

ENTERPRISE HIERARCHY MANAGEMENT; REINVENTING ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL EFFICIENCY IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

ELSIE EMMANUEL ENEYO¹ and PROFESSOR PATRICK NWINYOKPUGI¹

Department of Office and Information Management, Faculty of Management Sciences,
Rivers State University, Port Harcourt
Nwinyokpugi.ptrick@rsu.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between Enterprise Hierarchy Management and Administrative Control Efficiency of the Rivers state Civil Service. As a cross sectional study that adopted the macro level analysis, a census of principal officers of the 26 civil service ministries in Rivers state were covered. Thus, 108 principal officers in the rank of permanent secretary, Director-Administration, Director-Finance & Administration, Director-Planning and Research were studied. The structured close ended questionnaire was used to gather the study data on the test of the dimensions of Enterprise Hierarchy Management (Rules Supremacy, Span of Control, Chain of Command and Discipline Architecture) and their relationship index with Administrative Control Efficiency. The data gathered were statistically analysed using the Spearman Rank Order Correlations statistical tool and presented with the aid of SPSS version 20. Findings of the study revealed strong positive significant relationships between the tested dimensions of Enterprise Hierarchy Management against the measures of Administrative Control Efficiency(Commitment and Compliance) in Rivers State civil Service. Findings also revealed positive significant moderating effect of Organisational Culture on Enterprise Hierarchy Management and Administrative Control Efficiency in the Rivers State civil service. Based on the findings, the study concluded that there is positive significant relationship in the study dimensions and the measures thus, the study recommended that the identified indicators of Enterprise Hierarchy Management should be encouraged in Rivers State civil Service so as to enshrine efficiency of Administrative Control.

Keywords: Enterprise Hierarchy, Administrative Control, commitment, Compliance, Organisational Culture, Span of Control, Chain of Command, Rules supremacy.

INTRODUCTION

The success of any human engaged system is a function of how efficient the control mechanism are applied. Nothing works well without some mechanics of regulation. The civil service in Rivers State had over the years been subjected to the discretions of the political leadership of the state. The failure of the systems can be traced to the efficiency of the administrative control mechanism and the sustainability of administrative control is determined by the strength of the rules of engagement. When workplace rules are not inculcated into the working lives of the workforce, a Every entity is driven on the path of achieving a predetermined goal and private business organisations as well the public sector organisations are driven by these goals. The success of achieving goals is a function of the systems structure as well as the regulatory processes that work in the way of monitoring and guide. A hierarchical structure is the chain of command within a company that begins with senior management and executives and extends to general employees. This organization of authority ensures management levels understand their relationships with each other and helps companies make efficient decisions. (Csaszar, 2021). The civil service in Rivers State is to a greater extent the product of seasoned political arrangements, therefore, allowing the systems run a deliberately free style is tantamount to pushing it to careless extinction. Administrative control procedures and organizational innovation appear to be incompatible organizational processes. Administrative control procedures are used to maximize coordination and to ensure reliability and predictability of behavior in the organization.

Organizational controls may also be hierarchical, collegial, or nonhierarchical. Hierarchical controls emanate from the organizational member's superior in the form of rules, procedures, and directives and in the form of evaluation, either through direct supervision or through the evaluation of outputs or results. Collegial control occurs when the subordinate claims professional status and is constrained by the rules, training, and expectations of colleagues. Finally, organizational controls may be nonhierarchical, deriving either from the power of internalized norms and values or from the strength of environmental groups that cross the organizational boundary to exert influence on the subordinate (Awajan, 2015). An organizational control system can vary in a number of important ways. It may be unitary, with all controls coordinated and emanating from one superior, or it may be fragmented, with control efforts emanating from different internal individuals or units or from external groups. The overall tightness or looseness of coupling in different control systems may also vary and the proportion of tight and loose controls may vary within types of organizations as well as between types of organizations. Finally, some patterns of control may be more effective than others in accomplishing organizational goals (Al-Bawab, 2015).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Today the dominant form of organisation in the private and public sectors is bureaucracy. The pedigree of the term 'Bureaucracy' is not quite clear. As Fritz Morstein Marx points out, "it was first used in the French form *bureaucratie* by a French Minister of commerce in operation, spread to Germany during the 19th century as *Burokratie*, and has since found its way into English and many other languages." The word 'Bureaucracy' was first coined by Vincent de Gournay (1712-1759), an economist of France. He had observed: "We have an illness in France which bids fair to play havoc with us; this illness is called *bureaumania*." The Dictionary of the French Academy accepted the word in its 1798 supplement and defined it as "power, influence of the heads and staff of government bureaux." The word 'Bureaucracy' itself is often used in a negative sense, that is, to characterize organizations burdened by red-tape and inefficient procedures. Actually, it refers to a specific form of social organization for administrative purposes. The most systematic study so far of bureaucratic phenomena is traced back to German sociologist Max Weber. Regarding the origin and nature of his concept 'organisation' (*Verband*) to Weber a person could be said to have 'power' (*Macht*) if within a social relationship his own power is exercised for the structuring of human groups, it becomes a special instance of power called 'authority' (*Herrschaft*). Thus, Weber distinguished between power and authority or 'domination'. This entails: Hierarchical arrangement of offices or positions (i.e., a pyramid like structure with each lower office under the control of a higher one). It follows the approach of systems theory and extensively utilizes methods and results of operations research, discrete mathematics, and game theory. In contrast to management theory and organizational studies. (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). TCO is an essentially formal, mathematical theory. In addition, it contains a brief sketch of individual and collective decision-making models. These models form the basis for the models of behavior by members of organizational systems.

