

# Effect of Organizational Structure on Productivity: A Case Study of Obajana Cement Factory, Kogi State, Nigeria

Ayodele Ekundayo Job<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Department of Management Technology, Federal University of Technology Owerri, Nigeria  
Correspondence: [raekundayo@yahoo.com](mailto:raekundayo@yahoo.com)<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

**Aim of the Study:** This research article examines how organizational structure affects output. The division of labour among employees and the coordination of their actions so they are focused on the organization's goals and objectives are the two purposes of organizational structure.

**Methodology:** The study adopted a survey research design with the population of 200 executives and subordinates out of which a sample size of (N=180) was randomly selected. Questionnaires were the instrument for data collection and were analyzed using the mean score approach.

**Findings:** Organization structure is important to improve organizational efficiency and productivity.

**Conclusion:** The paper concludes that organizational structures have an effect on productivity, improve firms' efficiency within the organizational units and brings about proper working relationship among various subunits in the organization. Also, structures affect the behavior of employees in the organization and people work better, duties are separated, and production will rise if a clear structure is in place.

**Keywords:** Organizational Structure, Organizational Performance, Productivity, Environment, Executives, Subordinates, Cement Factory.

## Introduction

Every organization has a structure that is required for the accomplishment of a common task by its members. The logical relationship between roles among individuals within an organization is referred to as its structure. It shows a hierarchy and level of authority, accountability, relationship activities and communication channels. These organizations are created by groups of people with the aim of producing results that a single person is unable to produce alone. As a result of organizational effect, which guides an organization toward accomplishing certain organizational goals, better results are produced. The aims and objectives that corporate organizations set out to attain, according to Nelson and Quick (2011), determine how their managers assign tasks to their personnel. The assigned tasks are typically divided into departments. As a result, tasks like task allocation, coordination, and monitoring are said to be part of an organization's structure because they are meant to help the company achieve its goals. Organizational

## Article History

Received:  
July 31, 2022

Revised:  
November 7, 2022

Accepted:  
December 2, 2022

Published:  
December 30, 2022

structure thus influences organizational actions and acts as the framework for routine and standard operating processes. According to Quangen and Yezhuang (2012), an organization's structure offers it the form to fulfil its goal in the business environment. However, Okoroma (2007) opined that certain elements are important when considering the characteristics of an administrative structure. Departmentalization, centralization, decentralization, span of control, and the transfer of authority are a few of these. It makes sense why Kheyrollah (2012) identified complexity, formality, and concentration as the three organizational structure dimensions.

Organizational structure, according to Mintzberg (2009), is how labour is split into tasks and coordination is performed between these activities. In other words, organizational structure governs the design, management, and coordination of roles, power, and duties as well as the flow of information among the many levels of management.

Okorie (2012) defined organizations as a pattern of related features which includes purposeful activities designed to achieve certain goals, the integration of jobs, which are coordinated through a system of command and process such as deciding, communicating, controlling and rewarding. In the same light, Abraham (2013) describes organization as processing units which transform certain inputs from the environment into specific outputs desired by society. He further explained that an organization is made up of any group of people which have united together to pursue and accomplish a common purpose as one team.

Organizational performance, according to Daft (2000), is the capacity of an organization to achieve its goals through the utilization of resources in an organized, well-educated social behaviour. According to Ricardo and Wade (2001), organizational performance is the capacity to meet goals and objectives. According to several writers, the effectiveness of an organization can be evaluated in terms of profitability, return on assets, gross profit, return on investment, etc. The same Ricardo and Wade (2001) made a distinction between productivity and organization performance by defining productivity as a ratio showing the amount of work completed in a given amount of time, whereas organization performance is a broader pointer that could include productivity as well as consistency, quality, and other factors.

