TEST Engineering & Management

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

# Internal Environment and Entrepreneurial-Venture Performance of Large Scale Enterprises (LSES) in Enugu, Nigeria

Happiness Ozioma OBI-ANIKE,
Department of Management, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus

Chikodili Nkiruka OKAFOR,
Department of Management, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus

Bamidele S. ADELEKE,
Department of Marketing, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso

***Article Info***
***Volume 82***
***Page Number: 1675 - 1684***
***Publication Issue:***
***January-February 2020***

***Abstract***

The influence of internal environment to the success and overall effectiveness of entrepreneurial organizations cannot be over-emphasized. In this paper, the study investigated the effect of internal environment on organizational performances of large scale firms in Nigeria. The work determines the impact of organizational structure on workers performance; and examines how organizational culture impact on organizational performance of large scale entrepreneurial businesses. To achieve the spelt objectives, the study utilized survey design; and data was collected though a self-administered questionnaire from a number of 275 respondents who were staff of three large scale entrepreneurial firms in Enugu, Nigeria. Statistical technique software SPSS was employed to aid the data analysis. Having analyzed the data, the study found out that: flat and tall structure affect the productivity of large scale firms. It was also discovered that organistic structure builds effective organization position. The work among other things, recommends that firms should try to motivate and sustain their workforce, because they are the indispensable assets that promote organization growth. It was also admonished that organizations should ensure that their good culture is maintained, and preserved in order onto their new employees, so that the norms, value and artifacts of the organization that can be uphold

***Article History***
***Article Received:*** *14 March 2019*
***Revised:*** *27 May 2019*
***Accepted:*** *16 October 2019*
***Publication:*** *07 January 2020*

***Keywords:*** *Organization Structure, Organizational Culture, Internal Dynamics, Large Scale Enterprises.*

## INTRODUCTION

An organization is a social set up, which has a boundary that separates it from its environment, pursues its own collective goals, and controls its own performance (Hicks and Gullet, 1975). In a formal organization, interactions are rationally coordinated and directed through time on a continuous basis. Organizations can be perceived as a system composed of interrelated subsystems (Flurke and Litwin, 1992). Thus, the impact of any factor in an organization such as structure, resources, culture, etc. should not he considered dependent of others, no matter they exist under internal environment. The internal environment of a firm is rapidly emerging as a primary model of competitive advantage that is explicitly focused on organizational effectiveness (Eisenhardt and Martin. 2000); and as a strategic tool of the highest order in terms of firm management (Lopez, 2005). Wu (2005) has states that for firms facing a rapidly changing environment, the strengthening of their dynamic capabilities is a key concern. These dynamic capabilities have been defined as the firm's ability to

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

innovatively reconfigure its resources (Wu. 2005). In which resource is a component of internal environment, which the manager should turn into competitive edge in order to achieve organizational performance.

Internal environment is a prominent factor in determining the growth and development of an organization. Nevertheless, there is no precise definition, nor a rigid methodology in measuring the enormity of internals environment. Different scholars interpret and define internal environment in different ways. According Lee (2004) internal environment deals with the management of resources like human resources, physical resources, technology, monetary resources and others that constitute the organization in order to implement or execute a strategy. When competing with other firms, the strategy needs to the in place which essentially deals with the internal environment. The estimation for the right amount of internal resources in the internal environment is needed to go ahead and take up a project or else the project may result in undesired consequences (Spreitier. 1996). Internal environment also includes culture and other intangible aspects like teamwork, coordination, efficiency level of employees, employee's salaries and monitoring costs. The strategy of competition should also be in sync with the internal resources especially the internal environment.

Consequentially' managers of organizations must identify those factors that make up their internal environment in order to achieve the objectives and goal of the organization (Rarne. 1991). On the other hand, internal environment include organizational culture, Organizational structure and organizational resource. The resource-based view of the firm suggests that resources that are valuable, rare, unique and inimitable should lead to competitive advantage (Connor and Prahalad, 1996). Volberda (1997) has emphasizes two challenges for firms to solve when manager went to achieve utmost organizational performance in the organisation. The first is organizational design and the second is the management challenge.

According to Keyes (2005) organizational performance as the process the measurement of information to effective a positive change in organizational culture, system, and process by helping to set agreed upon performance goals allocating and prioritizing resources informing the manager either confirm or change current policy or programme directions to meet those goals and sharing result of performance in pursuing those goals. De waal (2000) indicates that cases and literatures reveal organizations that use good performance management processes, achieve better performance both financially or non-financial than counterpart that are not as measurement focused. Thus structure performance management system produce better result.