Hierarchy Management: Hierarchies are often described as a system or organization in which elements are ranked, one above the other, according to status or authority. In general, hierarchy management requires that the levels and nodes are both accurate and in the right place. However, in analytical context, hierarchies have unique requirements depending on their intended purpose.

For example, in reporting, each level in the hierarchy represents a reporting level. Higher levels in the hierarchy are rollups or consolidations of their children. Entrepreneurs tend to regard the organizational structure of hierarchy as “a bureaucratic threat to their entrepreneurial souls” (Gulati & DeSantola, 2016) and are thus reluctant to impose hierarchical layers of managers (Davila, Foster, & Jia, 2010; Puranam, 2014). Some have gone on to successfully launch a “flat” start-up with minimal layers, thus gaining much popular acclaim and scholarly interest (Burton et al., 2017; Puranam & Håkonsson, 2015). This distaste for hierarchy among entrepreneurs is perhaps not surprising if we consider two assertions on new entrepreneurial ventures in the classic literature on organization design. One such assertion is that such small and undifferentiated firms do not require layers of managers for coordination (Lee & Edmondson, 2017). The other is that as these small nascent firms typically operate in dynamic and hostile industries (Santos & Eisenhardt, 2009), they should be flat to streamline their decision-making process and flexibly adapt to their environments (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Covin & Slevin, 1989; Garicano & Posner, 2005). However, recent qualitative studies have started to raise questions about this popular narrative that start-ups should be flat. These studies point out that, albeit smaller and less differentiated than their mature counterparts, start-ups face coordination problems because these nascent firms not only lack formalized routines (i.e., standard operating procedures; Sine, Mitsuhashi, & Kirsch, 2006; Stinchcombe, 1965, pp. 148–150) and informal coordination devices (e.g., shared culture or norms; McEvily, Soda, & Tortoriello, 2014; Meier, Stephenson, & Perkowski, 2019), but also have insufficient resources to designate integrating committees (Baker & Nelson, 2005). As start-ups have no other coordination devices that can substitute for hierarchy, Sutton and Rao (2014, p. 107) suggest that “even [these] small organizations can't function without hierarchies.” To date, this theoretical debate over whether start-ups should be flat has not been empirically addressed, partly due to the challenges in gathering a large sample dataset of start-ups and measuring their hierarchy (Burton, Colombo, Rossi-Lamastra, & Wasserman, 2019; Keum & See, 2017). Thus, as Burton et al. (2019, p. 2) remark, “the empirical evidence on the 2 LEE antecedents and consequences of organizational design choices in entrepreneurial ventures is both limited and mixed.” Hence, much remains to be learned about how the existing theories on organizational design apply to these nascent firms (Dushnitsky & Matusik, 2019; van de Ven, Ganco, & Hinings, 2013). To address this gap and reconcile the debate on whether start-ups should be flat, there are two conditions that start-ups face but that the popular narrative has largely neglected. The first condition is that these nascent firms lack alternative coordination devices (Sine et al., 2006). The second is that although start-ups strive for both creative success and commercial success (i.e., novelty vs. profitability; Kaul, 2013; they often realize one at the expense of the other (Kaplan & Vakili, 2015; Uzzi & Spiro, 2005, p. 468). This is because these two outcomes are shaped by distinct processes, thus requiring different structural configurations (Csaszar, 2013; Csaszar & Eggers, 2013; Keum & See, 2017).

Rules Supremacy: Bureaucracies function under formal rules. These instructions state how all tasks in the organization, or in a particular tier of the hierarchy, are to be performed. The rules are often called standard operating procedures (SOP) and are formalized in procedures manuals. From a scholarly perspective, the notion of optimal bureaucratic structure is not a new one: organizations are thought to seek optimal levels of bureaucratization based on rational decision processes (Wintrobe 1982), optimal managerial control has been conceptually linked to organizational effectiveness (Bozeman 2000, 95), and optimal levels of rules for particular

organizational sizes and sectors have been proposed as a diagnostic tool for red tape (Bretschneider and Bozeman 1995), managerial undercontrol can undercut organizational effectiveness and must be considered in crafting an effective rule (Bozeman 2000). The primary benefit of an optimally controlling requirement is the efficient pursuit of rule objectives, achieved through the imposition of minimum constraint necessary for achieving rule objectives. By comparison, undercontrolling rules impose inadequate constraints for achieving rule objectives and thus waste resources (Bozeman 2000, 95), whereas overcontrolling rules impose more constraint than necessary for achieving rule objectives and waste resources (Bozeman 2000; Landau and Stout 1979). Optimally controlling rules also provide two social psychological benefits that mirror the social psychological costs of undercontrol and overcontrol. First, optimally controlling rules convey a commitment to achieving desired objectives, as opposed to undercontrolling rules which can indicate an insincere or superficial commitment to rule objectives.