### ***Research Problem***

Every organization has structure when it is necessary for its members to accomplish common task. Organization structure lays down both channels and patterns of communication. This brings about proper administration. When proper structural techniques are not applied to accomplish desired result on productivity, it leads to non-coordination of activities and conflicts. For this reason, according to Mintzberg (1983), various structures offer varying strengths and weaknesses to the job to be done, and it is crucial to select a structure appropriate for the desired output on predictability and stability. This therefore means that poor productivity of an organization might be as a result of an imperfect structure, as well as constant changing of executives in the firm, either by sack or resignation. More importantly, structure is looked at, as aids organizations use to improve their performance. It has been observed that the productivity and performance of the cement factory has been dropping for several months now. Perhaps the above are the reasons for the short fall in production capacity. Hence the study to investigate the effect of organizational structure on productivity.

### ***Importance of Organization Structure***

1. Organization structure clearly defines the lines of authority and responsibility.
2. Organization structures helps to channel the flow of information or communication in the organization that leads to better administration.
3. Structure assists in bringing about the accomplishment of the organizational goals by coordinating the actions of various persons inside the company.
4. Structures aid in the expansion and diversity of an organization's activities.

5. Organizational structure aids in the easy achievement of goals and the application of policies.
6. Organizational structure avoids function duplication and enables maximum production with the least amount of effort.
7. Organizational structure makes employee participation increase their cooperation.

### ***Factors for Designing Effective Organizational Structure***

- (1) Environment              (2) Technology              (3) Size of the organization              (4) Strategy

### ***Organizational Structure Types***

Since organizational structure governs the allocation, control, and coordination of roles, power, and duties as well as the flow of information between various levels of management. the following

- (i) Organizational structures with a hierarchy
- (ii) An organizational matrix
- (iii) Horizontal organizational structure
- (iv) Organizational structures in the form of networks and
- (v) divisions (market-based; product-based, geographical)
- (vi) Team-based organizational structure and
- (vii) Organizational structures in lines

### ***Research Questions***

Four research questions were formulated to guide the study.

- (1) What structural patterns were used in Nigeria organization?
- (2) What communication patterns are used?
- (3) Are these structures internally or externally focused?
- (4) What are the effects of organizational structure on productivity?

### ***Literature Review***

Organizational concept: Regarding organizational structure, there are numerous definitions and points of view. Structure is everything that is placed in a specific pattern of organization, such as the division of tasks to be completed. The Jackson and Morgan organizational chart best illustrates this (1982). Wolf (2002) defined structure as the process of developing organizational competency, leadership, talent, functional linkages, and arrangement.

According to Walton (1986), structure, which includes roles and responsibilities, hierarchical levels and spans of accountability, and mechanisms for problem-solving and integration, serves as the foundation for organizing. According to Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), structure is the method used to separate and integrate the organization. According to Lawrence and Lorsch, a firm's organizational structure may be more centralized and have established rules and processes the more assured the environment is (1967). In a non-participation context, centralization diminishes participant communication, commitment, and work involvement. Decentralization fosters communication within the organization and produces a workplace with more satisfied and motivated employees, according to findings in the literature, which suggest that decentralization may have a positive impact on organizational effectiveness (Dewar and Webel, 1979; Schminke et al., 2002). (Burns and Stalker, 1961, Dewar and Werbel, 1979). Organizations that face high levels of environmental uncertainty, however, might delegate judgement.

### ***The Concept of Employee Performance***

This is the accomplishment of duties by a chosen individual or individuals as assigned and evaluated by a supervisor or organization to pre-define accepted standards while effectively and efficiently utilizing available resources in a changing environment. According to Federman (2006), managing and enhancing employee performance is crucial for reaching an organization's overall goals since it directly affects the productivity and development of the organization as a whole.

To get the most out of employees' contributions to organizational development, organizations need to manage their human resources effectively. Employee performance includes both the tasks that must be completed for the job to be done well and how well those tasks are carried out. While organizational performance includes performance planning, performance evaluation, and performance improvement, it also refers to an organization's actual output or results as compared to its expected outputs.

