LAPAI JOURNAL of MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

Volume 7 No.1

ISSN: 2315-9243

CONTENT

1. Effective Business Communication and Organizational Profitability: Evidence from selected retail outlets in Lagos State, Nigeria. KADIRI, Ismaila Bolarinwa (Ph.D), SULEIMAN, Ahmed Aremu..... 1

2. The Cost – Benefit Analysis (CBA) Of Electronic Banking in Nigeria: A study of United Bank for Africa (UBA), Jalingo, Taraba State, Nigeria, Innocent Felix Idoko Ph.D, Rollins C. Iyadi Ph.D, Yahaya Salifu Emeje 8

3. Meta-regression Analysis for Economic Condition of Business in Nigeria, Talatu Muhammad Barwa 22

4. The Impact of Staffing and Human Resource Reward/compensation on Organizational Effectiveness in Coca-cola Nigeria Plc, Abuja, Dr. Tijjani Adamu Aliyu, Mohammed Ibrahim Worogi..... 28

5. Impact of Intellectual Capital on Nigerian Commercial Banks' Employee Retention in Kaduna Metropolis, Abdul-Wahab O. Anafi [(1)] & Haruna Ismaila Maikujeri [(2)]..... 36

6. Determinant of Users' Acceptance of Internet Financial Reporting on Quoted Companies in Nigeria Josiah, Mary, Joseph Adetokunbo Abu, Gbenga Ekudayo..... 42

7. Pension Fund Investment and Financing Constraints: A lesson to Nigerian Pension Fund Administrators, Dr. Muhammad Shehu Tijjani..... 54

8. Unemployment, Poverty and Socio-economic Development of Nigeria, Abubakar Faruk & Abolaji Jamiu Atobatele..... 70

9. Effect of Corporate Governance on Financials of Manufacturing Companies in Nigeria, Kasum, Abubakar Sadiq[1], Fafeyiwa, Olajumoke Oluwafeyikemi[1], Nassar, Mashood Lanre[2], Salman, Ramat Titilayo[1]..... 80

10. Awareness, Knowledge and uptake of Pre-marital Screening for Sickle Cell Disease among Youth in Kano Municipal Local Government Area Of Kano State, Nigeria, Mohammed Mustapha Namadi, Ph.D..... 97

11. Industry Type, Return On Equity, Legal Environment And Corporate Voluntary Disclosure in Nigeria Francis Kehinde EMENI *(Ph.D)*, David Amenaghawon..... 110

12. Impact Of Organizational Structure On Organizational Behaviour, Olota, Oluwayomi Omotayo, Abdul, Falilat Ajoke , Oladipo, Ganiyu Taiwo, (ph.d)..... 126

13. Firm Financial Performance And Corporate Social Responsibility: Bidirectional Causality? , *Agbonrha-Oghoye Imas IYOHA (M.Sc.), KIFORDU Anyibuofo Anthony (Ph.D)..... 143

14. The Need for Methodological and Cultural issues during Quantitative Research Talatu Muhammad Barwa PhD..... 159

IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE ON ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR

OLOTA, Oluwayomi Omotayo
Olota.oo@unilorin.edu.ng
08037225831,

ABDUL, Falilat Ajoke
and
OLADIPO, Ganiyu Taiwo, (Ph.D)
Department of Business Administration,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Ilorin

ABSTRACT

The business environment changes continuously and these changes bring about high levels of uncertainties that the organization would have to make structural adjustment, so as to be able to accommodate these changes since the structural variable could influence changes on the organizational effectiveness. This study therefore examined the impact of organizational structure on organizational behaviour using Dangote Nigeria PLC Lagos as a case study with the objective of analysing the effect of the business environment on employee behaviour; to examine the relationship between organizations' size and employee behaviour; and to investigate the extent to which technology affects employee behaviour in organizational settings. This study used descriptive survey method while employing the use of questionnaire to obtain the required data from the respondents. A total of 786 respondents were identified in the population, while the sample size of 130 was calculated for using the Yaro Yamane formula and were administered with the questionnaire. The findings of this study shows that business environment has a positive effect on employee behaviour with a significance level of 0.03 which is less than 0.05 and R^2 value of 0.223, also that there exist a positive relationship between organizational behaviour and organizational size with a significance level of 0.04 which is also less than 0.05 and finally the study finds out that technology does have an effect on employee behaviour with a significance level of 0.06 and R^2 value of 0.222. The research concluded that the structure of an organization has a deep impact on the behaviours of employees as it build loyalty at employee level and encourage employees to work harder to advance within the company. It therefore recommends that organization needs to establish a framework of order and system of commending employees effort when work undertaken by them is accomplished successfully.

Key word: Organisational structure, organisation behaviour, business environment, organisation size, employee behaviour

INTRODUCTION

The structure of an organisation to large extent will determine the greatest and the achievement of organisational objectives. This organisational structure is tailored toward company's objective, divisions, or team's goals, and helps employees understand how they fit into the bigger picture in the pursuit of the organisation's mission and goal. Without a proper structure in place, an organization may fail to function efficiently, or even collapse. When an organisation is poorly design and lack proper structuring, this will result in chaos, confusion within roles, a lack of

coordination among functions, failure to share ideas, and slow decision-making bring managers unnecessary complexity, stress, and conflict."(Devaney, 2014).