Although undercontrolling rules can be intentional or unintentional, they are nonetheless thought to alienate stakeholders by conveying normlessness that, in turn, can trigger rebellion or superficial compliance (Goodsell, 2000). Second, optimally controlling rules communicate organizational trust, defined here as “a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of the intentions or the behavior of another” (Rousseau et al. 1998, 395). In the context of green tape, the minimal constraint imposed by optimally controlling rules, just enough to elicit desired outcomes—conveys that rule makers expect stakeholders to comply with rule requirements and accept the vulnerability of noncompliance with minimal constraint. Conversely, excessively controlling rules communicate that rule formulators are not willing to risk stakeholder noncompliance with lesser controlling rules. These arguments are consistent with the notion that there exists a threshold of control at which trust is communicated and beyond which distrust is communicated (Dekker 2004, 34). In turn, the messages of trust thought to emanate from optimally controlling rules are expected to increase cooperation with rule implementation. This contention is based on theory and evidence of trust responsiveness, which holds that individuals who feel trusted behave in trustworthy ways based on a desire to meet the truster’s expectations. By contrast, the message of distrust theoretically conveyed by over controlling rules is expected to lower cooperation with rule implementation, a contention supported by experimental evidence that distrust is a “hidden cost” of control that lowers motivation and performance (Falk and Kosfeld 2004; Frey 1993). Assembling these strands of thought, optimally controlling rules are thought to exist on a sort of “dose-response” curve. Control above the optimal level is thought to undercut rule efficiency and convey distrust. Control below the optimal level is expected to fail to achieve objectives and appear insincere to stakeholders. Optimal control, by contrast, is anticipated to efficiently achieve rule objectives and communicate the organizational sincerity of rule objectives and trust that stakeholders will cooperate in rule implementation without the need for additional constraints. Written rules were valued for their ability to empower rule implementation, both by validating rule requirements to the regulated and neutralizing the appearance of authority. Unwritten rules—of which city workers seemed keenly aware—were viewed as incapable of fulfilling these functions and sometimes working against them.

Span of Control: Fayol argued that the number of subordinates at the lowest level of management should be 10 to 30, 15 on average, and 2 to 5 at the highest level of management.

However, there is no exact rule in determining the exact number of subordinates per one superior (Delbecq, 1968; Staats et al., 2012; Davison, 2003; House and Miner, 1969; Nasrallah, 2015; Pendharkar et al., 2009; Holm-Petersen et al., 2017; Wallin et al., 2014; Walter and Zimmermann, 2016) because the size of the span influences several determinants that deviate from industry, enterprise size, type of organizational structure, performance of the organization (Staats et al., 2012). Zagoršek (2014) is also dedicated to a team's performance in terms of individual performance. There are also the competence of the head employee, the personality of the subordinates and their experience, knowledge (Schyns et al., 2010), motivation and degree of engagement, innovation in the team (Peltokorpi and Merv, 2014). Another factor is spatial organization. If the subordinates are concentrated in one place, it creates a lesser burden on the time and communication of the head employee. Conversely, if his/her subordinates are situated in different locations or even in different time zones, it places a heavy burden on the communication skills and time management of the head employee. As well as the quality of mutual relations in all directions (horizontal, vertical and diagonal) and the existence and efficiency of staff departments are important.

The level of process organization and standardization— if the level of organization is optimal and the individual processes are standardized, appropriate conditions are created to increase the span of control. The span of control expresses how many employees are directly subordinated to one supervisor. It can be different in the same enterprise at different hierarchical levels, but can also be different at the same level of control (McMullen and Nethersell, 2009). We distinguish actual span of control which gives a realistic picture of how many subordinates correspond to one manager, from an optimal span of control, which presents the number of subordinates one manager can effectively manage in a given post. This means the maximum number of subordinates the team leader can effectively manage in terms of his/her limited physical and mental capacity. Enterprises focusing on knowledge management and offering progressive training for talented employees can create more qualified teams. Teams with a higher span of control permit better selection of managers, higher likelihood of self-presentation, as well as faster results in the early stages of their career (Nikolowa, 2015). The performance of the teams and the overall effectivity of the organization can be estimated through the span of control. The maximum span of control is determined as the product of two independent variables – the individual index of company administration and how many managers manage one operation individually (Bagautdinova and Validova, 2014). Till now implemented research studies have demonstrated that determining a specific span influences a variety of organizational parameters, with the most commonly used analytical approach.

