

Organisational Structure and Employee Effectiveness in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigerian Bottling Company Plc Aba, Abia State

Ifekandu, I. M and Okebaram S.M (Ph.D)

Department Of Business Administration
Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike

Ikoro, E.I (Ph.D)

Department Of Entrepreneurial Studies
Michael Okpara University Of Agriculture, Umudike
ikoroike@gmail.com
DOI: 10.56201/ijssmr.v10.no7.2024.pg247.270

Abstract

*The study examined the effects of organizational structure on employee effectiveness in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Plc, Aba, Abia State Nigeria. The specific objectives are to: Specifically, the study examined the effect of work specialization on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba, the effect of departmentalization on training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba, effect of chain of command on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba and effect of centralization on profit per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba. The study employed both primary and secondary data in achieving its objectives. The sample size of the study is 242 which was determined using Taro Yamane's formula, but a total of 232 were retrieved, representing 95.87% response rate. The study found that work specialization has no significant effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 5.98^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), departmentalization has no significant effect on the training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 3.838^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), level of chain of command has no significant effect on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 3.757^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), centralization has no significant effect on the aspect of profit per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 3.823^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$) and formalization has no significant effect that influence employee turnover in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 2.702^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$). The study therefore concludes that organizational structure has significant effect on employee effectiveness in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Plc, Aba, Abia State Nigeria. The study recommends that management of organizations use decentralization as a dimension of organizational structure to restructure their organization when centralization is not giving required organizational performance.*

Keywords: Organisational Structure, Employee Effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

The success or failure of any organization depends on amount of people efforts in the organization and especially organization structure in order to achieve aims of firm that is possible by efficient use of hardware and software resources (Bridges & Bridges, 2017). In this regard ability of the management to motivate and create the desire to work hard on employees has a major role, so management structure of organization is mentioned as a vital link between management and staff. Because of the organization principles, policies implementation, management structure could be useful in the use of investments, efficient technology, advanced methods of work, the methods of motivating human resources and so on in order to improving productivity in organizations (Brandt & Agrawal, 2016).

Organizational structure is considered as formal and rational distribution or jobs, responsibilities, powers and the way of coordination and communication in order to achieve the main objectives of any organization in its inception (Ramadani, 2012). Nelson and Quick (2011) further posit that the organizations structure is meaningless unless supported by appropriate system and a well-conceived culture. Martinelli (2011) argues that the type of organization structure adopted by a firm will depend on the nature of the particular organization in question; in addition, the form which the organizational structure takes may be represented periodically by an organizational chart. Ajagbe (2011) sees organizational structure as “how jobs tasks are formally divided, grouped, and coordinated” the nature of formalization is the degree to which the workers are provided with rules and procedures that deprive versus encourage creative, autonomous work and learning. In organizations with high formalization, there are explicit rules which are likely to obstruct the impulsiveness and the flexibility needed for growth. Centralization or rigid authority structure also creates a non-participatory environment that reduces communication, commitment and involvement with tasks among participants. It refers to hierarchical level that has authority to make decision. If decisions are delegated to the lower levers, the organization is decentralized, and if decision making power authority is set aside at the top level, it is centralized.

Germain (2008) considers the outcome of structure on the performance mediating supply chain management and found that formal structure has a positive effect on performance in stable environment and a negative effect is achieved in dynamic atmosphere. Employee effectiveness relates to how successfully an individual group of people with a particular purpose perform a function. Essentially, this is what is meant by employee performance and achievement of successful outcomes. The organizational structure of an organization for this research is studied by looking at variables such as formalization and centralization. The research will examine these organizational structure variables in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company, Plc, Ikeja, Lagos State, Nigeria.

Formalization is a set of rules, policies that an organization has to follow. One advantage of formalization is that a certain standard of performance is always guaranteed. Centralization is the amount of authority higher level people in the hierarchy have over the business processes. A highly centralized company will have complete control by the higher authority and mostly all decisions will be made by the higher authority. A decentralized organization is one in which lower levels can make decisions as well. There has been a lot of debate regarding what is the right kind of structure, hence we will try to look at real life cases and examine what is the right kind of organization structure required in a dynamic environment especially in a brewing firm. (Liao, 2011). This study develops a research framework that examines relationships among various structural dimensions and employees' effectiveness in brewing industry in Nigeria.

Four aspects of organizational structure are considered; the number of layers in hierarchy of the organization, the nature of formalization, the nature of internal and external boundaries that exist in the organization and the nature of technology (appropriate) adopted by the organization.

The employee's effectiveness is represented by supervisor's rating, quality and quantity, goal accomplishment, efficient and effective, dependable and enthusiastic, ability and capability. Given the importance of structure to the performance survival, and sustainability of companies and contributions of the brewing sector to the economy, this research therefore deems it necessary to investigate whether appropriate structure is a critical success factor for success of brewing firms in Nigeria and extent it has helped in the effectiveness of its employees. The brewery firms have called for a well-structured and conducive environment for employees so as to retain intellectual and skilled employees in order to achieve towards greater productivity. Therefore, this research is aimed to find out the effects of organizational structure on employee effectiveness in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company, Plc, Aba, Abia State. This is necessary to identify how best the brewery firms like GNB and NBC can retain competent employees.

Business organization in an attempt to adopt the best type of structure with the aim of attaining maximum efficiency has faced a lot of problems. Also many organizational flaws can be related to inappropriate structures chosen in order to reach a desired goal. An appropriate structure is contingent upon both the type of work to be performed as well as the environment in which the organization conducts business (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Different structures provide different strengths and weaknesses to the work to be performed and it is therefore important to find a structure suitable for the desired outcome on stability and predictability.

However, employees of Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company, Plc, Aba quit their present working place because of lack of proper working environmental fixtures and these have gone a long way to affect the productivity of such employees and invariably affected the turnover of the organization. The dissatisfaction of these employees on their job have made them go looking for job in some other organization where they think that better provisions are made for these variable lacking in their former workplace. Moreover, because of improper positioning or location of plant, building and machineries, the employees work under stress and productivity adversely affected.

These problems encountered by business organizations in choosing suitable forms of structure are complexities associated with the recent shift from authoritarian to decentralized structures stressing employee empowerment, inability of managers to identify the best form of structure that should follow strategies adopted by their individual organizations, inability of employees to adapt to existing and changing structures and the difficulty in maintaining a stable structure as a result of the ever changing business environment.