### ***Concept of Organizational Effectiveness***

Robbin and Judge (2008) The definition of organizational effectiveness is fairly broad. In essence, a company's effectiveness is determined by its capacity to carry out a task with the best possible input-output ratio. Organizations utilize organizational effectiveness to gauge a variety of factors, including the connection between worker productivity and business success. Employees must use their full range of skills and do them proficiently in order for the business to be effective.

The perception of an organization's success in producing the results it seeks to create and the efficiency with which it is able to achieve its goals is known as organizational effectiveness. The primary indicator of an organization's effectiveness for a firm is its level of output or productivity. The company that achieves the required results or produces without wastage.

### ***General Studies Review***

In her 2012 article Effective Management of Nigerian Organization: A Study of Nigerian Brewery Plc, Enugu, Linda Nwachukwu examined the effect of organizational structure. The study used both primary and secondary sources of data throughout its length and adopted the descriptive survey approach. While secondary data was gathered through text books, magazines, journals, and the internet, primary data came from a questionnaire and oral interviews. Eight hundred ninety (891) people participated in the study, whereas 133 people were chosen as samples (133). Her research showed, among other things, that organizational structure has a significant influence on how effectively an organization is managed. She suggested, among other things, that businesses make an effort to have a well-structured organization in order to accomplish the goals established.

Increasing organizational effectiveness is one of the most essential organizational goals for practically all firms in every industry, according to Esra and Ozgur's (2014) "Structural Determinants of Organizational Effectiveness" research study. Their study examines how organizational structure contributes to greater organizational success with a particular emphasis on software organizations. Their research took formalization, specialization, centralization, organizational age, and size into account as structural variables. 120 software companies replied to the poll created using their research technique. Statistical test methods were used to analyze the data that had been collected. Their research demonstrates that specialization and formalization boost organizational effectiveness. Increasing organizational size, however, reduces the efficacy of the organization. According to their findings, software companies should maintain small organizational scales while improving organizational performance through specialization and formalization.

In their article titled Organizational structure: Influencing elements and impact on a corporation, Quangyen and Yezhuang (2013) also addressed this issue. They stated that the impact of particular characteristics on organizational structure and their influence on overall organizational effectiveness have been the subject of research for many years. Many of these elements come from a setting where internal

and external causes are frequently split according to traditional views. The research they conducted to assess the influencing elements and their effects on the organizational structure of a sample Vietnamese company in Hanoi is presented in their report. To gather information about these issues, structured questionnaires were distributed. By adding components of the strategic decision technique as well as factors taken into account by contingency theory, the variables under study were protected. Three categories of organizations were identified based on how they viewed how these factors affected organizational structures after the variables were divided into two elements (connected to external and internal factors, respectively). Organizational structures are of the "complex classical" type in those groups that believe internal influences are moderators of structure, whereas simple forms predominate in the group that believes these elements do not affect their structure.

## Research Methodology

### *Research Design*

For this study, a descriptive survey research design was chosen.

### *Population and Sample Size*

The 200 executives and employees of the cement industry that make up the study's population are divided into 180 samples, 90% of the overall population. The results are generalized based on these 180 samples.

### *Sampling Technique and Tool*

The simple random sampling techniques were used and the instrument used to collect data for the study is a structured questionnaire. The questionnaires were given to top managers, middle managers and subordinates. The data arising from the instrument was analyzed.

## Presentation of Data and Analysis

Table1: *Structural Patterns in Nigerian Organizations*

Questions	Executives		Subordinates	
	Total score	Means	Total score	means
Appointments of supervisors and foreman	110	1.37	130	1.30
Settling disputes among workers in Departments and Units	160	2.00	115	1.15
Work schedule	140	1.75	150	1.15
Work plans at departmental level	150	1.87	160	1.60
Decision work quality	110	1.37	250	2.50