Chain of Command: The chain of command is the system used to ensure that each individual receives instructions for a particular task from only one supervisor. It is an authority and accountability chain from the highest office or position within the chain to the lowest element. The chain of command assists commanders at all levels to achieve their primary function of accomplishing the organization or unit's assigned mission while caring for personnel and property in their charge. A chain of command provides proper avenues of communication. It allows for members to give and receive information. When used properly, it is both simple and effective. All orders and instructions should be issued through the chain of command. A person or unit can only have one immediate commander who issues orders and provides instructions. The hierarchy in organizations has not died. Although there are many opposing voices

(Lichtarski, 2014). In one of the scenarios it is assumed that a perfect organization will not need an organizational structure at all (Hamel, 2011), in another one – that the organization is fully open and there are no internal boundaries (vertical and horizontal) (Ashkenas, 2002). On the other hand, as Leavitt (2005) argues, all highly flexible structural solutions are inconsistent with human nature, and therefore will not be able to replace traditional hierarchical structures. This paper is in line with the last assumption that the organizational structure of the future will be an adapting hierarchy, and its perfection will be expressed in adapting to nature (homo hierarchicus) and human needs. Therefore, it is and will be still justified to study the issues of hierarchical challenges in organizations. One of them is a chain of command, frequently replaced by the term “scalar chain” or “line of authority”. The original proponent of the chain of command was Henri Fayol in one of his 14 management principles. In the middle of the XX century Fayol stated: “the line of authority is the route followed – via every link in the chain – by all communications which start from or go to the ultimate authority” (Fayol, 1949). According to Crumpton (2013), the chain of command is an element of organizational structure which refers to an organization’s hierarchy of reporting relationships. It has an important meaning for all personnel within the organization by determining a line of supervision for providing both direction and guidance and also to troubleshoot and advocate for resources and other needs related to the accomplishment of goals.

The chain of command not only establishes accountability, but it also lays out the decision-making power in an organization. It should ensure that every task, job position and department has one person assuming responsibility for performance. Despite its still valid and significant importance, the problem of the chain of command is insufficiently addressed in contemporary literature. Insufficiently in terms of lacking the complex systematization and practical verification of knowledge. Yes, there were relatively numerous attempts to recognize the impact of the chain of command in organizations. This impact may be positive, constructive (Qian, 1994, Aghion and Tirole, 1997, Kassing, 2009, Syriopoulos and Tsatsaronis, 2012, Oginni et al., 2014, Zydziunaite V. et al., 2015, Sanner and Bunderson, 2018) or negative, destructive (South and Matejka, 1990, Friebel and Raith, 2004, Hart and Moore, 2005, Yoo et al., 2006, Kassing, 2007, Abu Bakar and Mustaffa, 2008, Gaur and Ebrahimi, 2013). However, these attempts are fragmentary and often methodologically not consistent because they either remain purely theoretical or have no statistical validity in the case of empirical research. The aim of the study is the theoretical and empirical examination of the influence of the chain of command on different fields in organizations.

Discipline Architecture: Workplace discipline is defined as a systematic process of controlling and influencing all employees in the organization to achieve and maintain standards of behavior (rules of behaviour, alternatively the code of behaviour at work) in order to accomplish organizational goals and objectives. It is viewed as formulation, implementation and on-going maintenance of a fair and constructive discipline system for controlling human behaviour. Discipline means securing consistent behaviour in accordance with the accepted norms of behaviour and it is essential to a democratic way of life (Singh et al, 1990). Proper administration of discipline results in willing cooperation and observance of the rules established to achieve organizational goals and objectives. Proper employee discipline will lead to the absence of disorders and irregularities in the employees' behaviour. Disciplined employees cooperate and behave in orderly way. One author namely Tripathi (1992) notes: "Nothing left loose ever does