The brewing sector is faced with mixed performance. Evidences from the subsector confirm that quite a number of brewing firms are performing very poorly, in some cases, they go into liquidation, while few others are performing excellently well using all known performance indicators. For instance, Nigeria breweries and Guinness breweries have been paying dividend to their shareholders consistently for the past twenty years. Besides payment of dividend, almost all other performance indicators have been on the positive trend. However, the excellent performances of some brewery firms are still worrisome as about 70% of brewing firms went

under liquidation within the last twenty years (Femi, 2019) The essence of this study therefore is to determine whether adopting appropriate structure like quality of service, departmentalization, chain of command on revenue, centralization and formalization on employees turnover are the critical success factors that support those firms that are performing well in the sector and the extent to which appropriate structure has helped the performance of its employee. therefore it is based on this that the study seeks to investigate Organizational structure and employee effectiveness in Guinness Nigeria plc and Nigerian Bottling Company Plc Aba, Abia State. Specifically, the study sought to examine the effect of work specialization on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba, evaluate the effect of departmentalization on training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba, determine the effect of chain of command on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual review

Organizational structure

Organizational structure can be defined as a mechanism which links and co-ordinates individuals within the framework of their roles, authority and power. Organizational structure represents a useful tool that directs individuals' behaviors through shared values, norms and goals ("O'Neill, Beauvais; Scholl, 2001; Liao, Shu-hui & Pui-lai, 2011). However, it has been characterized as a technique in which the organizations are differentiated and integrated themselves by the allocation of work roles and activities (Tran & Tian, 2013). In recent years, researchers have sought to determine which structure brings the most advantages for organizations and they have suggested that organizational structure should be responsive to a variety of individual needs in businesses (Conner & Douglas, 2005). One of these widely used structures is presented by Burns & Stalker (1998) labeled as a mechanistic and organic. Mechanistic organization structure is characterized by highly formalized, standardized and centralized functions. Accordingly, in mechanistic organizations individuals have a clear understanding about their job responsibilities and it is expected of them to follow certain guidelines specified by policies, practices, and procedures. On the other hand, organic organizations are more flat, flexible and adaptable to environmental conditions, so individuals' behaviors are guided by shared values and goals.

Moreover, organic organizations have characteristics such as informal network of authority of communication and opportunities for participating in the decision process (Veisi, & Hasanvand, 2012; Danzfuss, 2012; Dust, Resick, & Mawritz, 2013). Therefore, organizations need to design their structures in accordance with the organization strategies, internal and external working environment conditions. Because organizational structure has numerous and significant effects on both individuals and organizations. In literature, researchers have suggested that types of organizational structures have considerable impacts on leadership styles, organizational performance, innovation, employees trust and job satisfaction levels, perceived fairness, individual job performance, job involvement and learning organization (Garg & Krishnana, 2003, Campbell, Fowles & Weber, 2004; Jiang, 2011; Hao, Kasper, & Muehlbacher, 2012; Agar and Danzfuss, 2012; Mehrabi, Alemzadeh & Jadidi, 2013).

Organizational structure has an effect on individuals' attitudes and behaviors. It is influenced by the manager's personal preferences for ways of relating to subordinates and other managers, and ways of attacking problems. Organization structure refers to the arrangement of tasks, interrelations of various departments and levels of authorities to achieve co-operation of efforts, span of control formalization, work specialization, delegation of authority and effective communication along the scalar chain of command. Organizational structure is a system used to define a hierarchy within an organization. It identifies each job, its function and where it reports to within the organization. This structure is developed to establish how an organization operates and assists an organization in obtaining its goals to allow for future growth.

Similarly, Nelson and Quick (2011) posit that the organization's structure gives it the form to fulfill its functions in the environment. Acknowledging the views of these authors on the indispensability of structural decisions and the ongoing debate on the interrelationships between strategy, structure and performance, one would want to agree with Joris, Brand, Marco & Zoetermeer (2002) that the outcome of the organizational design process is unmistakably an important determinant of the performance of firms.

Historically, organizational structure developed from the ancient times of hunters to industrial structures and today's post-industrial structures as pointed out by Lawrence (1982). Away from history to today's world of business, one reoccurring and widely asked question is; how does the structure of an organization affect its performance? The difficulty in answering this question hinges on the fact that the relationship between organizational structure and performance has received little attention over the past few years especially in regards to firms with less than 100 employees. McShane and Von Glinow (2005) however, answer this question partly by posing that structure includes two fundamental elements; the divisions of labor into distinct tasks and its coordination so that employees are able to accomplish common goals.

Additionally, Wolf (2002) believes that structure does not only shape the competence of the organization, but also the processes that shape performance. Clemmer (2003) also concludes that the performance of an organization is influenced by the structure adopted by that organization. This paper therefore will re-open the discussion on the relationship between structure and performance while placing particular emphasis on decentralization, task routine and span of control as they influence effective decision making, staff productivity and organizational efficiency respectively.

Dimensions of Organizational Structure

As a result of the position of Burns and Stalker (1998) who introduced a popular method of examining the potential dimensions of organizational structure; "mechanistic and organic" systems of organization, a large number of researchers have explored and produced different lists on the dimensions of structure. Notable among them are Pugh, Hickson, Hinings & Turner (1968) who defined five dimensions of organizational structure; specialization, standardization, formalization, centralization and configuration, Jackson and Morgan (1982) added a sixth dimension, traditionalism, Duncan (1971), proposed five primary features of organic structure; participation in work decisions, formalization, hierarchy of authority, impersonality, and division of labor.

More recently, Daft (2003), provided a list that includes formalization, specialization, and standardization, hierarchy of authority, complexity, centralization, professionalism and personnel ratios. Additionally, the structural dimension is a tool for coordination and integration (Bernd, 2007), and managers need to address six key elements when they design their organization's

structure; work specialization, departmentalization, chain of command, span of control, centralization and decentralization and formalization (Daft, 2010).

For the sake of this paper, most of the dimensions mentioned will be discussed but emphasis will be placed on only the ones relating to the objectives of the study. In broad terms, a firm's performance is determined by the success of selling products and services in the market, and by the effectiveness of organizing and transforming inputs (such as labour and capital) into sellable products and services (Nickel, Nicolitsas & Dryden 2001). In more specific terms, organizational performance is the ability of an organization to utilize its resources efficiently and to generate outputs that are consistent with its goals and objectives and relevant for its clients and stakeholders (Ezigbo, 2011)

Nature of Organizational Structure

The outcome of organizing is the creation of organizational structure; a formal system of tasks and reporting relationships that coordinates and motivates organizational members so that they work together to achieve organizational goals. Organizational structure determines how an organization's resources can be best used to create goods and services.

