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ABSTRACT

The study sought to analyse the impact of organisational structure on employee performance in the Grain Marketing Board

Literature was gathered from the various schools of thought on organisational design or structure and the type of structures as well as the nature of employee performance. The literature also looked into context of the organisation, reporting relationships and previous studies into organisational structure and performance.

The study made use of 20 respondents who were representative of the sample. A case study was used. Questionnaires were administered as well as interviews and participative observation. The researcher was responsible for administering the questionnaire to all the respondents. Interviews were carried out mostly in an informal setting because the working hours were not flexible enough to accommodate unscheduled work. Data was collected and analyse and presented in the form of tables graphs and pie charts.

The study determined that the organisational structure does have an impact on the nature of employee performance and hence overall organisational performance. The structure is the major drawback in performance since employees are failing to identify with or fit into the organisation.

Adopting a shorter and more flexible structure would ease communication and reporting lines amongst other things which will eventually aid improved performance. It is also possible to implement different approaches to design in order to come up with the most effective structure. There is room for further study preferably on the impact of organisational structure on different levels of employees and departments.
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CHAPTER 1

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Behaviour is affected by patterns of organisational structure and design, technology, styles of leadership and systems of management through which organisational processes are planned, directed and controlled. The focus of attention, therefore, is on the impact of organisational structure and design and patterns of management, on the behaviour of people within the organisation. An employee being a central feature of an organisation, whether acting in isolation or as part of a group responds to these various influences or stimuli from the organisation, which functions as part of a broader external environment.

Employees in the organisation interact within the structure of the formal organisation which is created by management to establish relationships between employees, to provide order and systems and to direct the efforts of the organisation into goal seeking activities. Through the formal structure people can carry out their organisational activities in order to achieve aims and objectives.

Child (1977) defined the organisational structure as comprising, “All the tangible and regularly bearing features which helps to shape their members behaviour”. The organisational structure facilitates an interconnection of roles and relationships to ensure that effort is channelled towards achieving specific goals.

The structure of the organisation becomes the boundary within which activities or tasks are done whilst being grouped under specific criteria. The network of relationships which in turn makes up the structure is defined in the form of organisational chart

In a model by Leavitt the consisting element of structure in the organisation refers to the pattern of organisation authority and responsibility and communication. Some form of structure is needed by which people’s interactions and efforts are channelled and coordinated. Personalities are however an important part of the working of the organisation and in
practice, the actual operation of the organisation and success in meeting its objectives will depend upon the behaviour of people who work within the structure and who give shape and personality to any framework.

The case of G.M.B is quite unique in itself because the organisation has seemingly forgotten the uniqueness of these personalities to the effective operation of the organisation. It has failed to merge personalities of the employees to the division of work tasks and coordination of their activities.

The organisation has in the past years been constantly restructuring and its reasons amongst many has been to increase operational efficiency and reduce costs. Whatever decisions that the company might make and implement they always come back to impact on the employee’s performance. In the past year the organisation also did a lot of redesign of structure of the organisation and the result was quite a lot of unrest and uncertainty within the organisation. A lot of the employees were left quite unsure of their position in the new “G.M.B” and a lot more still are. There is need for large companies to constantly review their structure to ensure that it is the most appropriate form for the particular organisation, and in keeping with its growth and development.

Mullins L in his book Management and Organisational Behaviour summarizes the objectives of structure as having to provide for the following:

- The economic and efficient performance of the organisation and the level of resource utilization;
- Monitoring the activities of the organisation
- Accountability for area of work undertaken by groups and individual members of the organisation;
- Co-ordination of different parts of the organisation and different areas of work;
- Flexibility in order to respond to future demands and developments, and to adapt to changing environmental influences; and
- The social satisfaction of members working in the organisation.
He goes on to state that these objectives provide the criteria for structural effectiveness. Structure in itself is not an end but a means of improving organisational performance and gives an example of Heller who points out that:

*No amount of reorganizing and reshuffling will increase the long term capability of a business unless you suit the organisation to the people and to genuinely shared purpose*

Employees need to work in a structure that aids them to perform and carry out their tasks and activities better. A good structure determines also the quality of output that is produced whether in terms of service or goods. Mullins quotes Drucker in the correctness of design of structure which is most significant in determining organisational performance:

*Good structure does not by itself produce good performance. But a poor organisational structure makes good performance impossible, no matter how good the individual managers may be. To improve organisational structure ... will therefore always improve performance.*

He also quotes Child on the emphasis of good structure:

*The allocation or responsibilities, the grouping of functions, decision making coordination, control and reward—all these are fundamental requirements for the continuous operations of an organisation. The quality of an organisation structure will affect how well these requirements are met*

The Grain Marketing Board has been experiencing cases of low productivity and economic inefficiency for quite some time now and this has reflected negatively on its performance as a whole. Low morale is high on the organisations list as more and more employees leave the
company for greener pastures elsewhere. Desertions and resignations are high as the level of job satisfaction also diminishes.