The internal environment of every organization is the engine room, that determine how effective organization can achieve it predetermine purpose. But if the manager of an organization manages it internal environment well, which consist of organizational culture, organization structure and organizational resources, there will be increase in productivity, satisfaction among employees, organizational commitment, good organizational climate and effective communication among employees and management. But if abnormality exists in the internal environment, there bound to be decline in productivity, sales and profits, conflicts of interest among employees and management and bridge of communication, which will result to organization inability to achieve its primary purpose. Thus, this study seeks to investigate the influence of internal environment on organizational performance among large scale entrepreneurial ventures in Enugu metropolis, Nigeria The specific objectives of the study are to determine the impact of organizational structure on workers performance of large scale enterprises; and to examine how organizational culture impact on organizational performance of large scale enterprises.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### 2.1 Dimensions of Internal Environments: Organization Structure and Organization Culture

Organization environment refers to the totality of forces and conditions that operate within and beyond the organizational boundaries. In the views of Wheelen and Hunger (2010), it is classified into three-societal, task (industry) and internal environment. The societal

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

and task environment are often referred to as external environment. The external environment offers to the firm's threats and opportunities and they are usually outside the control of the organization. The internal environment is usually within the control of the organization and is made up of the following: organizational structure, organizational culture etc

Organizations form the most efficient and rational social groupings in society; therefore, modern society is dependent upon organizations. Organizations exist as social tools in that they coordinate human actions. While combining personnel, resources, and materials, the organization is able to evaluate its performance and adjust accordingly in order to be successful in reaching its goals (Etzioni, 1964). Hatch (1997: 161) argues "structure refers to the relationships among the parts of an organized whole". In regards to organization theory, social structure specifically refers to relationships among people, positions, and organizational units, such as departments and divisions, to which they belong. The basic elements of organizational structure, first outlined by sociologist Max Weber, are hierarchy of authority, division of labour, and rules and procedures.

In an extensive overview of **organizational structure** and its many component parts, Robbins (1990) discusses ways many of those parts are related to one another and therefore affect organizational structure. He maintained that organization structure defines task allocation, reporting relationships, and formal coordination mechanisms in an organization. An organization's structure includes the three components of complexity, formalization, and centralization. Structural complexity refers to the extent to which there is differentiation, or a division of labour, in an organization. A complex structure has a greater need for communication across many departments horizontally or between many levels vertically. The more complex an organization is, the greater the need for effective communication, coordination, and control (Robbins, 1990).

The level of formalization dictates the degree to which rules and procedures guide organizational behaviour. There exists a link between complexity and formalization. It has been found that, due to the skill of specialists in highly complex organizations, high complexity generally sets the tone for low formalization. A formalized structure includes many rules and procedures that dictate how organizational activities are to be carried out; therefore. Formalization generally tends to reduce the amount of communication in an organization due to the discouragement of innovation (Hatch, 1997). Centralization determines where the decision-making authority in the organization lies. Highly centralized decision-making leads the senior executive(s) to make judgments. In organizations that are less centralized, decision-making authority trickles down to lower levels. Highly complex organizations are generally more decentralized while organizations lower in job specialization require a central locus of control. Decentralized organizations require more communication and employee involvement (Robbins, 1990).

Structure encompasses three other dimensions that are present in an organization. Organizations may be mechanistic, organic, or bureaucratic, depending on their levels of complexity, centralization, and formalization. A mechanistic organization harbours a highly complex, formalized, and centralized environment where tasks are greatly specialized, workers receive little discretion through the presence of strict procedures, and decisions are made at the highest level of the organization. Organic environments, the opposite of mechanistic organizations, involve low complexity where jobs are generalized, informal settings give employees discretion in completing their tasks, and decentralized structures give employees power to make decisions. A bureaucracy, however, incorporates high levels of complexity and formalization while retaining decentralization. The bureaucratic organization is governed very closely by a set of rules and procedures, but employees at different levels are granted the ability to make decisions according to those rules.

Organizational structure can be viewed as the way responsibility and power are allocated inside the organization and work procedures are carried out by organizational members (BIau, 1970; Dewar and Werbel, 1979; Germain, 1996; GerwinandKolodny, 1992; Ruekert, Walker andRoering, 1985; Walton, 1985). For Thompson (1965), organizational structure is the organization's internal pattern of relationships,

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

authority, and communication. Similarly, Goldhaber et al. (1984) define organizational structure as "the network of relationships and roles existing throughout the organization.