Organizational structure is a formal system of working relationships that both separates and integrates tasks. Separation of tasks makes clear who should do what and integration of tasks indicates how efforts should be meshed. Hellriegel, Jackson and Slocum (2007) emphasized that organizational structure helps employees work together effectively by

- Assigning human and other resources to tasks,
- Clarifying employees' responsibilities and how their efforts should mesh through job descriptions, organization charts, and lines of authority,
- Letting employees know what is expected of them through rules, operating procedures and performance standards and

Types of Organizational Structure

Formal Organizational Structure

Formal organizational structure is the planned structure and represents the deliberate attempts to establish patterned relationships among components that will meet the objectives effectively. It sets a general framework and delineates certain prescribed functions, responsibilities, positions, hierarchy of authority, etc and relationships among them.

Formal structure is frequently defined in terms of the following:

- The pattern of formal relationships and duties; the organization chart, job descriptions or position guides.
- The way in which the various activities or tasks are assigned to different departments and/or people in the organization.
- The way in which these separate activities or tasks are coordinated (integration).
- The power, status and hierarchical relationships within the organization (authority system).
- The planned and formalized policies, procedures, and controls that guide the activities and relationships of people in the organization (administrative system). (Ezigbo, 2007)

Informal Organization Structure

Informal organization structure refers to these aspects of the system that are not planned explicitly but arise spontaneously out of the activities and interactions of participants. Informal relationships are vital for the effective functioning of the organization when the formal organization is slow in responding to external and internal forces, informal relationships

develop to deal with these new problems. Thus, the organization may be adaptive and serve to perform innovative functions that are not being adequately met by the formal structure. On the other hand, there are occasions in which informal relationships may operate to the detriment of goals- when work groups slow down or sabotage production (Kask & Rosenzweig, 1985).

Tall Organization Structure

A tall structure has many levels and relatively small spans of management. As an organization grows in size, its hierarchy of authority normally lengthens, making its organizational structure taller. As a hierarchy becomes taller problems that make the organization's structure less flexible and slow manager's response to changes in the organizational environment may result. Communication problems may arise when an organization has many levels in the hierarchy. It can take a long time for the decisions and orders of top-level managers to reach lower-level managers and it can take a long time for top managers to learn how well their decisions worked out.

Another communication problem that can result is the distortion of commands and order being transmitted up and down the hierarchy which causes managers at different levels to interpret what, is happening differently. Distortion of order and can be accidental, occurring because different managers interpret messages from their own narrow functional perspectives or it can be intentional, occurring because managers' low in the hierarchy decides to interpret information to increase their own personal advantage tall organizations are known for centralization of authority. This refers to the concentration of decision making at the top of an organization.

Flat Organization Structure

A flat structure has relatively few levels and relatively large spans of management at each level. Another way in which managers can keep the organization hierarchy flat is to decentralize authority to lower-level managers and non-managerial employees. These design innovations, help keep the organization architecture flexible and responsive to complex task and general environments, complex technologies, and complex strategies. Nevertheless, too much decentralization has certain disadvantages; if divisions, functions, or teams are given too much decision-making authority, they may begin to pursue their own goals at the expense of organizational goals.

If managers are in a stable environment, using well understood technology then there is no need to decentralize authority and managers at the top can maintain control of organization decision making. However, in an uncertain, changing environment, top managers must empower employees and allow teams to make important strategic decisions so that the organization can keep up with the changes taking place (Jones & George, 2003).

Advantages of Work Specialization

- a. **Upward growth:** Having a specific skill or bring specialized in that work, one would also bring growth in that division. They get chances to move up the ladder and gain more expertise in that specialization. Each specialization has its own uniqueness depending on the weight age and the depth of knowledge.
- b. **Defines quality and excellence:** When company declares employing specialists from their tasks, it means that they take care of the type and quality of work being executed. It ultimately brings excellence to the work done.
- c. **Brings in trust:** There is a general understanding among customers that having specialists to carry out services means that their work is done without flaws. Besides

that, they also know that there would be quality in the work executed. This is the way specialists are renowned that brings trust in their name.

- d. **Increase productivity:** It is generally found that allowing work to be done by people who are expert in that field would have fewer errors. As correcting errors not only takes time and resources, it also reduces productivity.
- e. **Higher revenue:** Having quality control in place with experts or specialized task free to execute the job, will definitely reduce the defects. This is directly impacting the revenue of the business (Malik, 2010)

Disadvantages of Work Specialization

- a. **Becomes outdated:** This is often experienced during mid-career lie when a new trend is set in and the business changes it adapt them, the jobs carrying out those tasks becomes obsolete.
- b. **Mastering one skill set:** Having mastered one skill and having gained experience in only that field of work would eventually hinder career growth. This becomes even difficult when the job becomes learner throughout the job market.
- c. **Omitted from managerial positions:** As you keep focusing on doing the specialized job, you would eventually be sidelined when a position of managerial is required for specializing in doing a particular set of tasks, people would not make you as their choice for managerial post as those tasks wouldn't have an impact on the business.
- d. **Gets boring:** As you are aware that specialized work allows a person to concentrate on one aspect of work and day after day, they perform the same work. With time, this work does not pose any challenging assignments and becomes boring when the work becomes boring; it leads to dissatisfaction and loses interest.
- e. **Company suffers:** If the company is performing well due to the expert working in that category, his/ her absence would definitely create a vacuum (Malik,2010)

2.1.7 Departmentalization

This is one of the indicators of organizational structure which refers to the process of grouping activities into departments.

2.1.7.1 Types of Departmentalization

Functional Departmentalization: Grouping activities by functions performed. Activities can be group according to function (work being done) to pursue economics of scale by placing employees with shared skills and knowledge into departments, for example, human resources, IT, accounting, manufacturing, logistics and engineering. Functional departmentalization can be used in all types of organizations. Group activities are in accordance with the function of an enterprise.

Product Departmentalization: Group activities by product line can also be grouped according to a specific product or service, thus placing all activities related to the product or service under one manager. Each major product area in the firm is under the authority of a senior manager who is specialist in and is responsible for everything related to the product line.

Customer Departmentalization: Grouping activities on the basis of common customers or types of customers. Works may be grouped according to the types of customers served by the organization. The assumption is that customers in each department have a common set of problems and needs that can best be met by specialists. The sales activities in an office supply firms that can be divided into three departments that serve retail, wholesale and government accounts.