Organizations are made up of complex relations involving people from different tribes, background, with different morals, values, ethics, beliefs, ideas, cultures and traditions. If such complex relations takes place in a completely unstructured and Incoherent manner, organizations management will not have the right amount of information needed and may not be able to function in a knowledgeable manner. This has serious disadvantages, which is a reason why in history within human societies organizational structure has been developed as a means to manage such complex relations. Organizational structure provides co-ordination of the processes in such a manner that a process or agent involved can function in a more adequate manner. The relationship shown by a given organizational structure is much more dependable than in an entirely unstructured situation (Jonker, Letia, and Treur, 2002).

Structure is the framework through which an organization accomplishes the task and responsibilities needed to attain its objectives. This may be why Donnelly and Jane (1998) stated that "structure is a means for achieving the goal established planning". Structure in the present day organization represent complex relationship, it is the need for people to organize their efforts. Later on, to attain certain objectives becomes more and more imperative. Hence organization structure defines the format of a formal system of task and reporting relationships that controls, co-ordinates and motivates employees so that they work together to achieve Organizational goals (Buchanan and Huczynski 2004). It establishes the line of authority for integrating and coordinating activities. According to Galbraith, and Nathanson (1978) organizational structure means. "The organization of work into roles such as production, financial, marketing and so on".

Organizational behaviour has to do with the behaviours of individuals and groups within an organization towards one another and toward the organization as a whole, and its effect on the organization functioning and performance. That is, it interprets people-organization relationships in terms of the whole person, group, whole organization, and whole social system. (business dictionary.com, 2016). It is the study and application of knowledge about how employees, individuals and groups act in organizations. According to Newstrom and Davis (1993) it is the systematic application of organizational behavior results at various levels of the organization to bring about planned change. It is the study of what people think, feel, and do in and around organizations.

According to math (2010), Lack of a perfect structure and bad management can lead to employee turnover. The design of an organizational structure should be studied thoroughly to ensure that there are no cracks or loose ends in the structure, if it is not, the organization has the risk of demotivating employees and having negative influence on their behavior. Stringer (2007) asserts that an organizational structure that is promoting from within will increase the strong values and norms, build loyalty and encourage employees to work harder to advance within the company which gives them the motivation they need to perform better as negative behavior can be a death sentence for any organization. He went further to say that when giving employees the right to authority they become more positive and thus give more attention to their work and enjoy working for the company, they feel more wanted and recognized by the organization and contribute more. However employees with a negative behavior can drag their department or the

organization down the drain and drain other employees' positive behavior and in turn make them negative.

Organizational *structure* is used to obtain organizational *behavior* of a desired type. According to Mullins (2005), Individuals differs and they bring their own believes and values to jobs. Thus the way structure is designed affects the way people behave within organization.

Most business organisations are faced with the problem of rapid and continuous change. This has intensified the level of competition in the business environment. These changes also bring about high levels of uncertainties that the organization would have to make structural adjustment, so as to be able to accommodate the changes. The structural variable can influence business effectiveness either negatively or positively.

Also, grouping people together in a certain way elicits or prevents certain behaviors, so knowing how each structure shapes employee behavior helps managers to choose the one that produces the best result in terms of achieving goals and objectives. But unfortunately, there is no single way of determining what type of structure to be used for profit to be realized.

Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to examine the impacts of organizational structure on organizational behaviour; however, the following are the specific objectives:

- To analyze the effect of the business environment on employee behavior,
- To examine the relationship between organization's size and employee behavior,
- To investigate the extent to which technology affects employees behavior in an organizational settings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Framework

Organizations have existed for as long as people have worked together. Archaeologists have discovered massive temples dating back to 3500 B.C. that were constructed through the organized actions of people. The fact that this impressive monuments were built suggest not only that complex organizations existed, but that the people in them cooperated reasonably well (Greiner, 1979).

Organizational structure has been defined by researchers in many different ways or perspectives. Katz and Kahn (1978) believed that structure is found in an interrelated set of events which return to complete and renew a cycle of activities. Pugh (1990) claimed that organizational structure consists of activities such as task allocation, coordination and supervision that are geared toward organizational goals.

A structure is the arrangement of the component parts of something to enhance its functioning. Organizational structure can therefore be referred to as the arrangement of the component parts of the organization to enhance productivity and profitability. In essence, structure is the architecture of business competence, leadership, talents, functional relationship and management (wolf 2002).

Stroh, Northcraft, and Neale (2002) emphasized that organizational structure represents the relationships among different roles played by units within an organization. Organizations are defined as social arrangements constructed by people who can also change them. Buchanan and Huczynski (1997). Organizations are a system of cooperative activities and their coordination requires something intangible personal that is largely a matter of personal relationship (Barnard, 1938).

Organizations are groups of people who work interdependently toward some purpose. (Stern and Barley 1996). Organizations are not buildings or other physical structures. Rather they consist of people who interact with each other to achieve a set of goals. Employees have structured patterns of interaction, meaning that they expect each other to complete certain tasks in a coordinated way- in an organized way. Organizational structure is defined as the formal system of authority relationships and tasks that control and coordinate employee actions and behavior to achieve goals in organizations (Jones, 2013). Thus structure is synonymous to a rope that employees hold and binds all employees towards unified direction and aids the identification of "Who is Who" and "What is What" of organization.