Brown and Moberg (1980) argue that organisational structures are 'the prescribed patterns of work-related behaviour that are deliberately established for the accomplishment of organisational goals'. In their view, organisational structure is one of the most important factors in determining the success or failure for an organisation to achieve its goals. Of critical importance to note is that, as much as Brown and Moberg realize the impact of changes in organization's political and administrative hierarchy, organizations' structures are regarded as key to ensuring their success.

On the same note, Khandwala (1977) argues that organisational structures have super-structures and infrastructures. Super-structure refers to the way an organisation is departmentalized — how its personnel are grouped into departments, divisions or sections. He argues that the superstructure of an organisation tells us at a glance how the organisation is geared to meet its tasks, and it represents the top management's administrative strategy.

The presentation of organizational structures therefore needs to be as clear as possible and as reflective as possible of the organizational strategy. For example, if the organisation deals mostly with poverty alleviation issues, then its local economic development or community development department should be large and linked to positions with the required power and influence to make things happen in terms of this function.

Robbins (2000) postulates that culture, as a concept, had a long and chequered history. In the last decade, it has been used by some organizational researchers and managers to indicate the climate and practices that organizations develop around their handling of people or to refer to the espoused values and credo of an organization. Schein (1999:200) defines culture as a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. Mullins (1999) defines **organizational culture** as the collection of traditions, values, beliefs, policies, and attitudes that constitute a pervasive context for everything one does and thinks in an organization. Aswathappa (2003) refers to culture as a complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and other capabilities and habits acquired by man in a society.

Collins and Porras (2000) state that organizational culture refers to a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguish one organization from other organizations. They believe that these shared meanings are a set of key characteristics, and that the organization values and the essence of an organization's culture can be captured in seven primary characteristics. These characteristics are:

- Innovation and risk - taking. The degree to which employees are encouraged to be innovative and take risks;
- Attention to detail. The degree to which employees are expected to exhibit precision analysis and attention to detail;
- Outcome orientation. The degree to which management focuses on results or outcomes rather than on the techniques and processes used to achieve those outcomes;
- People orientation. The degree to which management decisions take into consideration the effect of outcomes on people within the organization;
- Team orientation. The degree to which work activities are organized around teams rather than individuals;
- Aggressiveness. The degree to which people are aggressive and competitive rather than easygoing; and
- Stability. The degree to which organizational activities emphasize maintaining the status quo in contrast to growth.

## 2.2. Theoretical Framework

This work anchored on *Person-Environment Fit Theory***.** The theory states that everyone has a work environment with which they are most compatible. The idea of PE is grounded in Kurt Lewin's maxim Bf(P,E), or, in words, behavior is a function of person

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

and environment. Characteristics on the person side of the equation include interests, preferences, KSAs (knowledge, skills and abilities), personality traits, values, and goals. The environmental factors may include such things as vocational norms, demands of the job, job characteristics, and organizational culture and values. The basic rationale of the theory is simple: if you work in an optimally compatible environment, all sorts of good things happen such as improved work attitude, performance, and less stress (Grimsley, 2013).

Organizations and their members have a fundamental stake in how well characteristics of the person and the environment of the organization fit one another. Organizations wish to select persons who will best meet the demands of the job, adapt to training and changes in job demands, and remain loyal and committed to the organization. Prospective employees want to find organizations which make use of their particular abilities and meet their specific needs. Achieving these goals in a systematic manner requires taxonomy of characteristics of actual and potential organizational members and of the organizational environment and its tasks (Kahana, E., Liang, J., & Felton, B. J. (1980). Job analysis is intended to help achieve this goal, but there is no clear method for choosing among the various methods of doing so (cf. Hakel, 1986). The issue is likely to remain challenge, and this paper does not pursue the topic of taxonomy excepting a very broad manner. What this paper does attempt is a description of a conceptual framework which might be used in conjunction with such taxonomy. The framework, person-environment (PE) fit theory, is proposed as a method for understanding the process of adjustment between organizational members and their work environments.

The theory described here was initially proposed by French et al. (1948). It has several properties which may be of theoretical and empirical value in understanding adjustment in organizations. One property is the operational need for assessing characteristics of the person and of the environment along commensurate dimensions. This property makes it possible to define goodness of firm as the discrepancy between objective and subjective fit. A second property is the importance of distinguishing between objective and subjective measures of fit and its components. This property makes it possible to define accuracy of perception as a discrepancy between objective and subjective fit. A third property is the distinction between fit defined in terms of abilities-environmental demands and needs environmental supplies, the value of which is detailed below.