Geographic Departmentalization: Grouping activities on the basis of territory. If an organization's customers are geographically dispersed, it can group works based on geography. For example, the organization structure of Guinness Nigeria Brewery and Nigeria Bottling Company, plc has reflected areas; the South east zone and Western region of Nigeria.

Process Departmentalization: This involves grouping activities on the basis of product or service or customers flow, because each process requires different skills, process departmentalization allows homogeneous activities to be grouped together. For example, the brewery firm might need to go through several departments before consumption.

Divisional Departmentalization: When the firm develops independent lines of business that operate as separate companies, all contributing to the firms profitability, the design is called divisional departmentalization.

Owing to the complexity of tasks and the competitive environment in which organizations operate, they often use a combination of the above mentioned methods in departmentalization (March and Simon, 2009).

2.1.24 Organizational Structure and Employee Effectiveness Framework

Organizational structure is how job is formally divided, grouped and coordinated (Sablinski, 2003). It is the anatomy of the organization, providing a foundation within which organizations function. However, Nnabuife (2009), visualizes organizational structure as the setting up a structure or mending an already existing one to suit the organizational environment and the demands of technology. From the views of Nnabuife (2009), structure is a factor of technology. Organizational structure influences the way in which work flows in a company, therefore, different design or structure can help or hinder different strategic objectives and also aid or hinder employees in the role. Structure can as well dictate the means by which strategies are formed. However, employees performance in brewing industry in Nigeria examined by various structural dimensions. Four aspects of organizational structure are: the number of layers in the hierarchy, the nature of formalization, loose/blurred internal and external boundaries and appropriate technology. These dimensions can make or mar the effect of structure on employees' performance if not appropriately situated.

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

The Stakeholders Theory (Edward Freeman, 1984).

The work anchored on the stakeholder theory which was propounded by Edward Freeman (1984) According to the stakeholder's theory, the organization is a network of mutual dependencies where the interests and expectations of the different stakeholders can be jeopardized in diverse ways, and the satisfaction of all of them is necessary for maintaining the balance of the ensemble. Freeman (2007) is the father of this theory and the bases it on the idea that the dominant model until that moment was not consistent with the basic ethic and for this reason, he offers a new strategic framework based on the principle of responsibility. Many have been the subsequent contributions, but the essence of the theory is maintained in identifying, prioritizing and meeting the needs and demands of each one of the concerned parties. This way, the division into stakeholders is a deontological code that not only reflects the structure of the organization but also reviewing the specific responsibilities that it has about each one of them. The Foretica Report (Foretica, 2011; Granda and Trujillo, 2011) standardizes the implementation of dialogue mechanisms with the stakeholders and marks the phases in the generation process of a management model of the stakeholders in any organization: (a) Identify the stakeholders by proximity, influence, responsibility and dependency; (b) Priorities the most relevant for the organization according to the level and capacity of influence, the expectations

and the level of commitment, the typology of relationship, the knowledge of the organization, the sort of stakeholder, the geographic dimension or the social context; (c) Select the dialogue and development tools of the process unidirectional, bidirectional, integrative in the processes of decisions making; (d) Carry out the activities planned and (e) control with indicators.

According to the stakeholder's theory, the organization is a network of mutual dependencies where the interests and expectations of the different stakeholders can be jeopardized in diverse ways, and the satisfaction of all of them is necessary for maintaining the balance of the ensemble. Freeman who is the father of this theory bases it on the idea that the dominant model until that moment was not consistent with the basic ethic and for this reason, he offers a new strategic framework based on the principle of responsibility. Many have been the subsequent contributions, but the essence of the theory is maintained in identifying, prioritizing and meeting the needs and demands of each one of the concerned parties.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted survey design method. This design was chosen because it permits investigating description and recording of information in their natural settings. This design aid the researcher to ascertain the views, ideas and feelings of those that are directly concerned with the project topic. To achieve the research objectives, both primary and secondary data was be used. Questionnaires were employed to elicit information from the targeted respondents The target population of this study comprise of the total staff, including executive and non-executive directors of Aba Branch of the Organisation. Population means all elements in a research area of interest. It is the group of individuals or objects from which samples are taken for measurement for this study the target population were employees of Guinness Nigeria Plc Aba (382) and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc (230) which is a multinational and national corporation which has a total population of 612. The distributions are as follows:

Population Distribution table

STATUS	GUINNESS	NIGERIA BOTTLING
Executive	12	10
Non-executive	80	50
Lower Staff	280	170
Total	382	230

Stratified random sampling was employed and this entail dividing the population into three strata that is executive level manager, non-executive level manager and lower level staff/subordinates. This was to ensure a better coverage of the population. In addition, simple random sampling technique was used to sample the population in each stratum to select the final respondents as this will give the respondents in the population equal chance of being chosen. According to Gay (1981), a sample of ten percent (10%) of the population is adequate to serve a study sample; therefore the study used 242 employees as a sample case.

The primary data collected through the questionnaire was analyzed and presented using different descriptive and non-parametric methods.

DATE PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A total of 242 Questionnaire were administered to 242 respondents and 232 were retrieved, representing 95.87% response rate. The remaining 10 copies were discarded because they were not fully answered or some not correctly filled, the researcher has taken the number of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Plc, Aba, Abia State Nigeria. This ensured that the sample size as was originally designed remained almost the same thereby ensuring representativeness of the target population and validity of the result of the study. The table below represents the response rate

Demographic characteristics of respondent

: Distribution of respondents based on sex

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	187	80.60
Female	45	19.40
Total	232	100.00

Source: Field survey questionnaire, 2024

Gender of the respondents is shown in Table 4.2 above. The analysis of their responses shows that 80.6% of the respondent were males while 19.4% were females. This means that there were more female in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Plc, Aba, Abia State Nigeria. This means that the distribution is gender sensitive in favour of males. This could be attributed to the fact that men are more committed to Bottling companies related jobs than the women who have less interest.

Table 4.3: Distribution of the respondents based on age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Below 25	46	19.83
25 – 34	99	42.67
Above 34	87	37.50
Total	232	100.00

Table 4.3 shows that 19.83% fall below 25 years, about 42.67% falls within 25-34 while 37.50% falls above 34 years respectively. This means that majority of the respondent are young, productive and vibrant. This represents an active stage in life. This group of employees are “independent and enterprising thinkers who relish responsibility, demand immediate feedback, and expect a continuous sense of accomplishment. “They are regarded as the drivers of organizational employee effectiveness and therefore, they are essential to the growth of every organization. The implication of this age bracket on employee morale in an organization is increase in employee effectiveness.