Modern Types of organizational structure

1. The functional organizational structure

A functional organizational structure is a structure that consists of activities such as coordination, supervision and task allocation. According to Jones (2007) it groups people together on basis of their common expertise and experience or because they use same resources thus expertise and use of same resources can result in high quality products at competitive prices. Plus it offers employees a chance to learn from each other and become more specialized and productive thus helping organization spend less on training and endorse development of norms, values, and group cohesiveness that promote high performance which helps in building loyalty and commitment thus contributing to organizational efficiency.

2. The divisional organization structure

The divisional structure or product structure consists of self-contained divisions. A division is a collection of functions which produce a product. It also utilizes a plan to compete and operate as a separate business or profit center. According to Zainbooks.com, divisional structure in America is seen as the second most common structure for organization today (Wikipedia.com, 2016).

A divisional structure groups employees around geographic areas, clients, or outputs (products/services). Divisional structures are sometimes called strategic business units (SBUs), because they are normally more autonomous than functional structures and may operate as subsidiaries rather than departments of the enterprise. Employees who are responsible for certain market services or types of products are placed in divisional structure in order to increase their flexibility. Examples of divisions include regional/geographical (a U.S Division and an EU division), consumer/clients type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for trucks, another for SUVS, and another for cars).

3. The matrix organization structure

The matrix structure groups employees by both function and product. This structure can combine the best of both separate structures. A matrix organization frequently uses teams of employees to accomplish work, in order to take advantage of the strengths, as well as make up

for the weaknesses, of functional and decentralized forms. An example would be a company that produces two products, "product a" and "product b". Using the matrix structure, this company would organize functions within the company as follows: "product a" sales department, "product a" customer service department, "product a" accounting, "product b" sales department, "product b" customer service department, "product b" accounting department (Wikipedia.com, 2016)

- **Weak/Functional Matrix:** A project manager with only limited authority is assigned to oversee the cross- functional aspects of the project. The functional managers maintain control over their resources and project areas.
- **Balanced/Functional Matrix:** A project manager is assigned to oversee the project. Power is shared equally between the project manager and the functional managers. It brings the best aspects of functional and projectized organizations. However, this is the most difficult system to maintain as the sharing of power is a delicate proposition (Wikipedia.com, 2016)
- **Strong/Project Matrix:** A project manager is primarily responsible for the project. Functional managers provide technical expertise and assign resources as needed (Wikipedia.com, 2016)

4. Team-Based (Lateral) Structure

Some writers call this a lateral structure because; with few organizational levels it is very flat and relies on extensive lateral communication. Others refer to it as a cluster structure because it is composed of a cluster of teams. Harley-Davidson refers to its team-based organization as a circle structure because the organization has several circles of activity with free-floating teams operating within each domain (Galbraith, 1994).

No matter what the team based structure is called or how it is drawn, it has a few features that distinguish it from other organizational forms. First, it uses self-directed work teams rather than individuals as the basic building blocks of the organization. Second, teams are typically organized around work processes, such as making a specific product or serving a specific client group. For instance Harley-Davidson has platform teams that design new products and are responsible for the life cycle of their particular line. Each platform team includes a design engineer; manufacturing lead, purchasing lead and marketing lead (Brunelli, 1999).

5. Network structure

A network structure also known as modular structure is an alliance of several organizations for the purpose of creating a product or serving a client (Baldwin and Clark, 1997). This collaborative structure usually consists of several satellite organizations bee hived around a hub or core firm. The core firm coordinates the network process and provides one or two other core competencies, such as marketing or product development.

6. Virtual

Virtual organization is defined as being closely coupled upstream with its suppliers and downstream with its customers such that where one begins and the other ends means little to those who manage the business processes within the entire organization. A special form of boundary less organization is virtual. This means while the core of the organization can be small but still the company can operate globally is a market leader in its niche. According to Anderson (2007), because of the unlimited shelf space of the Web, the cost of reaching niche goods is falling dramatically. Although none sell in huge numbers, there are so many niche products that collectively they make a significant profit, and that is what made highly innovative Amazon.com so successful (Anderson, 2007).

The Design of Organizational Structure

It is important to bear in mind that there are many variables that influence the most appropriate organization structure and system of management, including situational factors and the contingency approach. Changing patterns of work organization, the demand for greater flexibility and the multi-skilling challenge and managerial processes such as delegation and empowerment also have a major interrelationship with structure and influence decisions and structural design. Lundy and Cowling (1996) said that organizations are collections of people brought together for a purpose to achieve this purpose successfully; people need to be organized within the best possible structure. Decisions on structure are primary strategic decisions.

The Basic Considerations in the Design of Organization Structure are as follows (Nwachukwu, 2012):

(a) Divisional Work: Within the formal structure of an organization work to be divided among its members and different jobs related to each other. The division of work and the grouping together of people should, whatever possible, be organized by reference to some common characteristics which forms a logical link between the activities involved. The most commonly used basis for grouping activities is according to specialization, the use of the same set of resources, or the shared expertise of members of staff.