## METHODOLOGY

This study adopted descriptive survey. The choice for survey research design was because it is valuable for assessing opinions, perception and trends for a given phenomenon. The target population of the study includes the management and non management staff of three randomly selected large scale firms in Enugu Urban, Nigeria. These firms were: Innoson Technical and industrial, Juhel Nig Ltd Enugu and Hardis & Dromedas, Emene. These entrepreneurial firms' were purposively selected because they have sizeable workforce. The population of staff of these firms was 1152. Sample size of 297 was drawn using Trek statistics formula. Convenience sampling technique was adopted to select the respondents from the population. The rationale for this is that respondents at the organizations are often too busy to be contacted. The instrument for data collection used in this research was a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire has two parts. All the questions in part A provides general information about the respondents while the remaining questions in part B address the research questions. Five-point Likert scale format was used. There were 7 questions in the questionnaire. The organizational processes were observed in the various companies by the researcher

## DATA AND RESULTS

The presentation and interpretation of data were based on questionnaire administrated to the staff of the selected companies in Enugu state Nigeria. A total two hundred and ninety—seven (297) copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the respondents. A total of two hundred seventy-five (275) copies were returned while twenty two copies (22) were not returned.

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684

**Table 1: Distribution and Return of the Questionnaire**

| Firms | No. distributed | % | No. returned | % | No Not returned | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Innoson | 132 | 44 | 122 | 41 | 19 | 3 |
| Juhel | 110 | 37 | 103 | 35 | 7 | 2 |
| Hardies | 55 | 19 | 50 | 17 | 5 | 2 |
| Total | 297 | 100 | 275 | 93 | 22 | 7 |

**Source**: Researcher Field Survey, 2019

**Table 2: Biographical Data of the Respondents**

| Biography Info | Options | Freq | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | Male | 148 | 53.7% |
| | Female | 127 | 46.2% |
| | **Total** | **275** | **100%** |
| **Managerial Position** | Top Level | 24 | 8.7% |
| | Middle Level | 86 | 31.3% |
| | Lower Level | 165 | 60.0% |
| | **Total** | **275** | **100%** |
| **Departments** | Human Resources | 23 | 8.3% |
| | Marketing | 125 | 45.5% |
| | Finance/Admin. | 48 | 17.5% |
| | Production/Operations | 57 | 20.7% |
| | Others | 22 | 8.0% |
| | **Total** | **275** | **100%** |

**Source**: Researcher Field Survey, 2019

The biographical information shown above revealed that many of the respondents of the selected three firms were male (54%). Also, majority of the respondents in the organizations were of middle and low level managerial positions (91.3%) which definitely give the work more meaningful responses since the issues relating to internal environments affect these management cadres most. Finally, our respondents come mostly from marketing (45.5%) and production (20.7%) departments.

Research Objective one: What impact would organizational structure have on workers performance?

**Table 3: Respondents Responses to the Question One**

| S/N | Question Items | SA (5) No. (%) | A (4) No. (%) | U(3) No. (%) | D(2) No. (%) | SD(1) No. (%) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Flat Organization structure will affect firm productivity | 96(34.9%) | 73(26.5%) | 16(5.8%) | 45(16.4%) | 45(16.4%) | **275** |
| 2. | Tall Organizational Structure influence firm effectiveness | 104(37.8%) | 76(27.6%) | 7(2.5%) | 48(17.5%) | 40(14.6%) | **275** |
| 3. | Organistic structure will impact on the firms' decision making process | 94(34.2%) | 82(29.8%) | 12(4.4%) | 47(17.1%) | 40(14.5%) | **275** |
| 4. | Mechanistic Structure affects employee morale and commitment in any firm | 111(40.4%) | 78(28.4%) | 6(2.2%) | 40(14.5%) | 40(14.5%) | **275** |

**Source**: Researcher Field Survey, 2019

TEST Engineering & Management

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

Research Objective Two: The extent to which organizational culture impact on organizational performance?