: What extent does work specialization has an effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba?

Table 4.7: Coded responses on: What extent does work specialization has an effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba?

S/N	ITEM STATEMENTS	SA 5	A 4	UD 3	D 2	SD 1	Total	Mean	Remark
1	My organization has different roles in productivity, efficiency, quality of services and scale that allow easy relationship with various units and departments of the firm.	69	40	83	25	15	819	3.38	Accepted
2	Work specialization enables effective co-operation and coordination between experts in different units, ie, co-operation and coordination enhances performance of the firms.	114	85	17	10	6	987	4.08	Accepted
3	Work specialization on the quality of services enables free communication with customers, suppliers and other companies.	90	88	3	4	47	866	3.58	Accepted
4	My organization receives inputs from customers and other stakeholders extensively in product development, production and delivery activities as a result of open access.	80	47	43	18	44	797	3.29	Accepted
5	Feedback from our customers contributes immensely to our good products or quality of services rendered due to work specialization.	81	82	20	23	26	865	3.57	Accepted
6	Our suppliers and other companies contribute valuable suggestions, technical contributions and quality improvement actions that improve our products.	3	4	90	88	47	524	2.17	Rejected
7	Work specialization breaks internal boundaries to ensure coordinated actions, infiltrating external boundaries between customers and suppliers to cope with the increasing	18	47	43	80	44	611	2.52	Rejected

complexity and dynamics of the environment.	
Clustered means	3.23

Source: Field survey, 2024. Decision rule: any mean response ≥ 3.0 was adjudged accepted while any mean responses < 3.0 was adjudged rejected

From the result, seven questions were designed in the questionnaire to ascertain the effect of work specialization on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba. From the result five (5) of the variables in the table were accepted by the mean range used for decision which is 3.0 and above. This result shows that the mean responses for items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 surpassed the criterion mean (3.38, 4.08, 3.58, 3.29 and $3.57 \geq 3.0$). Specifically “Work specialization enables effective co-operation and coordination between experts in different units, ie, co-operation and coordination enhances performance of the firms” on the average the highest mean ($\bar{X} = 4.08$) i.e. the respondents indicated strong agreement to the question statement; this was followed by “Work specialization on the quality of services enables free communication with customers, suppliers and other companies” has mean of ($\bar{X} = 3.58$); this was followed by “Feedback from our customers contributes immensely to our good products or quality of services rendered due to work specialization” ($\bar{X} = 3.57$). Others are shown on the table.

What is the effect of departmentalization on training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba?

Table 4.8: Coded responses on: Effect of departmentalization on training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba

S/N	ITEM STATEMENTS	SA 5	A 4	UD 3	D 2	SD 1	Total	Mean	Remark
8	An organization with different units or departments in hierarchy is as a result of organize and adequate structure that Concerns training of employees.	41	57	94	33	7	788	3.26	Accepted
9	As a result of few units or departments in my organization, decisions do not take longer time due to the natural and logical way of taking decisions on training hours of employees.	46	87	64	29	6	834	3.45	Accepted
10	Different units or departments enables a high level of integration and coordination, certain decisions are not always taken at higher level so that it will be easier for the	100	8	11	80	33	758	3.13	Accepted

11	manager in-charge of training to synchronize activities of employees. Direct and adequate attention to the basic training activities of different departments or units guarantee the availability and effective utilization of outstanding skilled and experts in the firms	90	10	9	96	27	736	3.04	Accepted
12	Engaging lower employees in the decision making in departments or units facilitate employee empowerment and sense of belongingness	94	98	19	12	9	952	3.93	Accepted
13	Reducing departments or units and empowering lower level employees through training facilitate employee's devotion to the vision and objectives of our organization by employees.	79	44	79	13	17	851	3.52	Accepted
14	Few department or units enhances better communication during training hours within the organization.	57	41	94	33	7	804	3.32	Accepted
Clustered mean								3.38	Accepted

Source: Field survey, 2024. Decision rule: any mean response ≥ 3.0 was adjudged accepted while any mean responses < 3.0 was adjudged rejected

Table 4.8 revealed responses from respondent effect of departmentalization on training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba. From the result, seven questions were designed in the questionnaire and all the variables in the table were accepted by the mean range used for decision which is 3.0 and above. Specifically “Engaging lower employees in the decision making in departments or units facilitate employee empowerment and sense of belongingness” on the average the highest mean ($\bar{X}= 3.93$) i.e. the respondents indicated strong agreement to the question statement; this was followed by “Reducing departments or units and empowering lower level employees through training facilitate employee’s devotion to the vision and objectives of our organization by employees” has mean of ($\bar{X}= 3.52$); this was followed by “As a result of few units or departments in my organization, decisions do not take longer time due to the natural and logical way of taking decisions on training hours of employees” ($\bar{X}=3.45$), this was followed by “Few department or units enhances better communication during training hours within the organization” ($\bar{X}=3.32$), this was followed by “An organization with different units or departments in hierarchy is as a result of organize and adequate structure that Concerns training of employees” ($\bar{X}=3.26$), this was followed by “Different units or departments enables a high level of integration and

coordination, certain decisions are not always taken at higher level so that it will be easier for the manager in-charge of training to synchronize activities of employees” (\bar{X} =3.12). and the least was “Direct and adequate attention to the basic training activities of different departments or units guarantee the availability and effective utilization of outstanding skilled and experts in the firms” (\bar{X} =3.04). Furthermore, the clustered mean was 3.38 which was accepted, this therefore implies that departmentalization has effect on training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

To what extend does chain of command has an effect on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Ab?