(b) Clarification of objectives: A clear definition of objectives is necessary in order to provide a basis for the division of work and grouping of duties into subunits. The objective for these sub-units must be related to the objectives of the organization as a whole in order that in appropriate problem of structure can established. Clearly stated and agreed objectives will provide a framework for the design of structure, and a suitable pattern of organization to achieve those objectives.

(c) Task and Element Functions: In order to produce some goods, or provide some services, there are four essential functions that the organization must perform (Nwachukwu, 2012).

- The good or service must be developed
- Something of value must be created. In the case of the business organization this might be the production or manufacture of a product; in the case of the public sector or organization the provision of a service.
- The product or services must be marked. They must be distributed or made available to those who are to use them.
- Finance is needed in order to make available the resources used in the development; creation and distribution of the products or services provided.

(d) Centralization and Decentralization: A critical decision point that arises from division of work and grouping of activities is the extent of centralization or decentralization. Most organizations necessary involve a degree of decentralization arising from such features as an increase in size, the organization, or the need to extend activities or services to remove areas.

(e) Principles of Organization: The classical writer placed emphasis on the definition of structure in terms of division of work, chain of command, span of control and reporting relationship. Attention was focused on the requirements of the formed organization and the search for a common set of principles applicable to all circumstances. Urwick (1952) originally specified eight principles of organization but revised these to ten in his letter writing.

(f) Span of Control: The span of control arise in line authority and refers to the number of subordinate who report directly to a given manager or supervisor. It does not refer to the total of subordinate operating staff, that is, those staff who report first to another person. Hence the term

span of responsibility or 'span of supervision' is sometimes considered to be more appropriate (Nwachukwu, 2012).

Organizational Behavior

Organizational behavior is concerned with' the study of the structure, functioning and performance of organization and behavior of groups and individuals within them.' Pugh (1971). Organizational behavior is the study of human behavior in organizational settings, the interface between human behavior and the organization, and the organization itself. Moorhead & Griffin, (1995). Organizational behavior is the study of what people think, feel and do in and around organizations. Organizational behavior scholars systematically study individual, team and structural characteristics that influence behavior within organizations. (Organizational behavior, 2003). Organizational behavior has been divided into two levels (Wagner and Hollenbeck, 2010). The study of Individuals in organizations (micro levels)

1. Work groups (micro level),
2. How organizations behave (macro level)

Organizational behavior theorists involved in studying not only at individual or groups as isolated entities, but also as part of an interactive social system in which the actions of one part impact the functioning of another. Organizational behavior also enhance organizational effectiveness at all levels within the organization through good understanding, predicting and influencing events on the individual, group and organizational levels (Civil service india.com, 2016). One of the most important principle in the area of organizational behavior is that organizational behavior theory and practice does not function in separation but is multidisciplinary, drawing on the insights arising not only from its own research but also the research and insights of other disciplines.

Organizational Behaviour and Organizational Structure

Organizational structure is the pattern of relationships among positions in the organization and among members of the organization. Organization structure makes possible the application of the process of management and creates a framework of order and command through which the activities of the organization can be planned, organized, directed and controlled. Structure defines task and responsibilities, work roles and relationships and channels of communication.

The factors determining an organizational structure goes a long way in affecting the behavior of employees in the organization. According to Hahn (2007) the best structure of an organization depends on its external environment. Every organizations goal is growth and making money. To do that, it is important that all employees are on board and that their behavior contribute to the company's success. Employee behavior, however can be affected by external factors outside the business. Business owners need to watch out for changes in employees that could signal trouble.

Organizational researchers have rarely considered ambient temperature a relevant contextual factor in influencing organizational behaviors and outcomes, with a few exceptions. Van de Vliert and van Yperen (1996), for instance, applied the negative affect approach to studying the relationship between national variations in ambient temperature and role overload, or employees' lack of personal resources needed to fulfill commitments, obligations, or requirements (Peterson, 1995). They discovered that in regions of warmer temperature, employees tended to report more role overload compared to regions of colder temperature,

presumably because heat induces negative affect, which in turn reduces productivity and increases role stress.

Another structural variable that affects employees' workplace behavior is the technology. According to Suttle (2011), technology also greatly influences working relationships between employees. Companies that have more updated equipment or computer software usually can expect greater production from workers. There also tends to be more cohesiveness among employees. Managers spend less time harping over details when they know employees have the proper tools. Contrarily, employees who do not have the proper technology and equipment may become agitated. They may start viewing their jobs as drudgery and start taking their frustrations out on other workers (smallbusiness.chron.com, 2016).

The size of the organization can also affect employee's behavior. The size of the organization will determine the level of centralization or decentralization-the concentration or division of decision making power and authority. Bloisi (2007) affirmed that large organization like Microsoft, Intel require decentralization and devolves authority to individuals at lower level.

According to Taylor (2005) ''organizational structure defines the quality of the relationship between employees and managers, this relationship lies at the heart of achieving both compliance to rules and an ability to work with the principles behind them''. If the relationship is good, and trust and respect high, then both sides understand the importance of each other's role.