Source: *Research data 2019*

Table 1 above reveals that executives do not give supervisors and formen position (job). This is evident from the negative response of 110 (1:37 Ms) and 130 (1:30 Ms) of both executives and subordinates respectively. Here, decision is delegated authority to the subordinates, low level decentralize. The table further indicates that there is settling of disputes among workers, this was shown from the positive response of 160 (2:00ms) from executives while the subordinates, the table shows negative response 115(1:15 Ms), it is also evident that scheduling is not allowed to be done by the subordinate based on the response of 140 (1.75 MS) and 150 (1.50Ms) of both executives and subordinates. This is clear specification of what is to be done from the beginning. The table indicates positive response of 150 (1.87Ms) of the executives and 160 (1.60Ms) from the subordinates which shows that there is work plans at departmental level. Furthermore, the table also shows that workers contribute to decision on work

quality. The analysis above shows that there are structural patterns in the organizations regards to work plan on departmental level. This will boost productivity and in agreement with various authors.

Table2: *Communication Pattern*

Questions	Executives		Subordinates	
	Total score	Means	Total score	means
Communication can be said restricted	200	2.50	150	1.50
Workers are completely in the dark about company related information	190	2.37	130	1.30
Workers are free to report problem to managers	190	2.37	170	1.70
The company uses committee system to solve many problems	240	3.00	280	2.80
The workers only report to his immediate boss and to no other boss	350	2.25	290	2.90

Source: *Research data 2019*

Table 2 above reveals that communication is not restricted this is from the positive total response of 200 (2.50ms) of the executives while negative indicating restriction, this is evident from response of 150 (150ms) of subordinates.

Table 2 further reveals that workers not completely in the dark, this is evident from the positive total response of 190 (2.37ms) of the executives while negative response of 130 (1.30ms) from the subordinates. Again table2, also indicates that workers are force to report problems to executive. This is shown from the positive response of the executives 190(2.37 Ms). While the negative response of 170 (1.70 Ms) of the subordinates respectively. The same table 2 revealed that the studied organization uses committee system to solve their problems as indicated in the table 240 (3:00 Ms) for executives and 280 (2.80Ms) for subordinates in communication patterns.

Since the flow of information is essential to organization's success. The analysis of the studied firm above, the executives have to create operational procedures which they can use to communicate to directors and managers. Managers in turn explain to subordinates down to employees, these is the operational procedures. This is in agreement with (wolf, 2002; Herath, 2007; Greenberg, 2011).

Table 3: *Internal/External Structure of Environment*

Questions	Executives		Subordinates	
	Total score	Means	Total score	means
The (CEO) or MD is too involve with internal management of the firm and does not have time to check on outside factor	110	1.37	160	1.60
The company checks on outside factors	240	3:00	280	2.80
External development communication to the firm	299	2.50	140	1.40
Many managers are preoccupied with internal matter not external matters	200	2.50	120	1.20

The workers only report to his immediate boss and to no other boss	350	2.25	290	2.90
--	-----	------	-----	------

Source: *Research data 2019*

Table 3: Above indicates that managing directors are too much involved in the internal management of the company, also has time to check on the external factors. This is showing from the positive response of 110 (1.37Ms) and 160 (1.60Ms) of both the executives and subordinates.

Table 3 also shows that the company checks on environmental changes, indicating positive response of 240 (3.00Ms) and 280 (2.80 ms) of both executives and subordinates. The external development is communicated to the studied organization as shown by the positive response of the executives 299 (2.50 Ms), but negative response from the subordinate of 140 (1.40 ms). The table indicates that managers are not only preoccupied with internal matters, but also external. This is evident is from the positive response of the executives 200 (2.50 Ms), while 120 (1.20 Ms). Finally, analysis from the above shows that the studied organization checks the environmental changes to perfects the internal and external structure of the organization. This is because organizations are dependent to some extent on the environmental factors, trends, and development lead to change in internal organizational process and behaviors. As external environment is becoming more and more complex, organizations have to adapt to the changes. The strategies an organization uses to manage its environment are reflected in the structure of the organization. This is supported by Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), Green berg (2011)

Table 4: *Firms Performance / Productivity*

Questions	Executives		Subordinates	
	Total score	Means	Total score	means
Profitability	130	1.62	300	3.00
Market share	130	1.62	250	2.50
Effectiveness	200	2.50	270	2.70
Productivity	240	3.00	280	2.80

Source: *Research data 2019*

Table 4 reveals that the executives do not agree that the organization makes profit as regards the negative response of 130 (1.62ms), while the subordinates' responses positively to 300 (3.00ms). In addition, table 4 indicates that there is a negative response for market share 130 (1.62ms) from the executives. The subordinate's response of 250 (2.50ms), which shows that their product is selling.