Table 4.9: Coded responses on: effect of chain of command on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba N = 232

S/N	ITEM STATEMENTS	S					Total	Mean	Remark
		A	A	UD	D	D			
		5	4	3	2	1			
15	Chain of command determines how effectively a company is operating in regards to revenue per employee in an organization.	46	87	64	29	6	834	3.45	Accepted
16	A comparative high revenue per employee is a positive signal that suggests the company is finding ways to achieve more sales (revenue) through chain of command.	8	11	100	80	33	577	2.38	Rejected
17	Chain of command attributes high labour demands and capital intensive companies in such a way that it fluctuates high revenue per employee ration than company that requires less labour.	9	10	90	96	27	574	2.37	Rejected
18	Chain of command comprises the relative performance of a company’s benchmark which should be made with competitors in the same company in order to asses revenue per employee in the firm.	94	98	19	12	9	952	3.93	Accepted
19	Chain of command evaluate appropriate calculation of revenue per employee so as to give an assessment of whether or not the company is generating adequate sales (revenue) comparatively to its assets.	50	99	44	5	34	822	3.40	Accepted
20	Chain of command always track and scan the company’s investment and its future from its revenue per employee figures and expenses	69	40	83	25	15	819	3.38	Accepted

21	Chain of command establishes accountability and a quick sense of the company's financial status which is a determinant factor to revenue per employee in the organization.	47	57	70	44	14	775	3.20	Accepted	
Clustered mean									3.16	Accepted

Source: Field survey, 2024. Decision rule: any mean response ≥ 3.0 was adjudged accepted while any mean responses < 3.0 was adjudged rejected

Table 4.9 revealed responses on effect of chain of command on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba. From the result, seven questions were designed in the questionnaire and five (5) variables in the table were accepted by the mean range used for decision which is 3.0 and above. This result shows that the mean responses for items 15, 18, 19, 20 and 21 surpassed the criterion mean (3.45, 3.93, 3.52, 3.38 and $3.2 \geq 3.0$).

1 Hypothesis one

H0₁: Work specialization has no significant effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc. and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

Table 4.12: OLS estimate for test of hypothesis one

Dependent Variable: Quality of services

Method: Least Squares

Included observations: 232

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Work specialization	0.449502	0.075155	5.980980	0.0000
C	1.304295	0.235449	5.539613	0.0000
R-squared	0.534597	Mean dependent var		2.650862
Adjusted R-squared	0.430834	S.D. dependent var		1.125693
S.E. of regression	1.049473	Akaike info criterion		2.943037
Sum squared resid	253.3206	Schwarz criterion		2.972750
Log likelihood	-339.3923	Hannan-Quinn criter.		2.955020
F-statistic	35.77212	Durbin-Watson stat		1.625885
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Source: Field survey, (2024)

From the regression analysis above, the value of the R^2 is 0.535, this suggest 53.5% of the changes in Quality of services is caused by the independent variables (Work specialization). The result shows that the coefficient of Work specialization was statistically significant in explaining the dependent variable. The intercept β_0 (1.304295) shows the value of Quality of services when the values of the independent variable are indeterminate or when they are zero; this means that when the independent variable (Work specialization) is 1.304295.

F-Statistics

The value of the F-stat, according to the result of the regression is given as (35.77212) 0.00000. The decision rule for the F-stat is goodness of fit statistic is satisfactory

Hypotheses 1 which states that Work specialization has no significant effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba was significant at 1% and positively related to Quality of services, this implies that an increase in Work specialization will increase the Quality of services, also a unit increase in Work specialization will lead to 0.45 increase in Quality of services. Hence, since sig ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$) is less than the 0.01 alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected meaning that Work specialization has a significant effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

4.3.2 Hypothesis Two

H0₂: Departmentalization has no significant effect on the training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

Table 4.13: OLS estimate for test of hypothesis two

Dependent Variable: Training hours

Method: Least Squares

Included observations: 232

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Departmentalization	0.281751	0.073416	3.837709	0.0002
C	3.617573	0.211368	17.11504	0.0000
R-squared	0.660181	Mean dependent var		2.870690
Adjusted R-squared	0.560915	S.D. dependent var		1.292872
S.E. of regression	1.256087	Akaike info criterion		3.302463
Sum squared resid	362.8835	Schwarz criterion		3.332176
Log likelihood	-381.0857	Hannan-Quinn criter.		3.314446
F-statistic	14.72801	Durbin-Watson stat		1.360192
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000161			

Source: Field survey, (2024)

From the regression analysis above, the value of the R^2 is 0.6601, this suggest 66.01% of the changes in Training hours is caused by the independent variables (Departmentalization). The result shows that the coefficient of Departmentalization was statistically significant in explaining the dependent variable. The intercept β_0 (3.617573) shows the value of Training hours when the values of the independent variable are indeterminate or when they are zero; this means that when the independent variable (Departmentalization) is 3.617573.

F-Statistics

The value of the F-stat, according to the result of the regression is given as (14.72801) 0.00000. The decision rule for the F-stat is goodness of fit statistic is satisfactory

Hypotheses 2 which states that Departmentalization has no significant effect on the training hours in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba was significant at 1% and positively related to Training hours, this implies that an increase in Departmentalization will increase the Training hours, also a unit increase in Departmentalization will lead to 0.28 increase in Training hours. Hence, since sig ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$) is less than the 0.01 alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected meaning that Departmentalization has a significant effect on the training hours in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

4.3.3 Hypothesis Three

H0₃: Level of chain of command has no significant effect on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

Table 4.14: OLS estimate for test of hypothesis three

Dependent Variable: Revenue per employee

Method: Least Squares

Included observations: 232

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Chain of command	0.211855	0.056393	3.756764	0.0002
C	2.318553	0.177483	13.06353	0.0000
R-squared	0.557814	Mean dependent var	2.926724	
Adjusted R-squared	0.453718	S.D. dependent var	1.139139	
S.E. of regression	1.108121	Akaike info criterion	3.051791	
Sum squared resid	282.4242	Schwarz criterion	3.081504	
Log likelihood	-352.0078	Hannan-Quinn criter.	3.063774	
F-statistic	14.11327	Durbin-Watson stat	0.898228	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000218			

Source: Field survey, (2024)

From the regression analysis above, the value of the R^2 is 0.558, this suggest 55.8% of the changes in Revenue per employees is caused by the independent variables (Chain of command). The result shows that the coefficient of Chain of command was statistically significant in explaining the dependent variable. The intercept β_0 (2.318553) shows the value of Revenue per employee when the values of the independent variable are indeterminate or when they are zero; this means that when the independent variable (Chain of command) is 2.318553.

F-Statistics

The value of the F-stat, according to the result of the regression is given as (14.11327) 0.00000. The decision rule for the F-stat is goodness of fit statistic is satisfactory.

Hypotheses 3 which states that Chain of command has no significant effect on the revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba was significant at 1% and positively related to Revenue per employee, this implies that an increase in Chain of

command will increase the Revenue per employee, also a unit increase in Chain of command will lead to 0.212 increase in Revenue per employee. Hence, since sig ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$) is less than the 0.01 alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected meaning that Chain of command has a significant effect on the revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

DISCUSSIONS OF RESULTS

This study aims at investigating the effects of organizational structure on employee effectiveness in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Plc, Aba, Abia State Nigeria. Based on results, the first hypothesis tested indicates that, work specialization has a significant effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba, the finding of the study was supported by Ajagbe (2011) sees organizational structure as “how jobs tasks are formally divided, grouped, and coordinated. Thus having a specific skill or bring specialized in that work, one would also bring growth in that division. They get chances to move up the ladder and gain more expertise in that specialization. Each specialization has its own uniqueness depending on the weight age and the depth of knowledge.