There is increased tendency for people to carry out a task not because they enjoy performing nor do they feel in the least bit inclined or motivated to perform. Communication amongst individuals in different positions and above and below each other is not the best it can be in an otherwise normal and effective scenario. Effective communication is supposed to enhance carrying out and completion of tasks. Less and fewer individuals in different positions participate in adding communication amongst themselves and within their jobs hence a lot of communication amongst themselves and within their jobs hence a lot of confusion on work expectations, entitlements, and grievances etcetera.

Poor undertaking of allocated responsibilities is evident in operations mainly because line management tends to delegate immediately below them in the structure, individuals who will overlook their duties. In some cases these individuals already have quite a lot on their hands or are just not competent enough.

Functions are grouped ambiguously that more often than not you find that people in some positions are not quite aware how they do their tasks where there is no proper lines of communication and definition of tasks. People lack initiative because there is no clearly stated goals or activities hence no real need to achieve.

It is quite difficult to force results from employees but these results can be natured overtime. Structure should be designed to encourage willing participation of all the members within the organisation. Employee performance needs to be defined within the confines of the structure of the organisation; where there is a non functional structure of the organisation it becomes a deterrent of performance. The reason being that there are no proper way of doing things.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The research seeks to explore and bring to light the idea that the structure of the organisation has a bearing on employee performance hence overall organisational performance. If organisational structure is the major drawback in performance then how best can management correct this discrepancy.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The study will try and explain why the organisational structure is influencing nature of performance by employees in the organisation. Its intent will be to:

- Identify how best the organisational structure can determine attitudes and behaviours to encourage from the employees
- Assess the extent to which organisational structure influences performance.
- Use research findings to appropriately advise management in light of research findings.
- Assess the attitude of employees towards the organisational structure
- Establish an awareness of the impact of organisational design/structure on employee performance

1.4 Research Questions or Sub-Problems

- Does a flat organisational structure influence the nature of employee performance?
- Does a tall organisational structure influence the nature of employee performance?
- What is the impact of the organizational design on structure on employee performance?
- What relationship is there between organizational structure and performance?
- How can employees identify with the organisational structure and its components?
1.5 Statement of Hypotheses

1. A tall organisation structure will lead to poor employee performance.

2. A Flat organisation structure will lead to good employee performance.

3. Organisational structure will influence the nature of employee performance.

1.6 Significance of the study

1. For the student to prove within reasonable doubt that the structure of the organisation has an influence on employee performance and how best to go about implementing the results.

2. Research findings will be useful to management to probably redress situations resulting from inefficiencies in structure where employee performance is concerned. Ultimately employee performance welfare is paid more attention to and improved.

3. Advice management on how best to design and deal with organisational structure in relation to the nature of employee performance. Upon recommendations and consideration assist Human Resources Management to come up with measures and plans to deal with structure and performance.