Furthermore, the response of 240 (3.00ms) from the executives and the subordinates 270 (2.70ms) respectively, judging this, it shows that there is effectiveness in the organization. The executive response (200/2.50ms) indicates that there is enough production, while that of subordinates shows a positive response of 280 (2.80ms).

Finally, the executives are of the view that there is efficiency, which indicates a positive response of 280 (2.80ms). From the above analysis it is evident that there is an effect of structure on productivity.

## Discussions

With respect to research question one, which tries to identify the structural pattern that were in use in Nigerian firms. The findings shows that the executives and subordinate disagreed on the appointment of the supervisors and foremen, so also the settling of disputes among workers in the department, work schedules and decision work quality is at departmental level. Subordinates are in charge of job at departmental level. This is because work schedule and work plan are interwoven. An organization

structure can be seen as an ever changing dynamic and living organization as the organization move from one stage to another in terms of growth, size, market, technology, product line etc.

According to Otth (2004) function of organizational structure affect the Efficiency, Coordination, Communication, Job satisfaction, Innovation and adaption, and Organizational identity.

There is interpretation by the firm of the nature of its environment and how best to respond to the environment. Allocation of task, and responsibilities to individuals and departments through-out the selected firm. There are formal reporting relationship including the number of levels in the hierarchy and span of control of managers and supervisors. There are decision-making powers in the component part of the firm (Okorie, 2012; Abraham 2013).

The above is observed in the studied firm. The above points will serve to guide employee's perceptions, thought and actions. Other factors that will affect performance are the external and internal forces as well as the style of management approach to structuring the organization.

Furthermore, Liao (2011) claimed that formalization gauges how much a company may dictate behaviour through rules and procedures. According to Nelson and Quick (2011), organizational departments can be divided into different units, such as sales, manufacturing, marketing, and advertising, whereas Quangyen and Yezhuange (2013) believe that an organization's structure gives it the shape to carry out its objectives in the business environment. According to Walton (1986), the foundation of organizing is structure, which comprises responsibilities for accountability, mechanisms for problem-solving, and integration.

In the word of Lawrence & Lorsch (1967) describe structure as the established pattern of relationship among the component parts of a firm. The statements above are features observed in the studies firm. Last but not least, firms operate in a dynamic environment that is always evolving Accra & Amah (2014). According to Armitage, managers must manage change while ensuring that their firms are profitable and thrive (2005).

### ***Communication Pattern in the Studied Firm***

Organization structure works with a good flow of communication. In today's business environment flow of information is essential to organization's success. And for firm to be successful, there is need for materials flow, good information perception and understanding between various members of the firm.

From the analysis that the executives restrict communication to the subordinates. This might not be true as observed in the studied firm. In the opinion of Wolf (2002) that structure has an effect on the success of an organization operational strategy. Therefore, the line of communication is from top down the organization. However, there may be changes at times depending on the environmental factors. The work of Walton (1986), who claimed that structure is the foundation for organizing to include hierarchical structures, time frame of obligation, role and stance, framework for assimilation, and problem-solving, as well as Jackson and Morgan (1982), who believed that structure is the building of business competence, functional relationships and arrangement, leadership, and talents, is consistent with this.