anything creative. No horse gets anywhere until he is harnessed. No steam ever drives anything until it is confined. No Niagara is ever turned into light and power until it is funnelled. No man ever grows until he is disciplined". Within an organization whether it is a business, a society, a university, a trade union or an association, the creation, promotion and maintenance of employee discipline are essential for making any organized activity efficient and effective. Employee morale and industrial peace are definitely linked with a proper maintenance of discipline (Mamoria, 1991). Individuals, having different interests, ambitions, orientations, and focus are employed in the organization, and most likely would result in conflict due to the divergence in interests. Due to the conflicting interests of employees and the possessive attitude of employees or employees, there is a tendency for behavioral attitudes to deviate from the established rules and regulations of the organizations (Idris & Alegbeleye, 2015). The lack of adequate disciplinary measures in an organization spurs ineffectiveness and ineptitude on the part of such organization (Nwosu & Ugwuera, 2015). Effective discipline enables an organization to accomplish its goals cost-effectively (Onah, 2009). There have been so many complaints that public institutions such as Abia State Polytechnic, has been under-performing, and lack of discipline has been attributed among the causal factors. Staff indiscipline is entrenched in the Nigerian civil service and the conventional function of policy implementation has been negatively affected. As a matter of fact, the Federal Civil Service Commission, which is saddled with the responsibility of maintaining order and discipline in public parastatals have been deficient in this function. According to Ani (2011), the majority of public servants in Nigeria have a conception that civil service belongs to the colonialists and this made them behave out of control. An undisciplined organization is an ineffective organization. This supports the assertion of Agba and Abubakar (2013) that employees would dissipate their best efforts to the organization when things are properly put in place. According to Schein (2008), human behavior is determined by some needs and motives. As a result of the unpredictability of man's behavior, it is pretty difficult to identify the driving force that makes men behave in certain ways. Management experts recognized discipline has a potent tool that could be deployed to address the ineffectiveness of public organizations in Nigeria. Public parastatals are known for gross misconduct such as unexcused absence, fraud, dishonesty, discrimination, falsification of records, vandalization of properties, sexual harassment, insubordination, truancy and absenteeism amongst others (Onah, 2009). Staff discipline is pivotal to the daily operations of any organization if it wants to accomplish its stated goals and objectives. Public service in Nigeria is known for inefficiency, bribery, corruption, misconduct, discrimination, nepotism, non-compliance with the code of conduct, lack of respect for law. Despite the establishment of anti-corruption agencies like the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) to curtail deviant behaviors in public organizations, indiscipline, misconduct, and corruption remain pervasive in the Nigerian public service. An organization may have established goals such as increasing net assets of owners, maximizing customer satisfaction, achieving institutional growth, improving market share, achieving financial stability and so on. In order to achieve the organizational goals proper employee discipline is of very importance.

METHODS

This study population comprises of all the principal officers of all the twenty six (26) ministries in the Rivers State civil service. Consequently, in this study, there was no need to be involved in the rigorous procedures for determining an appropriate sample size rather census sampling was adopted because our population of study was not large. A census of 108 respondents was derived

as the study sample which include Permanent Secretaries, Directors Administration, Directors Finance and Administration and Directors of Planning and Research across all the 26 ministries of the Rivers State Civil Service, Nigeria. Hierarchy Management which is the predictor variable of the study was operationalized using four dimensions: Rule Supremacy and Span of Control, Chain of Command and Discipline Architecture. The dimensions reflect manifestations and distinct attributes of knowledge harvesting as expressed by the corporate entities of interest in this study. Each dimension is also examined on a set of multi-item instruments with 4 indicators each; all scaled on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 4 = Strongly Agree; 3 = Agree; 2 = Disagree and 1 = Strongly Disagree. The reliability of the instrument variables will be the 0.7 threshold of Cronbach alpha. Therefore, the researcher employed the use of Cronbach Alpha in calculating the average of all possible split half reliability coefficient as a rule of thumb according to Nunally (1978).

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The data obtained from the field will be analysed in several stages. The analyses was carried out at primary, secondary and tertiary stages. The primary stage of the analyses used descriptive analytical tools such as frequencies, means, standard deviations and diagrams. At the secondary stage, inferential statistics will be used to answer the research questions and test the research hypotheses; the hypotheses were tested using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation coefficient pronounced (ρ), to be aided by the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The Spearman Rank Order correlation is relevant because responses are measured in Likert scale with ordinal data. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation coefficient was adopted as the correlation tool as a result of its non-parametric features (normality of distribution, homogeneity of variance for the variables) and its suitability for data which is either scaled on the interval or ordinal level of scaling. It also allows for the assessment of the assumptions of ranking in the effect and associations between the variables. Bivariate analysis measures the strength of relationship between two variables in a single test and produces values such as -1 and +1; these values are referred to as the correlation coefficient. A positive correlation coefficient indicates a positive relationship between variables; this means an increase in the values of one variable affects increase in the values of the other variables. Negative correlation coefficient expresses a negative relationship; this means that as the values of one variable decreases, the values of the other variable decreases too; while correlation coefficient at zero indicates zero relationship. The decision to utilize the spearman rank order correlation coefficient was informed by the nature of data in this study. The observation requires ascertainment of the degree of correlation which is best fitted in Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient ρ ; it is an appropriate analytical tool when rank or ordinal data are used (Ngereni, 2005). It is appropriate for paired observations and is best measured by the ordinal scale (Baridam, 2001). It is designed mainly to determine whether two rankings of the same case are identical. The formula for the spearman's rank-order correlations is as follows:

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d_1^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Where r_s = Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

d_1 = differences in ranking of a given observation

n = number of observations

Table 1: Correlations Matrix for Rule Supremacy and Administrative Control Efficiency

| | | | Rule Supremacy | Commitment | Compliance |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| Spearman's rho | Rule Supremacy | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .916** | .927** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Commitment | Correlation Coefficient | .916** | 1.000 | .989** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Compliance | Correlation Coefficient | .927** | .989** | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | . |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |

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

Table 1 above shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) of 0.916 on the relationship between rule supremacy and commitment. This value implies that very strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in commitment was as a result of the adoption of rule supremacy. Therefore, there is a very strong positive correlation between rule supremacy and commitment in Rivers State Civil Service. Similarly, it shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) of 0.927 on the relationship between rule supremacy and compliance. This value implies that a strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in compliance was as a result of the adoption of rule supremacy. Therefore, there is a very strong positive correlation between rule supremacy and compliance in Rivers State Civil Service. The result obtained from Table 4.14, the sig- calculated is less than significant level ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). Therefore, based on this finding the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between rule supremacy and commitment in Civil Service in Rivers State.

