ORGANISATIONAL DESIGN AND ORGANISATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN ECOBANK NIGERIA LIMITED IN DELTA STATE

Tobi Becky Ejumudo
Department of Business Administration
University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria
E-mail: ejumudotobi@yahoo.com

Kelly Bryan Ovie Ejumudo
Department of Political Science
Novena University, Ogume, Nigeria.
E-mail: profkellynovena@yahoo.com

Abstract: *The study examines the organisational design and organisational effeceiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta State. The instrument used for data collection wasorganisational design questionnaire and the data were analyzed using chi-square. The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant relationship betweenpoor technology, inappropriate organisational size and staff mix as well as poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state. The study recommended that organisation should increase the level of their technology, organisational size, staff mix as well as imbibing the culture and practice of anticipating, scanning, monitoring of internal and external environments with an eye to responding and adapting to appropriate changes and trends to actualize their organisationalset goals.*

Key words: organisational, design, effectiveness, ecobank, Delta State and Nigeria

1. Introduction

Organisational as social systems require a formal structure. This structure serves as a formal arrangement that allocates tasks and responsibilitties among employees and departments. The structure also determines the relationships between the different employees and various departments and it is created to facilitate the coordination of organisational activities in an integrated fashion. It also controls the actions of its members through

effective communication in order to attain organisational goals. Organisational design which involves a set of structural elements and their relationships equally seek to implement strategies and plans for purpose of achieving organisational effectiveness.In so far as organisationals are not expected to be static, especially as they must anticipate and take appropriate actions in order to take care of changes in their external and internal environments, organisational redesign is inevitably an on-going concern.In the absence of organisational design or the failure of organisationals to re-design their structures in the face of changing environmental situations, demands and decisions are either delayed or they turn out to be of poor quality, employees go through unnecessarily high levels of stress, excessive conflict between employees and departments commonly erupt, the ability to cope with changing external conditions is sharply lowered and organisational effectiveness and survival may be threatened or undermined as (Baron 2016) rightly articulated.

Despite the recognized and acceptable need for organisationals to create, maintain and redesign ther formal structures to ensure that activities are grouped and tasks are assigned, the levels in the authority hierachy are minimized, authority is decentralized to units and sub-units, functions are placed in the structures and relationships exist between units and funcions in a co-ordinated and integrated manner in order to actualize organisational effectiveness (Armstrong 2012; Ekakitie 2017; Griffin 2016 & Robbins 2015), it is surprising to observe that several factors seem to be inhibiting the critical role that organisational design is expected to play in the attainment of organisational effectiveness. For instance, Ann, Nwankwere, Orga & Igwe (2015) investigated the impact of structure on organisational performance and the findings revealed that decentralisation enhanced better and more informed decision making in technical and service firms in Nigeria and task routine affected staff productivity both positively and nagatively.In a similar vein, Laleh, Masoud and Aflatoon (2014) examined the relationship between organisational structure and effectiveness in Melat bank and the result indicated that the organisationalstructure negatively affected the organisational's status and conditions.

Latifi and shooshtarian (2014) also assessed the effects of organisational structure on organisational trust and effectiveness and the findngs showed that while there is a significant relationship between organisational organic strucure and effectizveness, there is no significant relationship between mechanistic structure and effectiveness dimensions. Masoud and Narges (2013) equally examined the relationship between organisational structure and organisational effectiveness at Rafsanjan public departments and the

results revealed that there is a relationship between organisational structrue, formalisation and the organisational effectiveness. The contention in this study however, is that poor technology, inappropriate organisational size and staff mix as well as poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment appears to be affecting and constraining organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.

2. Statement of the Problem

While several studies have investigated the relationship between organisational structure and organisational effectiveness (Latifi and Shooshtarian 2014; Laleh, Masoud and Aflatoon 2014 and Ann et al. 2015), the relationship between poor technology, inapproriate organisational size and staff mix as well as poor responsive and adaptive (internal) environmental dimensions of organisational design and organisational effectiveness have not adequately engaged the attention of scholars and resultantly they have been relatively unstudied in the literature of management. This is the gap that this study seeks to fill.