Workers are not forced to report problem to executives rather people are organized on how their job is to be carried out and coordinated. This supports the claims made by Mintzberg (2009) and Greenberg (2011), who define organizational structure as the formal arrangement between individuals and groups regarding roles, work distribution, and power inside an organization. This brings out better performance and shape to the organization. Both executives and subordinates agreed on the committee systems for solving their problems and reporting to their immediate boss. This is supported by Nelson and Quick (2011) as well as Quangyen and Yezhuang (2013) This will help the firm to carry out its purpose in the business environment. Cellphone are also used today as a result of technology in communication, this speed up flow of communication. Span of control, employee motivation, reporting relationship and administrative overhead. Therefore, one can say communication certainly aid activities and motivate workers if properly used well.



### ***Internal/External Structure***

From the research, it is discovered that; 1.) managers check on environmental changes. 2.) External events/ developments are communicated to the firm, and 3.) The executive pre-occupied themselves with internal matters.

The analysis shows firm check on the environmental changes and development communicated to the organization. This is because organizations depend to some extent on environment. There is always a flow from the environment and flow back to the environment so that there can be survival. This is part of the effect of structure on organization as it is exposure to much external pressure.

In the word of Accra and Amah (2014) organization exists in a dynamic environment that is constantly changing. As external environment factors, trends and development which are not controlled by the organization leads to change in the internal organization processes and behaviors. According to Armitage, managers must manage change while maintaining the survival and financial success of their firm (2005). Because of this, everyone—including the MD—places more emphasis on the internal environment. As the outside world becomes more complex, companies must adapt, and this shapes their possibilities and risks. While Child (2005) claimed that the purpose of structure is to contribute to the successful implementation of objectives by allocating people and resources to necessary tasks and design responsibilities, as well as authority to their controls and coordination, Nelson and Quick (2011) argued that an organization's structure provides it with the form to fulfil its functions in the environment.

The managers of the studied organization are skilled at inventing things and thinking of solving organizational problems as a result of the happenings in the environment. They are concerned about the employee's morale and welfare and go above and beyond what is necessary to make their employee feel valued and important. This act balances the internal environment. Therefore, employees are loyal to the organization and happy doing their jobs. This normally leads to increase in productivity.

### ***Firm's Performance!***

In line with the analysis, there was agreement between the executives and subordinates on effectiveness, productivity, and efficiency. The degree to which something (organization) is successful in achieving the desired outcome is referred to as its effectiveness. Competence in performance contrasts with efficiency, which is the capacity to do a task with the least amount of time and effort wasted. There is orderliness, planning, regulations, coherence and productivity in the studied company. Table 4 indicates that there is cost effectiveness, high productivity and no wasting of materials, effort as well as time in doing something to produce a desired result. When performance is at its pinnacle, the fewest inputs are required to produce the greatest number of outputs. But in the case of profitability and market share, there is disagreement. The executives are of the opinion that there is no much profit and the market share is low, while the subordinates are of the opinion that there is maximum efficiency, productivity and effectiveness which leads to market share and profitability. Market share is the percentage of a market that a specific business or product controls. The secret to profitability is market share. A company is likely to have a bigger profit margin if its market share grows. Profitability is also a measure of efficiency and profitability is the primary goal of all business ventures.

Ezeigbo (2011) asserts that organizational effectiveness and the ability to effectively organize and turn inputs like labour and capital into marketable goods and services are key factors in determining performance. The studied firm has proofed this in the analysis above in table 4.

Clemmer (2003) draws the conclusion that an organization's performance is influenced by the structure it has chosen, contrary to Wolf (2002)'s contention that organizational structure determines both the competence of the organization and the processes that shape performance. Csaszar (2008) opined that structures shape performance in an organization.

## Conclusion

The study concluded that organizational structure shows an effect on productivity, brings about working relationship among various department in the organization. Therefore, structure improves firm's efficiency and has effect on performance as well as behavior of employees in the organization. It can be inferred that when clear structure is in place, people perform better, task are divided and productivity is increased.

## Acknowledgments

None


## Conflict of Interest

Author has no conflict of interest.

## Funding Source

The author received no funding to conduct this study.