Hypotheses two which states that which states that Departmentalization has no significant effect on the training hours in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba was significant at 1% and positively related to Training hours, this implies that an increase in Departmentalization will increase the Training hours, also a unit increase in Departmentalization will lead to 0.28 increase in Training hours . Hence, since sig ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$) is less than the 0.01 alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected meaning that Departmentalization has a significant effect on the training hours in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba. Owing to the complexity of tasks and the competitive environment in which organizations operate, there is need for departmentalization as noted by March and Simon, (2009)

The result from hypothesis three also shows that an increase in Chain of command will increase the Revenue per employee, also a unit increase in Chain of command will lead to 0.212 increase in Revenue per employee. Hence, since sig ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$) is less than the 0.01 alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected meaning that Chain of command has a significant effect on the revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba. This confirms apriori expectation. The results of the analysis revealed that an increase in Centralization will increase the Profit per employee, also a unit increase in Centralization will lead to 0.322 increase in Profit per employee. Hence, since sig ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$) is less than the 0.01 alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected meaning that Centralization has a significant effect on the profit per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba. According to Okoye, (2017) a centralized organization benefits from a clear chain of command because every person with the organization knows who to reports to. Junior employees also know who to approach whenever they have concerns about the organization. On the other hand, senior executives follow clear plan of delegating authority to employees who excel in specific functions. The executives also gain the confidence that when they delegate responsibilities to mid-level managers and other employees, there will be no overlap.

5.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The results show that;

- i. Work specialization has no significant effect on the quality of services in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 5.98^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$).
- ii. Departmentalization has no significant effect on the training hours of employees in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 3.838^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$).
- iii. Level of chain of command has no significant effect on revenue per employee in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba ($t = 3.757^{***}$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$).

CONCLUSION

The success or failure of any organization depends on amount of people efforts in the organization and especially organization structure in order to achieve aims of firm that is possible by efficient use of hardware and software resources. In this regard ability of the management to motivate and create the desire to work hard on employees has a major role, so management structure of organization is mentioned as a vital link between management and staff. Basically, empirical results from this study finding indicate that organizational structure has significant effect on employee effectiveness in Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Plc, Aba, Abia State Nigeria. It was, therefore, deduced that organizational structure can simply be improved through increase in work specialization, departmentalization, chain of command, centralization and formalization in i Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Company Plc, Aba.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are, hereby, suggested:

- i. The work organization should encourage functional specialization of duties across each regional offices in order to make grouping of functions easy and accelerate good decision making for maximum productivity. There must be proper job analysis and job design in the organization in order to foster efficiency and profit margin of the organization. Also the human resource department of the organization as well as the management must always embark on training programmers most especially on types of organizational structure to employ as the organization expands.
- ii. Guinness Nigeria Plc and Nigeria Bottling Plc in the contemporary society is dynamic, therefore, there should be more attention on Departmentalization as it will increase training hour and increase competitive environment.

REFERENCES

- Abutorabi, M (2008), Relationship between organizational structure and knowledge management of employees of South Khorasan physical education, physical education students of the fifth. Conference of sports science, Mazandaran University.
- Abdekhoda, A (2011), Embeddedness and individual adaptive Performance; *proession Economics and Finance*, 23,13 pg 58-66.
- Abanobi, O. C (2009), *Guidelines for project Reports, Thesis, and Dissertations*; Owerri; Ugoma Printing Press & co.
- Absar, N., Nimalathan, B and Mahmoud, M. (2012), Human Resource Management Market performance relationship; Evidence from Bangladesh organization South Asian *Journal of Global business research*, 1(2); 238-255.
- Armstrong, M. (2013), *Human Resource Management practice*; (11th edition) London Kogan Page company.
- Armstrong, M. (2003), *A handbook of human resource management practice*; (9th edition), Great Britain; Cambrian printer Ltd.
- Abtahi, H and Kazemi, B. (2002), Organizational efficiency, *Institute for trade studies and Research*, Tehran.
- Accenture, M. (2001). The high performance workforce; *Separating the digital economy is winners from losers*. In the battle for performance.
- Abtahi., H. (2018), *Human resource management*, field management, payame Noor publisher, Tehran.
- Asgari, N. (2006), Investigate the relationship between structural factors (structure, culture, technology); Ministry of labour and social Affairs with knowledge management strategy. Master thesis, Tehran University.
- Anazodo, R. O., Okoye, J. C and Chukwumeka, E. E. O (2012), *Elements of Management and Culture in Organizational Behavior Enugu*; Phyce Kerex publisher.
- Angela, L., Daniel, N. & Jackson, K, (2022), Effects of organizational structure centralization on employee performance in Narok County Government: *international Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. Vol.6 Issue 11 Pg 2454-2460.
- Anyebe, A. (2003), the Nigeria Civil Service; issues in structure and operation, *Journal of professional administration*, 5:11-17
- Anderson, P, and Pulish, M. (2000). Retaining good employees in Tough Times. *The Health Care Manager*.
- Achcaoucaou, F; Bernardo, M., and Castan, J. M. (2009), Determinants of organizational structures; an empirical study”, *Reviews of international comparative Management*.
- Akinyele, S. T. (2011), “Significance of strategic marketing to enterprise performance; An empirical analysis of Nigerian oil and gas industry”, *Global journal of management and Business Research*, vol. 10, No. 6, pp. 60-77.
- Argote, L. (1999), *Organizational learning; creating, retaining and transferring knowledge*, Boston, Kluwer Academic.
- Ashkenas, D; Ulrich, D., and Jick, T. (2002), *The Boundaryless Organization; Breaking the chain of organizational structure* Mechanical Industry Press.
- Ajagbe, M. A., (2011). The relationship between strategic planning and the effectiveness of marketing operations. *International Journal of Innovation, management and Technology*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 390-396.