2.1. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to examine organisational design and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited, while the specific objectives are to:

1. Investigate the impact of poor technology on organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.
2. Examine the influence of inappropriate organisational size and staff mix on organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.
3. Assess the impact of poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment on organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.

2.2. Hypotheses of the Study

1. There is no significant relationship between poor technology and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.
2. There is no significant relationship between inappropriate organisational size and staff mix and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.
3. There is no significant relationship between poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.

2.3 Literature Review

2.3.1. Meaning of Organisational Design

Griffin (2016) definedorganisational design as the overall set of structural elements and the relationships that exist among those elements used to manage the total organisational. He also noted that it is a means to implement strategies and plans in order to achieve organisational goals. In his own thinking, Armstrong (2012) organisational design is the process of organising which may involve the grand design or redesign of the total structure, but most frequently it is concerned with the organisational of particular functions and activities and the basis upon which the relationships between them are managed and that organisationals are not static. This view is based on the understanding that changes are constantly taking place in the organisationalitself, in the environment in which the business operates, and inthe people who work in the organisational.

In a similar vein, Ekakitie (2017) opined that organisational design is the decision-making process by which managers choose an organisational structure that is appropriate to the strategy for the organisational and the environment in which members of the organisational carry out that strategy. He added that organisational design implies that managers must look into two directions simultaneously: that is inside their organisationals and outside their organisationals. Mintzberg (2009) also posited that organisational structure defines how people are organised or how their jobs are divided and coordinated. Greenberg (2011) equally stressed that organisational structure is the formal configuration between individuals and groups concerning the responsibilities, allocation of tasks and authority in the organisational, while Damanpour (2002) emphasized that organisational structure includes the nature of formalization, layers of hierarchy, level of horizontal integration, centralization of authority and patterns of communication. Generally, there seems to be a convergence of opinion on the fact that organisational structure consists of job positions, their relationships to each other and accountabilities for the process and sub-process deliverables.

2.3.2. Organisational Design and Organisational Effectiveness

Anderson and Zbirenko (2014) emphasized that structure, communication and leadership affect productivity and efficiency. While structure explains how productive the operational processes are in the organisational, communication affects how things are done very fast and how willing and happy personnel are in the organisational and leadership affects every personnel and how they strive for the achievement of their goals. Long,

Perumal and Ajaagbe (2012) explained that organisational effectiveness and its relation to structure can be determined by the fit between infomation processing requirements in a way that people can have neither too little nor too much inappropriate infomation. The above understanding shows the inevitability of information flow in the accomplishment of organisational goals. He also suggested that the organisationalstructure should be designed in a manner that will enable departments and individuals that are involved in coordinating organisational efforts to have their lines of communication built into the structure. Walton (1996) also sketched the relationship between organisational structure and effectiveness when he stressed that the restructuring of organisational is designed to improve on both the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of organisationals.

2.3.3. Bureacratic and Behavioural Models of Organisational Design

2.3.3.1. Bureaucratic Model
Ekakitie (2017) explained that bureaucratic approach has contributions from Henri Fayol who formulated the fourteen (14) principles of management in order to understand the organisational and its structure/design. He also explained that Max Weber (the doyen of bureaucracy) and Frederick Taylor (the leading exponent of the scientific management theory) laid a solid background of organisational design and formation. Max Weber and Frederick Taylor have a strong believe in the   one best way of doing things and the link between efficiency, effectiveness and organisational design. Griffin (2016), in his own view, posited that bureacracy is a type of organisational structure that is based on a legitimate and formal system of authority. In fact, most of the people relate bureaucracy with red-tape, rigidity and passing the buck.

According to Ekakitie (2017), bureaucratic thoery states that good allowance should be given to experience, merit and the ability to perform or execute task rather than favouritism. He also observed that Taylor was emphatic about the exigency of scientific selection as well as training and development of workers and the bureaucratic model recommended the need for clear job responsibilityand specialization so that evaluation of and reward for performance can be easily achieved. Griffin (2016) summarised the ideal bureaucratic approach into five ways:
1. Organisation should adopt a distinct division of labor and each position should be filled by an expert.
2. Organisation should develop a consistent set of rules to ensure that task effectiveness is uniform.