## ORCID iDs

Job Ayodele Ekundayo <sup>1</sup>  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5538-8458>

## References

- Abraham, N.M. (2013). Educational Administration in Nigeria; Port Harcourt Pam Unique Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Accra, J.S., & Amah, E. (2014). Mentoring and Organizational Resilience. A study of manufacturing companies in Rivers State. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JMB)* 16(10), 2319 – 7668.
- Armitage, D. (2005). Adaptive capacity and community – based natural resource management. *Environmental management*, 35(3), 703-715.
- Child, J. (2005). *Organization Contemporary Principles and Practice*. Blackwell Publishing
- Clemmer, J. (2003). Organization Structure Limits or Liberates High Performance. Available at [www.Clemmogroup.com](http://www.Clemmogroup.com)
- Csaszar, A.F. (2009). *Organizational structure as a determinant of performance: Evidence from Mutual Funds I*, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania 2000 Steinberg Hall- Diefrich Hall Philadelphia.
- Daft, L.R. (2000). *Organization Theory and Design*. (7<sup>th</sup> edition). South-Western College Publishing, Thomson Learning USA.
- Esra, B. and Ozgura, D. (2014). Structural Determinants of Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of organizational management studies*, 273364.
- Ezigbo, C. (2011). *Advance Management Theory and Applications*. Enugu, Immaculate Publications Ltd.
- Federman, O.C. (2006). Strategic Human Resources Management and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 12 (2), 299-310.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behaviour Saddle River*, Nj: Prentice Hall.

- Herath, S.K. (2007). A framework for Management Control Research. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(9), 895 – 915.
- Jackson, J.H., and Morgan (1982). *Organization Theory. Second Edition*, Prentice Hall.
- Kheyrollah, S. (2012). Effect of Different Organizational Structure on the Productivity of Human Resource Management (A Case Study: Electricity Distribution Company in Ardabil Province)
- Lawrence, R.P., and Lorsch, W.J. (1967). *Organization and Environment* Irwin, Home wood, IL
- Liao, J. (2011). How Knowledge Management Mediates the Relation between Environment and Organizational structure” *Journal of Business Research*, 64(7), 728-736.
- Martinelli, P.P. (2001). System Hierarchies Management, *System Research and Behavioural Science*, 18(1), 68-82.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Designing Effective Organizations*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey
- Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Tracking strategies: Toward a General Theory of Strategy Formation*. New York NY oxford University Press.
- Nelson, D., and Quick, C.J. (2011). *Understanding Organizational behavior*. Manson, OH: South Western Cengage Learning.
- Nwachukwu, L. (2012). *The Impact of Organizational Structure in Effective Management of Nigerian Brewery Plc. (Enugu)* A Research Project Submitted to the Department of Business Administration Faculty of Management and Social Science Caritas University, Amorji-Nike, Enugu
- Okorie, N.C. (2012). *Organizational Setting of Leadership, Theoretical Perspective*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Port Harcourt, Totan Publishers.
- Okoroma, N. (2007). *Perspective of Educational Management, Planning and Policy Analysis, Second Edition*, Port Harcourt Minsan Publishers
- Ottih, L.O. (2004). *Organization theory: Structure, Design and Process*. Unplished Manuscript, Rivers State University of Technology, Port Harcourt, Nigeria PP 23-73.
- Quangyen, T., and Yezhuang, T. (2013). Organizational Structure: Influencing Factors and Impact on a Firm. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 3, 229-236
- Ricardo, R., and Wade, D. (2001). *Corporate Performance Management: How to build a better organization through measurement driven strategies alignment*; Butter worth Heinemann.
- Robinsons, S.P and Judge, T. (2008). *Essentials of Organizational behavior* Upper Saddle River, NJ Pentice Hall.
- Walton, R.E (1986). A vision-led approach to management restructuring. *Organizational Dynamics*, 14(4), 5-17.
- Wolf, D. (2002). Execution and Structure. [https://www.dewarsloan.com/work in %20 papers-execution % 20 and 20% structure.html](https://www.dewarsloan.com/work-in-20-papers-execution-20-and-20%_structure.html) internet source