- Anderson, J., and Zbirenko, A., (2014). Effect of organizational structure, leadership and communication on efficiency and productivity. A qualitative study of a public health care organization. UMEA University.
- Bridges, W., and Bridges, S., (2017), *Managing transitions; making the most of change*. Da Capo press.
- Borman, W.C and Motoldlo, S., (2000). "Task performance and contextual performance; the meaning for personal selection research, *Journal of Human Resource Management*.
- Booner, A. (2009), *Competitive strategies for a world class workforce*. Retrieved from <http://boonerauthority.ning.com>.
- Bock, D. (2013), *Business Research. A practical Guide for under-graduate and post graduate students; (2nd edition)* Basing stoke. Macmillan Business.
- Blount, Y, Munir, R., and Upadhaya, B. (2014). Association between performance measurement system and organizational effectiveness: *International Journal of operations and production management*, 34 (7), 2-2.
- Bozbor, U. (2007) "Social structure and competition in interfirm networks; the paradox of embeddedness, *Journal of administrative science*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp 35-67.
- Buchele, R. B. (2003). Motivating employee owners in Esop firms; Human resources policies and company performances *journal of national Bureau of Economic Research*, vol. 8, no. 10 pp. 101-127.
- Bradley, R. and Colleague, G. (2011). Organizational structure applying miutzberg's framework "*international journal of scholarly academy intellectual diversity*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp 48-64.
- Cummingham, S. (2002) Attracting and retaining employees in a competitive world. *Journal of academy of insurance*. September, 16.
- Cole, G. A (2002). *Personnel and Human resource management* 5th edition.
- Cole, G. A (2004). *Management; Theory and Practice*, London; Thompson Learning.
- Collis, J. and Hussey, R. (2003). *Organizational structure; Business Research. A practical guideline for post graduate students; 4th edition; Basing stoke, Macmillan Business*.
- Csaszar, A. F., (2008). Organizational structure as a determinant of performance; Evidence from mutual funds; the Wharton school, University of Pennsylvania steinberg Hall-Dietrich hall, Philadelphia, P. *A strategic management Journal*, 33 (6), 611-632.
- Edwin, B. F., (2004). *Personnel management on organizational structure and perspective*, 5th edition, Tokyo; McGraw-Hill, Kogakusha Ltd.
- Eghbali, S., (2002). Investigate the relationship between cooperative systems by increasing efficiency master's thesis.
- Ezigbo, C. A., (2003). *Advance Management Theory*, (1st edition), Enugu; Immaculate Publications Ltd.
- Ezigbo, C. A., (2007). *Managing Subordinates for effectiveness in Nigerian University system; International Research Journal for Development; January-April, 9 (1)*.
- Freeman, R. D., (2007). The last American Shoe Manufacturers; Decreasing Productivity and increasing profits in a shift from piece Rates to continuous flow production. *Journal of Industrial Relations* vol. 44, issue 1, pp. 307-330.
- Foretica, S., (2011). Design and structure of the organization; international standard organization (150-19011) guidelines for auditing management systems.
- Granda, J. M and Trujillo, T. (2013). Perceptions of student leadership in the university. Department of Didactic and school organization, university of Granada.

- Gilani, N., (2013). The difference between centralized and decentralized organizations. Retrieved from [http:// www.ehow.com/info-8703779-difference-between-centralized-decentralized- organization.html](http://www.ehow.com/info-8703779-difference-between-centralized-decentralized-organization.html).
- Global corporate finance society, 2019. <http://corporatefinanceinstitute.com>>ce
- Gittell, J., (2001). Supervisory Span, relational coordination and flight departure performance.
- Griffin, R. W., (2003). Management; 7th edition, Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Griffieth, R., Jorn, P. W and Sambrook, G., (2010). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee performance; update, moderate tests and research implication for the next millennium. *Journal of management*. 26 (3); 463-488.
- Gresov, C. and Drazin, R., (2007). Equifinality; functional equivalence in organization
- Morton, N. A., and Ho, Q (2008). The Relationship between organizational structure contingency Theory Approach; Florida, Atlantic University. *A Journal of America conference on information system, proceedings 498*. <http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2008>
- Novak, S., and Stern, S., (2008). “Comparative nature on organizational structure and coordination costs. “How does outsourcing affect performance dynamics?”
- Nnabuiife, E., (2009). Organizational behavior and management theory, Nimo; Rex Charles & Patrick Limited.
- Nwosu, H., (2015), strategic planning and organizational performance; A study of selected Brewing firms in Nigeria. *The International Journal of Business and Management vol. 3 issue 2., 162-186*.
- O’Neill, J. W, and Liao, C. H., (2001). The use of organizational culture and organizational structure to guide strategic behavior. *An information processing perspective; Journal of Behaviour and Applied management*.
- O’ Toole, L. J., and Meier, K. J., (2004). Modeling the impact of public management; Implications of structural Dimension; *Journal of Administration Research and management, vol. 4, issue 1*.
- Onodugo, V. (2000). Management Fundamentals and practices Enugu; El Demark Ltd.
- Onwuchekwa, C. I., (2006). Business Policy and Strategic management, Onitsha; varsity press.
- Okebaram, C., (2011). Organizational structure and Human Resource Management Personnel and Professional; A framework of mintzberg’s organizational structure; *Journal of personnel management, 5; 25-40*.
- Oso, W. and Onene, D., (2009). A General Guide to writing Research proposal and Report. Nairobi; option press and publication.
- Oyedijo, A., (2012). “Antecedents and performance outcomes of strategic planning Nigeria public universities,” *International Journal of Asian Social Science, vol. 2, issue 4, pp. 448-461*.
- Weigelt, C., and Miller, D. J., (2013). Implications of Internal Organization structure for firms boundaries strategy, bass San. Francisco.
- Wezel, F. C., and Saka-Helmbout, A., (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational change; institutionalizing the behavioural theory of the firm, *Journal of Organization Studies, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 265-286*.
- Williams, A., and Bolonz, M., (2014). Knowledge sharing in inter-unit cooperate episodes. The impact of organizational structure dimensions. *International Journal of Information Management vol. 29, no 2, pp.151-160.*

- Willem, A., and Buelens, M., (2009) Knowledge sharing in inter-unit cooperative episodes: The Impact of organizational structure dimension: *International Journal of Information Management*, vol. 2, n.29, pp. 151-160.
- Yang, B., Zhou, Y. B., Mclean, G. N and Zhang, W., (2015). “Linking organizational structure, culture, strategy and organizational effectiveness”. Mediating Role of Knowledge Management,” *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 763-771.
- Zabojnik, J., (2002). Centralized and decentralized decision making in organizations. [https://www.researchgate.net>publication](https://www.researchgate.net/publication).