3. Organisation should establish a hierarchy of positions or offices that create a chain of command from the top to the bottom of the organisation.
4. That manager should conduct business in an impersonal way and maintain an appropriate social distance between themselves and their subordinates.
5. Employment and advancement should be based on technical expertise and employees should be protected from arbitrary dismissal.

2.3.3.2. Behavioural Model

This is a universally accepted approach of organiszation structure that involves the behaviourists and human relations schools. The best-known behavioural model was the Likert's system model of organisational (Ekakitie 2017). He carried out a research which he pioneered at the Michigan University in which he surveyed a large number of organisationalso as to figure out the factors that make some organisational successful and others less successful. He opined that organisational that adopt and apply the bureaucratic model tend to be less effective than those organisational that largely emphasis group work deevelopment, behavioural as well as social processes in the organisational (Griffin 2016).

Likert (1967) identified system 1 form organisational that is related to an ideal bureaucracy. In this type of organisational, motivational processes are seen to be based on economic factors and interaction processes are restricted and closed. This means that communication is relatively formal and mainly job related. The system 1 is considered to be somewhat rigid and flexible. The behavioural model paralleled the emergence of human relations school of management thought. Likert equally developed a framework that classified organisational in terms of eight important processes: Leadership, commuication, motivation, interactions, decision making, goal – setting, and contol and performance goals.

2.3.4. Situational Approach on OrganisationalDesign

This approach is based onthe assumption that the optimal design for any given organisational depends on a set of relevant situational factors and this implies that situational factors play a role in determining the best organisational design for any particular circumstance (Griffin 2016). For purpose of this study, four factors: technology, environment, size and organisational life cycle as (Griffin 2016) rightly articulated were discussed.

2.3.4.1 Technology
This is the conversion processes that is utilized to transform inputs like (materials/ information) into outputs like (products/services). Majority of the organisational use multiple technologies. The concept of technology is not limited to assembly lines and machinery, especially as it can also be applied to service organisational. Joan Woodward was the first woman to recognise the link between technology and organisational. She studied one hundred manufacturing companys in Southern England and gathered information about such things as the history of individual organisational, their production processes, their forms and procedures and their financial performance. Although, she assumed a relationship betwwen the size of an organisational and its effectiveness, but the finding of her study did not support such a relationship (Griffin 2016). In Woodward's sample, she also explained that as technology became more complex, especially as the number of management levels increased, executive span of management also increased, as the size of its staff component relatively did. The management supervisory span, first increased and then decreased as technology became more complex mainly because more of the work in continuous and fewer workers were needed but the skills needed in carrying out the job increased. This, technology seems to play a key role in determining organisational design.

2.3.4.2. Environment
Environmental elements and organisational design can be linked in different ways. According to (Griffin 2016) environment organisational linkages was widely recognized for the first time by Burns and Stalker. Their first assignment was to identify two extreme forms of organisational environment: stable and unstable. Thereafter, they studied the organisational design of each type of environment. Their findings revealed that organisational in stable environments (mechanistic) have a different environment than that of the unstable environments (organic). Mechanistic organisational is close to bureaucratic model, which was frequently found mostly in a stable environmentsand it is free from uncertainty. An organic organisational on the other hand was mainly found in unstable and unpredictable environments, characterised by a higher level of flexibility, constant change and uncertainty.

2.3.4.3. Organisational Size
Another factor that affects the design of an organisational is the size of the organisational. Organisational size is the total number of full-time or full-time equivalent workers. A team of researchers at the University of Aston in Birmingham, England is of the opinion that Woodward had failed to find a size

– structure relationship (which was her original expectation) because most of the organisationals she studied were quite small. As a consequence, they decided to study wider organisational in order to know how size and technology respectively and jointly affectorganisational design. Their findingsrevealed that technology influence small firms because their activities are centered on technology. While in large firms strong technology-design link broke down mainly because technology is not central to ongoing activities in large organisational (Griffin 2016).