1.7 Assumptions

1. G.M.B as case study is operating in a normal business environment holding all other factors constant

2. G.M.B Mash Central is representative of all other provinces comprising of the whole organisation.

3. Employee performance is being studied at positional rather than individual level.

4. All respondents are literate and knowledgeable on the subject area.

5. Information is readily available and accessible to the user.

6. Respondents are willing to participate

7. The research will be carried out during normal working hours.
1.8 Definition of terms

- 1. G.M.B - Grain Marketing Board a government owned parastatal responsible for the storage of grain and resale at a subsidised price
- 2. Employee - any person who performs work or service for another person for remuneration or reward on such terms and conditions as agreed upon by the parties or as provided for in the Labour Act, and includes a person performing work or services for another person, (Labour Act Chapter 28:01)
- Performance - level of the individual’s work achievement.
- 4. Motivation - A motive is an impulse that causes a person to act. It is an eternal process that makes a person move toward a goal, like intelligence it cannot be directly observed. Instead, motivation can only be inferred by noting a person’s behaviour, (Armstrong, 2001)
- Organisational design – is the process by which managers select and manage various dimensions and components of the organisational structure and culture so that an organisation can achieve its goals
- Organisational structure-is the formal system of task and reporting relationship that controls, coordinates, and motivates employees so that they cooperate to achieve an organisation’s goal’s
- Coordination –the integration of activities of the separate parts of an organisation to accomplish organisational goals
- Tall Structure –characterized by a narrow span of management and many hierarchical levels.
- Flat structure-characterized by a wide span of management and few hierarchical levels
- Job Satisfaction –“It is the measurement of one’s job” (Graham, 1982:68)
- Organisational Commitment-“The degree to which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals, and wishes to maintain membership in the organisation” (Robbins, 1998:142)
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 OVERVIEW

Literature Review looks into the sources available to the subject area of the research that is organisational culture with emphasis on its effect on employee performance. The purpose of the study is on finding out the role of organisational culture on employee performance the researcher will also look into the types of organisations structure and theories that explain the characteristics of organisations and management patterns. The researcher will also define performance and look into the elements of structure and other aspects of the organisation.

2.1.1 Context of the organisation

Organisations are designed with a function to perform and they are in existence because there is a need to achieve objectives and give satisfaction to all those who are part of it. Farnham and Horton in the book by Mullins J(1999) are quoted to having defined organisations as:

....social constructs created by groups in society to achieve specific purposes by means of planned and coordinated activities. These activities involve using Human Resources to act in association with other inanimate resources in order to achieve aims of the organisation (Page 88)

The organisation is characterised by three common factors in the least, and these are people structure, objectives and management. People in the organisation are there to interact for the purpose of goal achievement. Structure is needed by which people’s interactions are channelled and coordinated. A management process is required so that these activities and efforts are directed and controlled towards the pursuit of objectives.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

Performance

Bates and Holton (1995) argue that “Performance is a multidimensional construct, the measure of which varies depending on a variety of factors”
Kane (1996) argues that performance “is something that the person leaves behind and that exists apart from the purpose”

Bernadin et al (1995) are concerned that ‘Performance should be defined as the outcomes of work because they provide the strongest linkage to strategic goals of the organisation, customer satisfaction, and economic contribution.

Performance is all about doing the work as well as being about the results achieved.

Brumbach (1988) defines it as “Performance means both behaviours and results. Behaviours emanate from the performer and transform performance from abstraction to action. Not just the instruments for results, behaviours are also outcomes in their own right—the product of mental and physical effort applied to tasks and can be judged apart from results.

**Organisational Structure**

The organisational structure is the formal system of all tasks and reporting relationships that controls, coordinates and motivates employees, so that they cooperate to achieve an organisational goal. It is the way in which an organisation’s activities are coordinated and it helps provide a stable framework through which its members can work together to achieve its objectives.

Structure as defined by Child (1977) comprises ‘all the tangible and regularly occurring features which help to shape their members behaviour’. The structure of the organisation incorporates a network of roles and relationships and these are there to help in the process of ensuring that collective or joint effort is explicitly organized to achieve specific ends.

Mintzberg (1979) defines structure as the sum total of the ways in which it divides its labour into distinct tasks and then achieves coordination between them. The structure of the organisation can to a great extent be regarded as a framework or guideline on how to get things done. It consists of units, functions, divisions and formally constituted work teams into which activities related to particular processes, projects, products, markets, customers, geographical areas or professional disciplines are grouped.

Organisational structure can be viewed as the way the individuals and groups are arranged with respect to the tasks they perform. Coordinating these structural elements in the most effective manner is termed organisational design. The structure of the organisation refers to
the formal relationships between individuals and groups in relation to allocation of tasks responsibilities and authority within the organisation.

The organisational structure itself is an abstract concept however the connections between various clusters of functions of which an organisation is made up of is represented in the form of an organisational chart.

### 2.2.1 Organisational Chart

It is a useful tool for specifying how various tasks or functions are interrelated within the organisation. Depicted in the form of a diagram each box represents a specific job and the lines connecting them reflect the formally prescribed lines of communication between individuals performing those jobs. An organisational chart shows the functions, departments, or positions of the organisation and how they are related. One cannot talk about the organisation without talking about some very common terms like division of work, span of control, chain of command, departmentalization, and specialization known as the elements of structure.