Theoretical Framework

Many theories have been propounded by academicians, researchers and even scholars on the subject matter, "organizational structure" as well as on "organizational behavior" (myorganizationalbehaviornotes.com,2015). Some of these theories include:

Neo classical Organization Theory, Reinforcement Theory and Behavior Modification Theory

Neoclassical Organization Theory

The human relations movement evolved as a reaction to the tough, authoritarian structure of classical theory. It addressed many of the problems inherent in classical theory. The most serious objections to classical theory are that it created over conformity and rigidity, thus squelching creativity, individual growth, and motivation. Neoclassical theory displayed genuine concern for human needs.

One of the first experiments that challenged the classical view was conducted by Mayo and Roethlisberger in the late 1920's at the Western Electric plant in Hawthorne, Illinois (Mayo, 1933). While manipulating conditions in the work environment (e.g., intensity of lighting), they found that any change had a positive impact on productivity. The act of paying attention to employees in a friendly and nonthreatening way was sufficient by itself to increase output. Uris (1986) referred to this as the "wart" theory of productivity. Nearly any treatment can make a wart go away--nearly anything will improve productivity. "The implication is plain: intelligent action often delivers results" (Uris, 1986).

Reinforcement Theory

Reinforcement theory suggests that individuals can choose from several responses to a given stimulus, and that individuals will generally select the response that has been associated with positive outcomes in the past. Thorndike articulated this idea in 1911, in what has come to be known as the *law of effect*. The law of effect basically states that, all other things being equal,

responses to stimuli that are followed by satisfaction will be strengthened, but responses that are followed by discomfort will be weakened.

Reinforcement theory is the process of shaping behavior by controlling the consequences of the behavior. In reinforcement theory a combination of rewards and/or punishments is used to reinforce desired behavior or extinguish unwanted behavior. Any behavior that elicits a consequence is called *operant behavior*, because the individual operates on his or her environment. Reinforcement theory concentrates on the relationship between the operant behavior and the associated consequences, and is sometimes referred to as operant conditioning. The Theory starts to look into punishment and reward for behavior. This is what Skinner started to go into, saying that punishment was needed to make sure people stay on the right track and produce work which is of an adequate quality (bcotb.com, 2013). The main aspect of the reinforcement theory is that when behavior is reinforced, then it will be repeated and used again, but if the behavior is not reinforced, then that behavior will continue the same and not change, therefore if a behavior is currently bad, it will stay that way, unless something is done (Skinner, 1904-1990)

Behavior Modification Theory

Behavior modification is the use of empirically demonstrated behavior change techniques to increase or decrease the frequency of behaviors, such as altering an individual's behaviors and reactions to stimuli through positive and negative reinforcement of adaptive behavior and/or the reduction of behavior through its extinction, punishment and/or satiation (referenceforbusiness.com, 2016). Luthans and Kreitner orchestrated the way of altering people's behavior in business. Behavior modification first started out in treating mental patients etc. but was soon discovered to be practical in many other areas.

The first use of the term behavior modification appears to have been by Edward Thorndike in 1911. His article *Provisional Laws of Acquired Behavior or Learning* makes frequent use of the term "modifying behavior". Through early research in the 1940s and the 1950s the term was used by Joseph Wolpe's research group. The experimental tradition in clinical psychology used it to refer to psychotherapeutic techniques derived from empirical research. It has since come to refer mainly to techniques for increasing adaptive behavior through reinforcement and decreasing maladaptive behavior through extinction or punishment (with emphasis on the former). Two related terms are behavior therapy and applied behavior analysis. Emphasizing the empirical roots of behavior modification, some authors consider it to be broader in scope and to subsume the other two categories of behavior change methods. Since techniques derived from behavioral psychology tend to be the most effective in altering behavior, most practitioners consider behavior modification along with behavior therapy and applied behavior analysis to be founded in behaviorism. While behavior modification encompasses applied behavior analysis and typically uses interventions based on the same behavioral principles, many behavior modifiers who are not applied behavior analysts tend to use packages of interventions and do not conduct functional assessments before intervening.

In recent years, the concept of punishment has had many critics, though these criticisms tend not to apply to negative punishment (time-outs) and usually apply to the addition of some aversive event. The use of positive punishment by board-certified behavior analysts is restricted to extreme circumstances when all other forms of treatment have failed and when the behavior to be modified is a danger to the person or to others. In clinical settings positive punishment is usually restricted to using a spray bottle filled with water as an aversive event. When misused, more aversive punishment can lead to affective (emotional) disorders, as well as to the receiver

of the punishment increasingly trying to avoid the punishment (i.e., "not get caught") (referenceforbusiness.com, 2016).

However, this study adopted behavioral modification theory because it is believe that through reinforce a particular behaviour will either increase or decrease. This reinforcement can be through an organization structure that increases the productivity of employee.

Empirical framework

According to research conducted by Oldham and Hackman (1981) which was Published by: Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University on the topic "Relationships between Organizational Structure and Employee Reactions", there is a significant relationship found between organizational structure and both personal attributes and employee behavior and reactions, and between personal attributes and employee reactions. Data was collected from approximately 2960 employees working on 428 jobs in 36 organizations. The organizations were located in all geographic sections of the United States and in some sections of Canada. Data were collected by a number of individuals for various purposes. Approximately 75 percent of the data were collected by members of a consulting firm for use in organizational diagnoses.' The remainder of the data were collected by the authors of this paper as well as other researchers from universities and research institutes in the United States and Canada. Consultants, or their agents, and researchers administered a questionnaire to groups of 3 to 25 employees. The research concluded that there is a significant relationship found between organizational structure and employee behavior and reactions.