2.3.4.4. Organisational Life Cycle

Organisational life cycle is a natural sequence of stages in which most organisational go through as they grow and mature. Griffin (2016) asserted that there is no clear pattern that explain changes in size, but most organisational pass through four distinct stages: the birth stage of the organisational,the youth stage of the organisational, that is the growth and expansion stage of all organisational resources, the midlife stage which is the stage where oganizations experience gradual growth evolving eventually into stability and the final stage of an organisational life cycle is the maturity stage a period of stability. Managers must encounter a number of organisational design issues as theorganisational progresses through these stages. In sum, as organisational passes from one stage to another, it gets bigger, more mechanistic and more decentralized. Thus, an organisational's size and design are clearly linked and this link changes because of the organisational life cycle.

2.3.5. Components of Organisational Structure

Organisational structure is comprised of several components. According to Robbins (2015), the components of organisational structure are:

2.3.5.1. Organisational design

Organisational create structure to facilitate the co-ordination of facilities and to control the actions of its members. The structure is comprised of three components. The first has to do with the degree to which activities within the organisational are broken up or differentiated and it is known as complexity. The second is the degree to which rules and procedures are utilized and it is this component is referred to as formalization, while the third component of structure is centralizationwhere decision-making authority lies.

2.3.5.2. Complexity
Complexity encompasses three forms of differentiation: horizontal, vertical, and spatial. Horizontal differentiation has to do with the degree of horizontal separation between units. The larger the number of different occupations within an organisational that require specialized knowledge and skills, the more horizontally complex that organisational is due to the fact that diverse orientations make it more difficult for organisational members to communicate and more difficult for management to coordinate their activities. Vertical differentiation, on the other hand, means the depth of the organisational hierarchy and the more levels that exist between top management and the operatives, the more complex the organisational is because there is a greater potential for communication distortion. It is equallyharder for top management to oversee closely the actions of operatives where there are more vertical levels. Also, spatial differentiation implies the degree to which the location of an organisational's physical facilities and personnel are geographically dispersed and the higher the level of differentiation, the higher the level of complexity because communication, co-ordination, and control become more difficult.

2.3.5.3. Formalization
Formalization refers to the degree to which jobs within the organisational are standardized. If a job is highly formalized, then the position occupier has a minimum amount of discretion over what is to be done, when it is to be done and how it should be done. Employees are therefore expected always to handle the same input in exactly the same way, resulting in a consistent and uniform output. There are explicit job descriptions, lots of organisational rules, and clearly defined procedures covering work processes in organisational where there is high formalization. Where formalization is low, job behaviors are relatively non-programmed and employees have a great deal of freedom to exercise initiative in their work. Besides, in so far as an individual's discretion on the job is inversely linked to the amount of behavior that is preprogrammed by the organisational, the greater the standardization, the less input the employee has into how his or her work is to be done. Standardization not only eliminates the possibility of employees engaging in alternative behaviors, but it even removes the need for employees to consider alternatives. The degree of formalization can also vary between organisational and within organisational. Certain jobs, for instance, are well known to have little formalization.

2.3.5.4. Centralization
In some organisationals, top managers make all the decisions and lower-level managers simply execute top management's directives. At the other extreme, there are organisational where decision making is pushed down to those managers who are closest to the action. The former case is called centralization and the latter is referred to as decentralization.

The term centralization refers to the degree to which decision making is concentrated at a single point in the organisational. Specifically, it is said that if top management makes the organisational's key decisions with little or no input from lower-level personnel, then the organisational is seen as centralized. In contrast, the more that lower-level personnel provide input or are actually given the discretion to make decisions, the more decentralized the organisational.

3. Presentation of Results

3.1. Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 (Ho₁)
There is no significant relationship between poor technology and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state.

Table 1: Chi-square analysis of questionnaire for the relationship between poor technology and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited

Items	SA/A	D/SD	Total	Df	X²-cal.	X²-cri.	Decision
1	62	38	50				
2	64	36	50				Ho₁ is
3	70	30	50	3	12.73	7.82	Rejected
4	78	22	50				
5	78	22	50				

Source: Field Work 2019   P>0.05

In table 1 above, with alpha level of 0.05, the degree of freedom (DF) of 3, the critical value is 7.82, while calculated value is 12.73. Since the calculated value is greater than the critical value, the null hypothesis is therefore rejected. This shows that there is a significant relationship between poor

technology and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state.