### 2.2.1.1 Elements of Structure

**Division of Work**

This is the breakdown of tasks into components so that individuals are responsible for a limited set of activities instead of the task as a whole. Division of work needs to be implemented with reference to common characteristics which guide the carrying out of activities involved. Work can be divided according to the following criteria:

- Major purpose or function for instance according to specialization, use of the same resources or shared expertise.
- Product or service
- Location
- Nature of the work performed
- Common Time Scales
- Staff Employed
- Customer or people to be served

When individuals concentrate on specific tasks given to them, it results in specialisation. In theory the fewer tasks a person performs the better, giving others the opportunity to perform the tasks they are good at. However in practise where specialisation is too great, people may loose their motivation to perform.

**Decentralization**

Decentralisation is the delegation of tasks into subunits within the organisation such that they might enjoy a measure of autonomy or independence. It is the process of delegating power from a higher to a lower level within the organisation. During the 1920’s Alfred P. Sloan, Junior then the President of General Motors introduced the notion of a ‘Central Office’ the place where a few individuals made political decisions from the entire company. It also involved pushing decisions regarding the day to day operations of the company lower down the hierarchy.

**Hierarchy of Authority /Chain of Command**

The solid lines connecting individual boxes on the organisational chart represent the chain or command. It is the reporting relationship between individuals in the hierarchy, or “who reports to whom.” The organisational diagram reveals which particular lower level employees are required to report to which superior. Many levels indicate a tall structure and fewer levels mean a flatter structure. In recent years middle managers and executives who were long believed to be secure in their positions, found themselves unemployed as their companies “downsized”, “right sized”, delayered or retrenched by eliminating entire layer of organisational structure

**Span of Control**

It refers to the number of subordinates who report directly to a given manager or supervisor. Span of control arises in line authority and Classical writers such as Brech suggest that it should be limited to a reasonable number of interrelated executive or supervisory
subordinates. Various writers in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century concluded a universal maximum of six. Span of management is related to the organisational structure in two ways. Narrow spans result in \textit{tall organisational structures} with many levels between the highest and lowest managers in which the long chain of command slows down decision making. Wide spans on the other hand result in \textit{flat organisational structures}, with fewer management levels between top and bottom.

A flat organisation structure results in more effective performance because there are less people and reporting relationships are shorter. The flat organisation structure is also characterised by a wide span of control because there a fewer management levels between top and bottom. The need for improved efficiency and competitiveness, the demand for more participative management and greater involvement of staff and developments in information technology have all pointed towards this type of structure because of what it does for performance. Mullins quotes Greton’s example where he says that a flatter structure can lead to a climate of low morale, distrust of management and sometimes a deterioration in productivity hence performance. Flat structure may give rise to quite number of difficulties for instance, it might:

- Inhibits the flow of effective communications between top management and the workforce.
- reduce the opportunities for promotion, achievement or enhanced status and
- limit opportunities for the training and development of future managers

A tall organisational structure leads to narrow span of management that is the numbers of reporting relationships are longer. The tall structure is characterised by decentralised authority and high levels of delegation and for a highly motivated employee who likes to work they can perform better all their delegated tasks. There is also high degrees of functional specialisation which should make it easier for employees to perform. The tall structure is bureaucratic in nature.

\textbf{2.2.2 Formal Organisational Relationships}

They arise from the defined patterns of relationships in the organisation between individuals. These individual authority relationships may be identified as:
**Line Relationships** - authority flows vertically through the structure. There is a direct relationship between superior and subordinate, with subordinate responsible to only one person. Line relationships are associated with functional /departmental division of work and organisational control. Line managers have authority and responsibility for all matters and activities within their own department.

**Functional Relationships** - exist between people in specialist or advisory positions, and line managers and their subordinates. The specialist offers a common service throughout all departments, but has no direct authority over those who make use of the service. For example, the Human Resources Manager has no authority over staff in other departments but acts out an advisory role but can be assigned some direct executive authority for certain specified responsibilities like Health and Safety. However, specialists still have a line relationship with both their own superior and departmental subordinate staff.

**Staff Relationships** - arise from appointment of personal assistants senior members of staff. Those in staff positions act as extensions of their superior, practicing representative authority.