Table 2: Correlations Matrix for Span of control and administrative control efficiency

| | | | Span of Control | Commitment | Compliance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| Spearman's rho | Span of Control | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .961** | .966** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Commitment | Correlation Coefficient | .961** | 1.000 | .989** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Compliance | Correlation Coefficient | .966** | .989** | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | . |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |

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

The correlation coefficient (rho) result in table 2 was used to answer the research question 2 stated in the chapter one of this study. Table 4.15 shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (r) of 0.961 on the relationship between span of control and commitment. This value implies that very strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in commitment was as a result of the adoption of span of control. It also shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (r) of 0.966 on the relationship between span of control and compliance. This value implies that a strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in compliance was as a result of the adoption of span of control. Therefore, there is a very strong positive correlation between span of control and compliance in Rivers State Civil Service. From the result obtained from Table 4.15, the sig- calculated is less than significant level ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). Therefore, based on this finding the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between span of control and commitment in Civil Service in Rivers State.

Table 3: Correlations Matrix for Chain of Command and administrative control efficiency

| | | Chain of Command | Commitment | Compliance | |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Spearman's rho | Chain of Command | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .978** | .969** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Commitment | Correlation Coefficient | .978** | 1.000 | .989** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Compliance | Correlation Coefficient | .969** | .989** | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | . |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |

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

The correlation coefficient (rho) result in table 3 above shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) of 0.978 on the relationship between chain of command and commitment. This value implies that very strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in commitment was as a result of the adoption of chain of command. Similarly, Table 3 shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) of 0.969 on the relationship between chain of command and compliance. This value implies that a strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in compliance was as a result of the adoption of chain of command. The statistical test of significance (p-value) which makes possible the generalization of our findings to the study population. From the result obtained from Table 4.16, the sig- calculated is less than significant level ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). Therefore, based on this finding the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between chain of command and commitment in Civil Service in Rivers State.

Table 4. Correlations Matrix for discipline architecture and administrative control efficiency

| | | | Discipline Architecture | Commitment | Compliance |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------|------------|
| Spearman's rho | Discipline Architecture | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | .978** | .968** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Commitment | Correlation Coefficient | .978** | 1.000 | .989** |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | . | .000 |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| | Compliance | Correlation Coefficient | .968** | .989** | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | . |
| | | N | 90 | 90 | 90 |

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

Table 4 shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) of 0.987 on the relationship between discipline architecture and commitment. This value implies that very strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in commitment was as a result of the adoption of discipline architecture. It also shows a Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho) of 0.968 on the relationship between discipline architecture and compliance. This value implies that a strong relationship exists between the variables. The direction of the relationship indicates that the correlation is positive; implying that an increase in compliance was as a result of the adoption of discipline architecture. Therefore, there is a very strong positive correlation between discipline architecture and compliance in Rivers State Civil Service.

Table 5: Correlations Matrix for Organizational culture – the moderating variable

| Control Variables | | | Hierarchy Management | Administrative Control Efficiency | Organizational Culture |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| -none ^a | Hierarchy Management | Correlation | 1.000 | .974 | .959 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | . | .000 | .000 |
| | | Df | 0 | 88 | 88 |
| | Administrative Control Efficiency | Correlation | .974 | 1.000 | .989 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | . | .000 |
| | | Df | 88 | 0 | 88 |
| | Organizational Culture | Correlation | .959 | .989 | 1.000 |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | . |
| | | Df | 88 | 88 | 0 |
| Organizational Culture | Hierarchy Management | Correlation | 1.000 | .602 | |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | . | .000 | |
| | | Df | 0 | 87 | |
| | Administrative Control Efficiency | Correlation | .602 | 1.000 | |
| | | Significance (2-tailed) | .000 | . | |
| | | Df | 87 | 0 | |

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

With respect to table 5 which depicts the zero-order correlation between hierarchy management and administrative control efficiency and shows the correlation coefficient as positive and strong at 0.974, the partial correlation controlling for organizational culture, however, is also moderate with r value of 0.602. The observed positive "relationship" between hierarchy management and administrative control efficiency is due to the underlying relationships between each of those variables and formalization. Therefore, organizational culture has a positive and strong effect on the relationship between hierarchy management and administrative control efficiency in Rivers State civil service. Removing the effect of this control variable reduced the correlation between the other two variables to be 0.602 and significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. Since the difference between the zero-order correlation and the controlled correlation $(0.974 - 0.602) = 0.372 > 0.01$; hence from the decision rule, there is a significant difference and thus the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it is concluded that organizational culture has a significant moderating effect on the relationship between hierarchy management and administrative control efficiency in Rivers State Civil Service.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that hierarchy management positively influences administrative control efficiency in Rivers State Civil Service. The results clearly indicate that there is a significant relationship between these two variables. The study highlights the critical importance of implementing hierarchy management in Rivers State Civil Service.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From our findings, the study therefore make the following recommendations:

- i) Rule supremacy should be encouraged by organization as the study showed that it enhances administrative control efficiency.
- ii) Span of control still remains a very important tool for administrative control efficiency; hence it should be utilize and encourage across all types of organizations.
- iii) Chain of command should be followed strictly by management of organizations as it enhances effective administrative control efficiency and increases workplace orderliness.
- iv) Management of Civil Service organization should ensure the discipline architecture of the sector are utilized appropriately as it seen to enhance administrative control efficiency as it served as a corrective tool to guide civil servant against misbehavior.
- iv) To achieve successful organization, management of civil service organization and other kind of organizations should ensure the implementation of organizational culture that support hierarchical management pattern as it is the driver of effective administrative control efficiency.

REFERENCES

- Al-Bawab, A. (2015). The role of the internal control elements in accordance with the decisions of the COSO Committee in improving the performance of the external auditor - a field study on Jordanian legal accountants – Studies. *Administrative Sciences*, 42(2), 87 – 105
- Al-Jazi, M. (2014). Administrative and financial control in the audit bureau in Jordan, Theory and Practice, Master Thesis unpublished in Public Administration, Al-Zaeem Al-Azhari University, College of Graduate Studies, Khartoum,
- Al-Muqemmi, B. (2014). Effectiveness of administrative control in the faculties of applied sciences in the Sultanate of Oman. Unpublished Master Thesis. University of Nizwa, Algeria.

- Al-Otaibi, A. A., (2010). Impact of information technology on human resource performance, a field study on the Australian international academy, Unpublished Master Thesis, Abu Dhabi: Australian International Academy, United Arab Emirates.
- Apenteng, J. O. (2012). The effect one supervision on staff performance in GA South Municipal education directorate. A thesis submitted to the institute of distance learning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- Awajan, M. (2015). Administrative empowerment and its impact on performance in Jordanian Universities, A case study of Tafila university". Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, RedSea University,
- Agba, M.S. &Abubakar, Y.I. (2013). Public service ethics and campaign against corruption in Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, 2(1), 112 - 118.
- Ajila, O.C. &Omotayo, S. (2012). Workers' attitude towards disciplinary actions in business organizations in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 271 – 278.
- Ani, E.O. (2011). Staff indiscipline and productivity in the Nigerian public sector. *African Research Review*, 3(4), 461 – 471.
- Apalia, E.A. (2017). Effect of discipline management on employee performance: Evidence from county education office human resource department, Turkana County, Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 2(3), 1- 8.
- Armstrong, T. (2010). Building commitment to a new business strategy. *Strategic communication management*, 9(3),14 – 17.
- Bloom, S. (2013). Methods of control and its role in evaluating the performance of the economic institution in Algeria, A field study in the engine corporation". Unpublished Master thesis. University of Mentori Constantine, Algeria,
- Bertrand, M., Burgess, R., Chawla, A. & Xu, G. (2016). The costs of bureaucratic rigidity: Evidence from *the Indian Administrative Service*, University Of Chicago Working Paper.
- Bagautdinova, N., Validova, A. (2014), Defining optimal span of control for an enterprise", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 14(2), 30-34.
- Cerdayana, M., Luddin, R. & Yetti, S. (2018). Influence of work discipline, career development, and job satisfaction on employee performance in the ministry of research and technology. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*. 6(2), 87 – 96.
- Crumption M. (2013). Is the chain of command working for you?', *The Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances*, 26(3), 88-91.
- Dauber, D., Fink, G., & Yolles, M. (2012). *A configuration model of organizational culture'*, SMA Proceedings, 28-33.
- Dumisan, R. (2012). Employee responsiveness to disciplinary actions. *Human Relations*, 40(8), 507 – 524.
- Fink, G., Dauber, D. & Yolles, M. (2012), 'Understanding organisational culture as a trait theory', *European Journal of International Management*, 6(2), 199-220.
- Friebel, G. and Raith, M. (2004). Abuse of authority and hierarchical communication, *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 35(2), 224–244.
- Gaur, M. & Ebrahimi, N. (2013). Understanding workplace relationships – with special reference to superior-subordinate relationship – An important dimension having impact on the success, growth and performance of the employees and organization',