Ming-Chang Huang (2005). "The impact of external environment and self-serving motivation on physician's organizational behaviors". The study was aimed at determining the impacts of external environment on physician's organizational behaviors. There were 211 physicians that served as doctors in hospitals which still kept contract with Bureau of National Health Insurance in 2005 who responded to questionnaires. The empirical result shows that external environment does not have significant impacts on job satisfaction, but does have significant negative effect on organizational behaviors. The study submits that the more favorable the external environment is, the better the employees behavior

Baron (1994) carried out a thorough review of studies that examined the influences of physical work environment such as illumination, temperature, and noise on work performance and job satisfaction. In his framework, work context such as illumination and temperature influence work related outcomes mainly through changing arousal level and positive or negative affect. From this perspective, concrete physical environments were not considered an integral part of thought processes, but they influence behavior indirectly through provoking autonomic or emotional responses. The conceptual metaphor framework that focuses on how the physical work environment may directly impact social perception and cognition not only reinforces the idea that both affective and cognitive processes are important determinants of social outcomes, but also completes the picture of a more integrative framework for understanding the complex dynamics between an expansive list of physical work environments and a diverse set of organizationally relevant outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

The population of this study consist of members of staff of Dangote Nigeria PLC 2nd gate Guinness Ikeja, Lagos which comprises of both the Managers and staffs having a total population of 786. Primary source of data was employed to obtain data through the use of

structured questionnaire in a close ended format and a total of 130 copies of questionnaire were administered, this is based on sample size calculated

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e^2)}$$

Where n = sample size
N = total population=786
E = level of specification 8% = 0.08

$$\frac{786}{1+786(0.08)^2} = \frac{786}{6.0304} = 130$$

Thus the sample size is 130 respondents. This means a total of 130 copies of questionnaire were administered to members of the population under study.

Method of Data Analysis

For the purpose of data analysis of this research study both descriptive and inferential statistics were applied. While percentage and frequencies will be used for the descriptive analysis. For the frequencies of various unique features of respondents, descriptive statistics was applied and for testing the hypotheses correlation and regression analysis was employed using SPSS 17 edition.. The importance of each answer will be critically analysed to make it more meaningful.

Hypothesis One

H_{o1}: Business environment does not have any effect on employees' behavior

Table 1: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.457[a]	.223	.027	.701

a. Predictors: (Constant), ORGANIZATION OPERATES IN A GOOD ENVIRONMENT

Source: Researcher's SPSS analysis (2016)

Table 1 shows that 22.3% variation in employee behavior is explained by business environment, the remaining 77.7% variation is explained by other variables different from business environment which are not included in the model summary. The R square of 0.223 shows the weakness of the model for making predictions because it is far from 1. In the social sciences, low R squares in regression equation are not uncommon especially for a cross sectional analysis. He emphasized that a seemingly low R square does not necessarily mean that an OLS (Ordinary Least Square) regression equation is useless. It is possible that the r square is a good estimate of a ceteris paribus relationship between the dependent and independent variable (Thomson, 2011)

Table 2 Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	4.695	.519		9.043	.000

	ORGANIZATION OPERATES IN A GOOD ENVIRONMENT	-.068	.120	.457	-.565	.003

a. Dependent Variable: THE SOCIETY AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
Source: Researcher's SPSS analysis (2016)

Table 2 shows how business environment contributed to the prediction of employees' behavior. The beta is 0.457 and p-value of 0.003 lesser than 0.05% which is the critical value. This implies that business environment is accumulated to 45.7 % of employee behavior and since the p-value which is 0.003 is lesser than 0.05, this reveals that the null hypothesis is rejected and we can therefore conclude that business environment has a positive effect on employee behavior. The Coefficients value for business environment which is -0.068 also reveals that business environment does have effects on employee behavior because changes in the business environment will bring about changes in employee behavior.

Hypothesis Two

4.3.2 Ho2: There is no significant relationship between employees' behavior and organizational size.

Table 3 **Correlations**

		ORGANIZATION OPERATES IN GOOD ENVIRONMENT	EMPLOYEES BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE
ORGANIZATION OPERATES IN GOOD ENVIRONMENT	Pearson Correlation	1	.218**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.004
	N	98	98
EMPLOYEES BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE	Pearson Correlation	.218**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	
	N	98	98

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Source: Researcher's SPSS analysis (2016)

The result presented in table 3 shows the estimate of correlation analysis for hypothesis two (2) which shows the relationship between employees' behavior and organizational size. As contained in table, the correlation significance is .004 which is less than the .05 indicating that there is a significant relationship between the two variables. The correlation figure of .218 shows that there is a positive relationship between employee behavior and organizational size. The implication of the result of model 2 is that the null hypothesis stated above is rejected. There is no significant relationship between employees' behavior and organizational size is not accepted.