**Lateral Relationships** - exists between people in different departments or sections, especially on the same individual level, based on contact and consultation and are necessary to maintain co-ordination and effective organisational performance. Lateral relationships cut across the chain of command, permitting information exchange and decisions to be made where the needed information exists.
2.2.3 Ways of Structuring Organisations

Departmentalisation

Functional Structures

This type of differentiation in the organisation groups together people with similar or related activities. Division by function means a separate marketing, sale, human resources and accounting departments. This type of organisation is more popular with smaller entities with smaller production lines.

Advantages

1. Allows for easy communication among specialists since people grouped together according to similarities in their positions can easily communicate and share information with each other.

2. Quick decision since people approach problems from the same perspective make more decisions quickly and effectively than those who differ.

3. It also makes it easier for other people to learn from another’s experiences. Skills and abilities are improved thereby enhancing individual and organisational performance.

4. Facilitates performance evaluation for the supervisor because they possess high levels of skill in the particular area.

5. Allows group members to monitor each other’s performance levels and behaviour and creates teamwork.

Disadvantages

1. Servicing needs of a different range of products can pose difficulties in terms of efficiency.

2. Co-ordination may be hard where a single set of functions is used to serve different needs.

3. Servicing the needs of different regions might be a lot more difficult as an organization expands or grows.
**Divisional Structures: Product, Market, and Geographic**

A divisional structure that overlays functional groupings, allows an organisation to coordinate intergroup relationships more effectively than does a functional structure.

Product Structure- each product division contains the functions necessary to the specific function. The product structure increases division of labour to facilitate completion of a wider range of tasks.

i.) Market Structure – groups functions into divisions responding to the differences in the needs of particular types of customers.

ii.) Geographic Structure – services customers in different geographic markets in order to control its activities.

**Advantages**

1. Quality goods and products as emphasis is given on specific kind of goods, services or customer.

2. Facilitates communication improving decision making, thereby improving performance.

3. Customized management and problem solving – the geographic structure puts management at the scene of operations than are managers at central headquarters. Regional managers are well positioned to be responsive to local situations therefore they can find solutions to region-specific problems.

4. Facilitates teamwork as people pool their skills and knowledge and brainstorm new ideas for products.

5. Results in clear connection between performance and reward.

6. Employees’ close identification with their division can increase commitment, loyalty and job satisfaction.

**Disadvantages**

1. Loss of Economies of scale. Results from high operating and managing costs since each division has its own set of functions and operating costs.
2. Poor communication between divisions because of more levels of management.

**Matrix Structure**

A complex form of differentiation of the organisation. The matrix structure entails that an employee reports to two bosses for instance members of the product teams in a matrix structure have two bosses (dual authority) – a functional and a product boss. It is adopted by medium sized organisations with several product lines that do not possess sufficient resources to establish fully self contained operating units.

**Advantages**

1. Facilitates rapid product development, maximizes communication and cooperation between team members.

2. Managers with different functional expertise can cooperate to solve non-programmed decision –making problems.

3. Facilitates frequent changes of membership in product teams.

4. Employees are given the autonomy to take responsibilities for their work activities.

**Disadvantages**

1. Increase role conflict and ambiguity when two bosses make conflicting demands on an employee and the structure of reporting relationships.

2. High levels of work stress and frustration because of conflict and difficulties in demonstrating personal contributions to team performance because they move so often from one team to another.

3. Limited opportunities for promotion because most movement is lateral from team to team not vertical to upper management positions.
2.3 Theoretical Framework

The design of an organisation is bound to influence the way that the employee performs since the structure of the organisation gives guidelines on how the employee can do their job. Design of the organisation determines reporting relationship and ultimately state how to do a task where to do it and how. There are various schools of thought or approaches on the design of structure. Stoner et al (1992) views the process of organisational design as, “The determination of the organisational structure that is most appropriate for the strategy, people, technology and tasks of the organisation. Design of organisations evolved over a long period of time as individuals contributed their way of thinking to the field. Stoner goes on to emphasise the need to realise two things about organisational design and that is:

- First, because both strategies and environments change overtime, organisational design is an ongoing process.
- Second, changes in structure usually involve trial and error, accidents and accommodations to political realities rather than purely rational approaches.

The G.M.B can use models of organisational design upon which management can build their strategies for designing and implementing an effective organisational structure and maintain a higher level of performance among Board Staff and ultimately improve organisational performance. Various theories are looked into with their implications on the type of performance they produce.