- International Journal on Research and Development – A Management Review*, 2(2), 7–12.
- Goodsell, A., & Charles T. (2000). Red tape and a theory of bureaucratic rules. *Public Administration Review* 60 (4), 373–385
- Hart, O. & Moore, J. (2005). On the design of hierarchies: Coordination versus specialization, *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(4), 675–702.
- Hillsdale, C. T., & Carnes, A. (2017). The effects of workplace bullying on team learning, innovation and project success as mediated through virtual and traditional team dynamics”, *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(6), 964 – 977.
- Holm-Petersen, CH., Østergaard, S., & Andersen, P. B. N. (2017). Size does matter – span of control in hospitals”, *Journal of Health, Organisation and Management*, 31(2) 192-206.
- Hopej, M., & Martan, J. (2006). The determination of span of control, *Operations Research & Decisions*, 2(1), 55 - 62.
- Heru, K. & Heru, N. (2018). The influence of communication and work discipline on employee performance: A study of DwiArsaPersada foundation, Indonesia. *Journal of Arts, Science, and Commerce*, 9(2), 6 – 14.
- Idris, S.D. & Alegbeleye, G.I. (2015). Discipline and Organizational Effectiveness: Study of Nigerian Customs Service. *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 4(8), 88 – 107.
- Ignatius, J. & Ruliyanto, M. (2017). The effect of competence, training and work discipline towards employee performance: A case study at PT Krakatau Argo Logistics, Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 6(7), 77 – 86.
- Ishida, J. (2015). Hierarchies versus committees: Communication and information acquisition in organizations', *The Japanese Economic Review*, 66(1), 62-88.
- Katarina R, Skorkova, Z & Nadezda J., (2018). *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 14(2), 155-165
- Lichtarski, J. M., (2014). The evolution of criteria of assessment of organizational structure excellence', *Research Papers of Wroclaw University of Economics*, 35(9), 170-178.
- Marsela, J.T. (2017). *Perceived influence of disciplinary action on employee performance in Baringo County Government, Kenya*. A Published Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the School of Business, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Mackenzie N, & Knipe S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16(2), 1-11
- Nwosu, O. & Ugwuera, E. (2015). Staff discipline in the Nigerian local government system. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(7), 38 – 45.
- Nwinyokpugi P.N. (2015). Workplace discipline: A catalyst for organizational productivity in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Advanced Studies*, 2(3), 1 – 5.
- Nasrallah, W. F., Ouba, C. J., Yassine, A. A., & Srour, I. M. (2015). Modeling the span of control of leaders with different skill sets, *Computational & Mathematical Organization Theory*, 21(3), 296 – 317.
- Obisi, C., Samuel, R. & Elegbede, S. (2013). Organizational effectiveness: Beyond workers' rights and management prerogatives. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 3(1), 204 - 215.
- Olken, B.A. (2007). Monitoring corruption: Evidence from a field experiment in Indonesia, *Journal Of Political Economy* 115(2), 200-249.

- Oginni, B. O., Gbadegesin, A. & Patience, E. (2014). A study of superior-subordinate relationship and employees' commitment to the core beliefs of organisation in Public Universities of Southwest, Nigeria', *American Journal of Business and Management*, 3(1), 28–38.
- Piwoni-Krzeszowska, E. (2018). The business relationship value over time', *proceedings of the 32nd international business information management association (IBIMA)*, November 2018, Seville, Spain,.
- Pepinsky, T.B., Pierskalla, J.H. & Sacks, A. (2017). Bureaucracy and service delivery, *Annual Review of Political Science* 20(6), 249 – 268.
- Rasul, I. & Rogger, D. (2018). Management of bureaucrats and public service delivery: Evidence from the Nigerian civil service, *Economic Journal* 12(8), 413-446.
- Rasul, I., Rogger, D. & Williams, M. (2019). *Management and bureaucratic effectiveness: Evidence from the Ghanaian civil service*, Mimeo, University College London.
- Sanner, B. & Bunderson, J. S. (2018). The truth about hierarchy', *Mit Sloan Management Review*, 59(2), 49–52.
- SudanBahi, L. (2013). Mechanisms of administrative control over commercial transactions in Algeria. *Al Nadwa Magazine for Legal Studies* 1(1), 193-206.
- Urwick, L. F. (1974). Graicunas and the span of control, *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(2), 349 – 354.
- Warris, A. (2015). Effect of training, competence, and discipline on employee performance in PT Asuransi, Indonesia. *Proceedings of the 2nd Global Conference on Business and Social Science*, 17-18th September.
- Wedaga, S. (2012). Assessment of the effect of disciplinary procedures on employee punctuality and performance at AngloGold Ashanti, Obuasi Mine, Ghana. A Published Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Department of Managerial Sciences, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana.
- Wallin, L., Pousette, A., & Dellve, L. (2014). Span of control and the significance for public sector managers' job demands: A multilevel study", *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 35(3), 455-481.
- Walter, M., & Zimmermann, J. (2016). Minimizing average project team size given multi-skilled workers with heterogeneous skill levels", *Computers and Operations Research*, 70(2), 163 - 179
- Zhou, Y. M. (2013). Designing for complexity: Using divisions and hierarchy to manage complex tasks. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 339–355.
- Zydzianaite, V., Lepaite, D., Åstedt-Kurki, P. & Suominen, T. (2015), Head nurses decision making when managing ethical dilemmas', *Baltic Journal of Management*, 10 (2), 166 –18.