Hypothesis 2 (Ho$_2$)
There is no significant relationship between inapproriate organisational size and staff mix and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state.

Table 2: Chi-square analysis of questionnaire for the relationship between inapproriate organisational size and staff mix and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.

Items	SA/A	D/SD	Total	Df	X^2-cal.	X^2-cri.	Decision
1	76	24	50				
2	78	22	50				Ho$_1$ is Rejected
3	70	30	50	3	17.23	7.82	
4	62	38	50				
5	72	28	50				

Source: Field Work 2019   P>0.05

In Table 2 above, showing the degree of freedom (Df) of 3, the critical value of 7.82 and the calculated value of 17.23. Since the critical value is less than the calculated value the null hypothese is therefore rejected. It can be deduced that there is a significant relationship betweeninapproriate organisational size and staff mix and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state.

Hypothesis 3 (Ho$_3$)
There is no significant relationship between poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state.

Table 3: Chi-square analysis of questionnaire for the relationship between poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited.

Items	SA/A	D/SD	Total	Df	X^2-cal.	X^2-cri.	Decision
1	56	44	50				
2	76	24	50				

3	70	30	50	3	12.11	7.82	Ho$_1$ is Rejected
4	66	34	50				
5	74	26	50				

Source: Field Work 2019   P> 0.05

In Table 3 above, with P> 0.05, the degree of freedom (Df) of 3, the critical value of 7.82 and the calculated value of 12.11. Since the calculated value is greater than the critical value the null hypothese is therefore rejected. It can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state.

3.2. Discussion of Results

The study revealed that there is a significant relationship between poor technology and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state. This is because the findings of the study showed that poor technology (software platform) has impacted negatively on organizational effectiveness in the area of speed of banking operations and transactions, turn-around time for attending to customers and service delivery. This finding opposed Latifi and Shooshtarian (2014) who carried out a study on the effects of organisational structure on organisational trust and effectiveness and concluded that there is no significant relationship between mechanistic structure and effectiveness dimensions.

The finding also showed that there is a significant relationship between inappropriate organisational size and staff mix and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state. This is largely because inadequate staff strength and the resultant poor staff capacity to cope with the volume of the banking operations, poor staff mix in the context of the very high percentage of contract or subsidiary employees and the very low percentage of core or mainstream employees and the accompanying poor staff morale and commitment have impacted negatively on the organizational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state. This result is in consonance with Laleh, Masoud and Aflatoon (2014) who opined that poor organisational structure negatively affects the organisational's status and conditions. They concluded that managers have to select a structure to have correlation with organisational's status and conditions that will culminate in the achievement of organisational goals and aspirations.

The study equally revealed that there is a significant relationship between poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment and organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state. This

finding is in accordane with Laleh, Masoud and Aflatoon (2014) who posited that the poor organisational structure negatively affected the organisational's status and conditions. They added that managers have to select a structure to have correlation with organisational's status and conditions that will result in the achievement of organisational goals and aspirations. The finding is also in accordance with Masoud and Narges (2013) who articulated that there is significant relationship between organisational internal environment and organisational effectiveness. They advised that managers should choose organisational structure that correlate with organisational situation and condition that will promote stability, resource acquisition as well as human resource satisfaction and development.

3.3. Methodology

In this study, descriptive survey research design was employed. The use of descriptive survey design was based on the fact that the researcher used the questionnaire instrument to obtain information on the variables under study from the respondents. This design enables the researcher to collect detailed information from the research subjects. Descriptive survey research design is also used in the collection of quantitative information about items in a population survey of human populations and institutions (Gibson 2016).