**Table 4: Respondents Responses to the Question Two**

| S/N | Question Items | SA (5) No. (%) | A (4) No. (%) | U(3) No. (%) | D(2) No. (%) | SD(1) No. (%) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Bureaucratic culture stimulates employee effectiveness in workplace | 53(19.3%) | 49(17.8%) | 16(5.8%) | 57(20.7%) | 100(36.4%) | **275** |
| 2. | Clan Culture builds teamwork that enhances firms' performance | 102(37.1%) | 91(33.1%) | 4(1.5%) | 38(13.7%) | 40(14.5%) | **275** |
| 3. | Entrepreneurial culture develops firm overall innovative ability | 101(36.7%) | 51(18.5%) | 9(3.3%) | 34(12.4%) | 80(29.1%) | **275** |

**Source**: Researcher Field Survey, 2019.

Two hypotheses were formulated and are tested as follow using z-test.

*$HO_1$: Organizational structure to a greater extent does not impact on workers performance*

*$HA_1$: Organizational structure to a greater extent impact on workers performance*

**Table 5a: One-Sample Statistics**

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decisions on Structure and Org. Performance | 275 | 39.6000 | 19.84103 | 3.96821 |

**Table 5b: One-Sample Test**

| | Test Value = 0 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | Z | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Decisions on Structure and Org. Performance | 9.979 | 274 | .000 | 39.60000 | 31.4100 | 47.7900 |

Source: SPSS analysis of field data 2019

Having analyzed the data from the questionnaire using one-sample z-test to examines if organizational structure to a greater extent impact on workers performance, the Tables 5a&b revealed that the z-test result shows the existence of significant result on the variables ($z = 9.979 >$ at $p < 0.05$). The significant level was found to be 0.00, and due to this we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate one which states that organizational structure to a greater extent impact on workers performance

*$HO_2$: Organizational culture negatively impact on organizational performance*

*$HA_2$: Organizational culture positively impact on organizational performance*

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

**Table 6a: One-Sample Statistics**

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Decisions on Culture and Org. Performance | 275 | 22.2000 | 11.11233 | 4.12131 |

**Table 6b: One-Sample Test**

| | Test Value = 0 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | Z | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Decisions on Culture and Org. Performance | 7.221 | 274 | .001 | 22.2000 | 29.3200 | 46.8100 |

**Source: SPSS analysis of field data 2019**

Having analyzed the data from the questionnaire using one-sample z-test to examines the impact of organizational culture on organizational performance, the Tables 6a&b revealed that the z-test result shows the existence of significant result on the variables (z = 7.221 > at p< 0.05). The significant level was found to be 0.001, and due to this we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate one which states that organizational culture positively impact on organizational performance.

## CONCLUSION

This study on the influence of internal environment on organizational performance" was undertaken to establish the relevance of the internal environment on organizational performance in selected large scale firms in Nigeria. A lot of studies have been carried out on the role organizational environment plays, and it is a known fact that it does. However, the place of the internal environment in organizational performance needs to be determined, and particularly in local firms in Nigeria. To this end, this study focused on the activities of lnnoson Nigeria Ltd. Juhel and Hardis and Dromedas all in Enugu States. Their activities that border around organizational structure, organizational culture and non-human resources practices were observed and studied. The activities make up the internal environment of any organization.

To this end, this study concludes that internal environment is the life wire of every organization. There is no gainsaying this, as the constituents of internal environment are relevant to workers' and organizational productivity. In particular terms, culture promotes a code of conduct. A strong culture in an organization explicitly communicates modes of behaviour so that people are conscious that certain behaviours are expected and others would never be visible. Organizational structures are the prescribed patterns of work-related behaviour that are deliberately established for the accomplishment of organizational goals.

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that;

1. Nigerian entrepreneurial firms should ensure that their organogram is highly effective so that there will be a clear definition of duties and authority, as well as free flow of information.
2. Large Scale Firms should try to motivate and sustain their workforce, because they are the

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

indispensable assets that promote organization growth.

3. Organizations' should ensure that their good culture is maintained, and preserved in order onto their new employees, so that the norms, value and artifacts of such firms can be uphold. Further, the firms should continuously provide, maintain non-human resources so that the optimal organizational goals can be achieve.

## REFERENCES

[1] Achrol, R. S. (1997), "Changes in the theory of interorganizational relations in marketing: Toward a network paradigm", Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 25(1): 56-72.

[2] Agarwal, N. (2014), "The Functional Theory of Resources: A Dynamic Concept", http://environment. knoj i .com/the-functional-theory-of-resources-a-dynamic-concept!

[3] Agbaeze, K. (2004), Fundamentals of Research Methods, Enugu: Optimal International Ltd.

