chinese Management Studies* 14 (4), 871-894.
- Yin, Y., Wang, Y. and Lu, Y. (2019). Why firms adopt empowerment practices and how such practices affect firm performance? A transaction cost-exchange perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29 (1), 111-124.