2.3.1 The Classical Approach

Early writers of this management school of thought focused attention on the formal structure, technical requirements of the organisation and general sets of principles. There was an assumption of rational and logical behaviour. Bureaucracy, as a subgroup of the classical approach views the structure in terms of specialisation, hierarchy of authority, system of rules and impersonality. The classical approach disregarded the power of the environment instead they sought “one best way” - a set of principles for creating an organisational structure that would be efficient and effective in all situations. Max Weber (1864-1920), Frederick Taylor and Henri Fayol are major contributors. Weber called this type of organisation a bureaucracy. He says when fully developed such an organisation is characterised by specialisation of tasks, appointments by merit, provision of career opportunities for members, routinization of activities and a rational, impersonal structure.
The members of such an organisation are guided by a sense of duty to the organisation hence they perform better. Max Weber praised in particular its rationality establishment of rules for decision making, clear chain of command and its promotion of people on basis of ability and experience rather than favouritism or whim. He also admires bureaucracy’s clear specification of authority and responsibility which he believed made it easier to evaluate and reward performance. It most likely is regarded to be the most efficient form of organisation because it is coldly logical and because personalised relationships and non-rational emotional considerations do not get in its way.

This approach puts across that staff, in this instance at G.M.B, are subject to promotion on the basis of educational qualifications and experience on the job. They have clear reporting lines or chain of command. Staff in the Board knows who they report to and how failure which they cannot carry out their tasks or be delegated to do so. Fully developed structure means staff can practise job specialisation with appointments to higher grades or jobs available on merit and more career opportunities therefore they will perform better. However routinization and impersonality of structure can also reduce the rate of performance because employees do not feel a part of the organisation. They end up lacking the innovation and job satisfaction.

2.3.2 Neo-Classical Approach

It deals with the major shortfalls of the Classical school of thought which neglected the Human Element. Initial impetus of his point of view as provided by the Hawthorne studies productivity increased. The Hawthorne experiments grew out of famous studies conducted at the Western Electric company from 1924 to 1933 and performed mostly at its Hawthorne plant near Chicago hence the “Hawthorne Studies”. They began as an attempt to investigate the relationship between lighting, and the control groups, whose lighting remained constant throughout the experiments. Productivity increased with change in lighting even when conditions were made worse. Elton Mayo (1880-1949) et al partway through this set of experiments concluded that employees work harder if they believed management was concerned about their welfare and supervisors paid special attention to them and subsequently became known as the Hawthorne Effect. Mayo then came up with the concept of the ‘social man’ to complement the old one of a ‘rational man’. If staff at G.M.B perceive
that they are part of the organisation then their performance is likely to increase. Employees tend to reciprocate the efforts of the organisation.

Neo classicists argued that the bureaucratic structure could be improved by making it less formal and by permitting subordinates’ participation in decision making but, they did not reject the classical way of organisation. Amongst them are Douglas McGregor, Chris Argyris Herzberg and Rensis Linkert

2.3.4 Behavioural Science Approach

Argyris (1957) believed that individuals should be given the opportunity to feel that they have a high degree of control over setting their own goals and over defining the paths to these goals hence they are motivated to perform. G.M.B staff can in essence set the parameters through which they can work. An employee is more knowledgeable on how far they can go and how to get there.

Herzberg (1957) suggested that improvements in organisation design must centre on the individual job as the positive source of motivation. If individual feels that the job is stretching them; they will be moved to perform it well.

McGregor developed his theory of integration (Theory Y) which emphasises the importance of recognizing the needs of both the organisation and the individual and creating conditions that will reconcile these needs so that members of the organisation can work together for its success and share its rewards.

Linkert in his research of group performance he found that traditional authoritarian managers were less able to motivate their subordinates to high standards of achievement than managers who actively supported their subordinates’ feelings of self worth and importance. Based on these findings, Linkert created a model to describe different organisational designs and their effectiveness. He bases it on one of four systems

System 1 is the Traditional organisational structure where power and authority are distributed to the manager subordinate relationship. Managers at one level tell members at lower levels what to do and so on down the chain of command. Systems 2 and 3 are intermediate stages between the traditional structure and the ideal structure. Systems 4 is the ideal organisation.
where there is extensive group participation, supervision and decision making. To reach it he puts forward three (3) stages that an organisation must do:

1) Accept that managers and work activities should enhance individual members’ personal sense of worth and importance

2) Use group decision making where appropriate

3) Set high performance goals

2.3.5 Human Relations Approach

Bernard (1938) emphasised the importance of the informal organisation “the network of informal roles and relationships which for better or worse strongly influence the way the informal structure operates. Child (1977) has pointed out that it is misleading to talk about a clear distinction between the formal and informal organisation. Formality and informality can be designed into the structure. G.M.B staff also need the informal organisation to address the needs that might not be catered for by the formal structure.