[4] Aiharbi, M.A. and Alyahya, M.S. (2013), "Impact of Organisational Culture on Employee Performance", International Review of Management and Business Research, 2(1):168- 175

[5] Aswathappa, K. (2003). Organizational Behaviour. Bangalore: Publishing House.

[6] Barney, G. (1991), The Organization of Industry, Irwin: Homewood.

[7] Baron, C. 1. (2003), The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge: Harvard University Press

[8] Barterl, A. N. (2004), "Human Resource Management and Organsiational Performance: Evidence from Retail Banking", Industrial and Labour Relations Review, 57 (2): 181- 203

[9] Bennis, W. (1966) Changing Organisations, New York: McGraw-Hill

[10] Blau, P.M. (1970). "Decentralization in bureaucracies", In M. N. Zald (Ed.), Power in organizations. Nashville, TN: Vanderbuilt University Press

[11] Briner, R.B. (1996), "The neglect and importance of emotion at work", EurJ Work Organizational Psychol 8: 3 23-346.

[12] Brown, T .D. and Eisenhardt, S, J. (1998), "The romance of human resource management and business performance, and the case for big science", Human Relations, 58:429-462.

[13] Burke, H. T. and Litwin, E (1966), Economic Development and Cultural Change, USA: The University of Chicago Press.

[14] Burnes, M.E. (2003), "Changing an Organisation's Culture: Correlates of Success and Failure", Leadership and Organisation Development Journal, 5: 49-55.

[15] Channon, D. (1971), "Strategy and Structure of British Enterprise", Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Harvard University. Cambridge, MA

[16] Coch, L., and French, J. R. P., Jr. (1948), "Overcoming resistance to change", Human Relations, 4: 5 12-533

[17] Collin, J., and Harras. R. (2003), Business Research: A practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students ('2nd ed), London: Palgrave Macmillan

[18] Connor, H. and Prahalad, A. (1994), "The Structure of Unstructured Decision Process", Administrative Science Quarterly, 21(3): 246-275.

[19] Dammen, K.J. (2001). "The Effects of Organisational structure on Employee trust and Job Satisfaction", An Unpublished MSc Research Paper presented to The Graduate College. University of Wisconsin-Stout.

[20] Davidow, W. H., and Malone, M. S. (1992), The virtual corporation, New York, NY: Harper Collins.

[21] Dawes, R.V. (1994), "The theory of work adjustment as convergent theory", In Savikas, M.L. & Lent, R.W. (Eds) Convergence in Career Development Theories: Implications for Science and Practice, Palo Alto: CPP Books, pp. 33-43.

[22] Dawes, R.V. and Lofquist. L.H. (1984), A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

[23] De wal, D. J. (2001). "Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. Strategic Management Journal, 18 (7): 509-533.

[24] Dewar, R.. &Werbel, J. (1979). "Universalistic and contingency predictions of employee

*January - February 2020*
*ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 1675 - 1684*

satisfaction and conflict", Administrative Science Quarterly, 24: 426-448

[25] Eisenhardt, R. E. and Martin, C. (2000), "Business Performance and Dimensions of Strategic Orientation", Journal of Business Research, 56: 163-176

[26] Etzioni, A. (1964), Modern organizations, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

[27] Fayol. H. (1914), General and Industrial Management, London: Pitman Publishing

[28] Finernan, S. (1993), Emotion in Organizations. London: Sage.

[29] Gingrich, P. (1999). Functionalism & parsons. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology and Social Studies, University of Regina, Regina, Canada. Retrieved from http://uregina.cal—gingrich/n2f99.htm

[30] Goidhaber, G.M., Dennis, H.S., Richetto, G.M.. and Wiio, O.A. (1984), Information Strategies: New pathways to management productivity, New York: Ablex.

[31] Greenberg, J., and Baron, R.A. (2003), Behaviour in Organisations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work (8th ed), Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education, Inc.

[32] Grimsley, S. (2013), "Person-Environment Fit: Theory, Model & Quiz". http://educationportal.com/academy/lesson/person-environment-fit-theory -model-quiz.html#lesson

[33] Gulick, L. (1937), "Notes on the theory of organization", Institute of Administration: 3: 35-41.

[34] Hailey, V.H.. Farndale, E. and Truss, C. (2006), "The HR Department's Role in Organizational Performance", Human Resource Management Journal, 15 (3): 49 — 66.

[35] Hak, D. (2007), "Stark and Finke or Durkheim on Conversion and (Re-) Affiliation: An Outline of a Structural Functionalist Rebuttal to Stark and Finke." Social Compass. 54(2):295-3 12.