The population of the study comprised all the 35 branches of Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta State.The total population of the 35 branches in the state are three hundred and sixty-three (363) staff. The sample of the study consists of fifty (50) staff that was drawn from eight branches (8) in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta State. The eight branches and fifty sampled staff were selected using purposive sampling technique. The choice of this technique was because of easy accessibility to the respondents and the technique is less expensive. The instrument that was used for data collection was organisational design questionnaire. The organisational design questionnaire is made up of three sections and it contains sixteen (16) items which enabled the researcher to spread the questions/items across the independent/moderating variables. The various indicators used were based on poor technology, inappropriate organisational size and staff mix, poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment. The organisational design questionnaire was validated by three experts in the field of management and social science. The experts made useful corrections, recommendations and suggestions as appropriate and the corrections were affected by the researcher on the receipt of the comments. All the research hypotheses were tested for significant difference at 0.05 level of significance using Chi-Square.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Arguably, organisational design appears to have a significant relationship with effectiveness in organisational. This relationship can however be in the positive or negative directions. This assertion is essentially premised on the understanding that it is the presence or absence of the relevant variables or factors in the environment of organisational design or structure that will either enhance or undermine the effectiveness environment in organisational. Specifically, in so far as the findings of the study showed that poor technology, inappropriate organisational size and staff mix as well as poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) aspects of organisational design have negatively affected organisational effectiveness in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta State, it is evident that poor technology particularly (software platform), inadequate staff strength and the resultant poor staff capacity to cope with the volume of the banking operations, poor staff mix in the context of the very high percentage of contract or subsidiary employees and the very low percentage of core or mainstream employees and the accompanying poor staff morale and commitment as well as poor responsive and adaptive organisational (internal) environment have constrained the organizational effectiveness in the area of speed of banking operations and transactions, turn-around time for attending to customers and service delivery in Ecobank Nigeria Limited in Delta state.

The study recommended that the organisation should increase the level of their technology, particularly its software platform as well as organisational size and staff mix to enable the organisation achieve their set goals and objectives. The study equally recommended that organisational should establish the structure and imbibe the practice of anticipating, scanning, monitoring their internal and external environments with an eye to responding and adapting to appropriate and relevant changes and trends in order to actualize their organisational goals and objectives.

References

Anderson, J. and Zbirenko, A. 2014. *Effect of organisational structure; Leadership and communication on efficiency and productivity*. A qualitative study of a public health-care organisational. Umea University, 1–71.

Ann, I. O., Nwankwere, F. C., Orga, C. C. and Igwe, A. A. 2015. "The impact of structure on organisational performance." *Journal of Corporate Ownership & Control 13* (1): 1–7.

Armstrong, M. 2012. *A handbook of human resource management practice.* New Delhi: Kogan Page.

Baron, R. A. 2016. *Behavior in organisational: Understanding and managing the human side of work*. London: Allyn and Bacon Publishers.

Damanpour, F. 2002. "Organisational innovation: A meta–analysis of effects of determinants and moderators." *Academy of Management Journal* 34 (3): 555–590.

Ekakitie, S. E. 2017. *Contemporary management*. Benin-City: Bob Peco Printing and Publishing Company.

Gibson, B.O. 2016. *Stratified Methods in the Social Sciences.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Greenberg, J. 2011. *Behaviour in organisational*. Upper Saddler River, Prentice Hall.

Griffin, R. W. 2016. *Management*. New Jersey, NJ: Houghton Mifflin.

Laleh, B., Masoud P. and Aflatoon, A. 2014. "Organisational structure and effectiveness." *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* 3 (7): 23–36.

Latifi, M. and Shooshtarian, Z. 2014. "The effects of organisational structure on organisational trust and effectiveness." *Polish Journal of Management Studies.*

Likert, R. 1967. *The human organisational: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw Hill Books.

Long, C.S., Perumal, P. and Ajaagbe, M. A. 2012. "The impact of human resource management practices on employee's turnover intention: A conceptual model." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 4 (2): 629–641.

Masoud, P. K. and Narges, H. K. 2013. "Organisational structure and organisational effectiveness." *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research* 3 (6): 1071–1078.

Mintzberg, H. 2009. *Tracking strategies: Towards a general theory of strategy formation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Robbins, S. P. 2015. *Organisational behavior: Concepts, controversies and applications.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Walton, R.C. 1996. "A vision-led approach to management restructuring." *Organisational dynamics* 14 (4): 5–17.