Hypothesis three

Ho3: Technology does not have effect on employees' behavior

Table 4 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.425[a]	.222	.018	.513

a. Predictors: (Constant), ORGANIZATION OPERATES IN A GOOD ENVIRONMENT

Source: Researcher's SPSS analysis (2016)

Table 4 shows that 22.2% variation in employee behavior is explained by business environment, the remaining 77.8% variation is explained by other variables different from business environment which are not included in the model summary. The R square of 0.222 shows the weakness of the model for making predictions because it is far from 1. In the social sciences, low R squares in regression equation are not uncommon especially for a cross sectional analysis. He emphasized that a seemingly low R square does not necessarily mean that an OLS (Ordinary Least Square) regression equation is useless. It is possible that the r square is a good estimate of a ceteris paribus relationship between the dependent and independent variable (Thomson, 2011).

Table 5

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.724	.455		8.186	.000
	ORGANIZATION OPERATES IN A GOOD ENVIRONMENT	.154	.105	.425	1.465	.006

a. Dependent Variable: TECHNOLOGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Source: Researcher's SPSS analysis (2016)

Table 5 shows how technology contributed to the prediction of Employee Behavior. The beta is 0.425 and p-value of 0.006 lesser than 0.05% which is the critical value. This implies that Technology is accumulated to 42.5 % of employee behavior and since the p-value which is 0.006 is lesser than 0.05, this reveals that the null hypothesis is rejected and we can therefore conclude that Technology has a positive impact on employee behavior. The Coefficients value for technology which is 0.154 also reveals that Technology has a positive impact on employee behavior because a unit improvement in technology will bring about a 0.154 change in employee behavior.

Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis 1 (Ho_1) tested the effect of business environment on employees behavior. From the analysis, the calculated significance of 0.003 is much lesser than a P value of 0.05 implying that if there is a good business environment, employees will be better motivated. This supports the claims that the environment of the business and changes in the society at large affects employees' behaviour. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and hence, the assertion that business environment has a positive effect on employee behavior. In the model the

value of the R^2 is 0.223. Which in the words of Thomson (2011), in the social sciences low R squares in regression equation are not uncommon especially for a cross sectional analysis. He emphasized that a seemingly low R square does not necessarily mean that an OLS (Ordinary Least Square) regression equation is useless. It is possible that the r square is a good estimate of a ceteris paribus relationship between the dependent and independent variable

Hypotheses 2 (Ho2) tested whether there is a significant relationship between employees behavior and organizational size. Many respondents confirmed that the organizational size do affect the employees behavior as many employees are scared of losing their position in a big firm. The correlation coefficient of 0.218 shows a positive relationship and the result was significant at .004 significant level and the null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

For hypothesis three, The R which is the correlation coefficient shows a significant positive relationship of 42.5% between technology and employees behavior. The R^2 of 0.222 shows that 22.2% variation in the dependent variable (employees' behavior) is caused by the independent variable (Technology). From the analysis of the hypothesis the level of significance obtained was 0.006 which as well is less than 0.05. Hence, factors such as quality methods of production, updated equipment and proper tools improves employee behavior in general. According to Thomson (2011), in the social sciences low R squares in regression equation are not uncommon especially for a cross sectional analysis. He emphasized that a seemingly low R square does not necessarily mean that an OLS (Ordinary Least Square) regression equation is useless. It is possible that the r square is a good estimate of a ceteris paribus relationship between the dependent and independent variable.

Conclusion

The environment of business in term of the available space, conduciveness and interaction between superior and subordinate have a positive effect on employees' behaviour in term of their commitment, efficiency, effectiveness and productivity.

The size of an organization has obvious implication on employees' behavior. The number of employees in each unit of an organization determines how coordinated the unit will be and employees are better able to relate and interact with each other.

Technology is required to enhance effective organizational behavior. The use of proper tools, updated equipment and quality methods of production will reduce stress level of employees, improve their behavior and increase their agility which increases production quality. This is line with the work of Mumford and Weird 1979, who states that other than directly influencing job performance, technology has the power to alter the nature of employees working condition; including work environment and interpersonal relationship and have considerable impact on job satisfaction, a predictor of work behavior.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions made, the Organization should monitor their external environment as the appropriateness of an organization depends on it so that organization can adapt to changes more quickly as well as to ensure that employees exhibit a positive desired behavior towards their work and the organization as a whole.

If organization structure is designed for the senior managers only to make decision, the credits for solution and creative problem-solving remains at the top which make the employees actually get the work done feel that the reporting structure is unfair. Therefore, managers should allow employees to participate in decision making and in formulating work regulation and standards

and also ensure that departments and individuals that need to co-ordinate their efforts have lines of communication that are built into the structure.

Companies should provide more updated equipment and computer software so that employee can have greater production and mangers can also spend less time harping over details when they know that employees have the proper tools.

REFERENCES

Arsenault T. (199)."*Return of the rich man*", Halifax chronicle herald.

Baldwin C. and Clark K. (1997). *"Managing in an age of modularity"*, Harvard business review 75 (September to October) pp84-93.

Barnard, C. I. (1968). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bettis R. & M. Hitt (1995). "*The new competitive landscape*", strategic management journal 16 pp7-19.

Carolyn T. (1994) *walking the Task; building Culture of Success,* Random House: Prentice Hall Publisher.

Christie P.M.J. & R. Levany (1998)." *Virtual corporation: recipe for success*", industrial management 40 pp7-11

Cross R (2000). "*Looking before you leap: assessing the jump to teams in knowledge-based work*", business horizons September.

Dalton, D.R., Todor, W.D., Spendolini, M.J., Fielding, G.J., and Porter, L.W.1980. *Organizational structure and performance*: A critical review.

Davenport T.H, J.G Harris & Kohli A.K. *"how do they know their customers so well"*, sloan management review 42 (winter, 2001) pp 63-75.

De vaus, D.A (2001). Research design in social research. London: SAGE.

Donaldson, L., (1995) *Contingency Theory.* History of Management

Donaldson, L., (2001), *the Contingency Theory of Organizations,* Sage, Thousand Oaks.

Egbert D. (2000) *"Label says 'Nortel', but somebody else probably made it"*, news and observer.

Ensign P.C. (1998). "*Interdependence, coordination and structure in complex organizations: implication for organization design*", Mid-Atlantic journal of business 34 pp5-22.

Fried L. (1995), managing information technology in turbulent times. New York: Wiley

Galbraith J.R. competing with flexible lateral organizations (Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1994)

Galbraith, Jay R., and Daniel A. Nathanson (1978). Strategy implementation: *The role of structure and process.* St. Paul, MN: west publishing company.

Greiner L.E. (1979) *"A Recent History of Organizational behaviour"*, in S. Kerr, ed., organizational behaviour, Columbus, pp 3-14

Grey C. & Garsten C. (2001). *"Trust, control and post bureaucracy"* sage publishing.

Heckscher C. (1994). *"The post bureaucratic organization: new perspectives on organization change"*, sage publication.

James H. Donnelly, Jane L. Gibson John (1998) *Fundamentals of Management.* BNG Publishers INC. Home Wool.

Jones, G. (2013). *Organizational Theory, Design, and Change*, (7th ed.), Pearson, Harlow, England

Jones, R. (2007). *Organizational theory, design, and change* (5th Ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Jonker, C.M., Letia, I.A., and Treur, J., (2002). *Diagnosis of the Dynamics within an Organization by Trace Checking of Behavioral Requirements.*

Knight K. (1976). "*Matrix organization: a review*", journal of management studies pp111-30.

Knol.google.com/k/organizational behavior-behavior-theoretical-frameworks 2011

Lawrence, P. R., and Lorsch, J. W. 1969. *Organization and Environment.* Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Lawrence, P., Lorsch, J. (1967). *Organization and environment,* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press

Lim, M., G. Griffiths, and S. Sambrook. (2010). *Organizational structure of the twenty-first century.*

Luthans, Fred 2005, *organizational behavior* 10th edition, McGaw-Hill

Malone T.W & Laubacher (1998). "The dawn of the E-lance economy", Harvard business review 76 pp144-52.*Management,* Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

May (1998)."*Plato on leadership*", journal of business ethics.

Mayo, E. 1933. *The Human Problems of Industrial Civilization*. New York: Macmillan.

McCauley, D.P. and Kuhnert, K.W. (1992). *A theoretical review and empirical investigation of employee trust in management*. Public Administration Quarterly, 16(2), 265-285.

Miner, J.B. (2006). *Organizational behavior*, vol.3: historical origins, theoretical foundations and the future. Armonk,NY and London : M.E. Sharpe

Newstrom, J.W., Davis, K. (1993). *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nwana .E. (1981): *Research Methodology and Statistics for Beginning Research.* Awka, Christian Printing and Publishing Ltd.

Nystrom, P. C., and Starbuck, W. H. (1984). "To avoid organizational crisis, unlearn." *Organizational Dynamics* Spring: 53-65.

Pascale, R. T. (1990). *Managing on the Edge*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Perrow, C. (1967) "*A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organizations*", American sociological review, 32(2):194-208

Perrow, C. 1979. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Pfeffer, J., and Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.

Pugh, D.; Hickson, D.; Hinings, C.; Turner, C. (1969) "*The Context of Organizational Structures*", Administrative science quarterly, 14(1):91-114

Raymond E. Miles, & Charles C. Snow, *causes of failure in network organizations*, California management review, summer 1992

Repenning, N. (2002). *A Simulation-Based Approach to understanding the Dynamics of innovation implementation*. Organization science, 13, 2:109-127.

Reuters (1999). "*Microsoft plans realignment to focus on customers*", February 1999.

Rivkin Jan W., & Sigglekow, N. (2003). Speed, search and the failure of simple contingency.

Simon H.A and Schuster 1998. *"Straight from the CEO"* pp86-93.

Simon, H. A. (1945). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Free Press.

Steven L. McShane and Maryann Von Glinow (2003). *Organizational Behavior.* Second edition

Taylor, F. W. (1917). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper.

Uris, A. 1986. *101 of the Greatest Ideas in Management.* P.225 New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wagner, J.A., and Hollenbeck, J.R. (2010). *Organizational behaviour: securing competitive.* New York: Routledge

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations*. Henderson, A. M., and Parsons, T. (trans.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolf Daniel (2002). *Execution and structure*. Retrieved from:http: //www. dewarsloan.com / working%20papers-execution%20and%20structure.htm