2.3.6 Contingency Approach

This theory relates the environment and other variables to specific structures of the organisation. It takes the view that there is no one best, universal structure. There are a large number of variables or situational factors which influence organisational design and performance. The contingency approach emphasizes the need for flexibility. The design of the structure is contingent on the situations being analysed.

Lawrence and Lorsh in 1967 maintained that there is no one best way to organise as it all depends upon choosing the most suitable combination of parameters which include technological factors, external factors and behavioural aspects.

Joan Woodward in the same period studied 100 British companies classifying them according to their production technological environment. Their findings point to the fact that in designing structure there is need to consider other factors to organisation or design.
These approaches despite their criticise show that the design of organisational structure does determine employee performance like a bureaucratic structure commanding loyalty from an individual hence performance or human relations view on implementing an informal structure into the design of the formal structure for instance.

2.4 Analysis of previous research

The research is similar to all other previous some of which are mentioned above in that researchers agree that the organisational structure or design can be manipulated or structured in a way to influence results however they do not state how exactly the organisational structure impacts on performance.

Similar studies carried out by Mark, A; Abraham Y and others in the U.S.A in the year 2003 on the impact of organisational structure time-based manufacturing and plant performance they discovered that time based manufacturing does have a significant direct and positive impact on plant performance. They drew up a few definitive conclusions from their findings that is the number of layers in the hierarchy, the level of horizontal integration have significant direct and positive effect on decision making.

Layers in hierarchies amongst other things have been mentioned in other theories but the above stated study does not specifically address the question of how this affects the performance of the individual employee and not at plant level. Their studies would greatly concur with those of Joan Woodward since their focus on time based manufacturing production not being the only function affected by the structure. The interview method was used in their study because respondents at times were not able to understand the technical aspects of design and structure. Questionnaires were also used in the research.

2.5 Justification of the study

Since the studies were carried out in a plant or manufacturing setting or rather at shop floor level the researcher wants to see whether results would differ at a slightly higher level of the organisation. Provincial office is mainly made up of managers, officers and clerks amongst others who are less involved at the shop floor and obviously possess more knowledge on the structure.
Previous research findings seem to confirm that the organisational structure does have an impact on performance and have provided the basis for trying to determine whether individual performance at G.M.B Mash Central is being influenced by the structure.

2.6 Summary

This chapter’s main focus was on the investigation of the already existing literature form various authors pertaining methods and theories of organisational structure or design. The chapter has also looked into the conceptual and theoretical frameworks, previous research findings as well as the justification of the study
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter gives an outline of the research methods used in the analysis of the impact of organisational structure on employee performance amongst Board employees. It also includes an explanation of the Research design and Instruments, Procedure for data collection, analysis plans and chapter summary.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design is a master plan specifying the methods and procedures for collecting and analysing the needed information. It is a framework of the research plan of action, for the collection and analysis of data. A research design is a strategy, plan or structure for conducting a research project (Leedy 1980:96). Voig (1993) defines research design as the science (and or art) of planning procedures for conducting studies so as to get the most valid findings.

For research a specific research design in line with the type of study needs to be chosen. The researcher made use of case study which entails the detailed analysis of a single case. The case is a single element or group member within a sample or population from which the data can be collected. A case study involves particular detail and intensive analysis of a case and allows the researcher to make use of interviews and questionnaires. Robson (1993) views the case study as the gathering and organisation of all relevant materials to enable analysis and explanation of individual units. Best and Khan (1993) define a case study as involving a detailed study of a social unit as a whole. The unit may be family, group, organisation, school or community. The case study was also chosen because it enabled the researcher to gather information about the attitudes, feelings and perceptions and beliefs of G.M.B –Mash Central staff on the impact of the organisational structure on performance.

Cohen and Manion (1994) state that the social life can only be understood from the point of view of the actors themselves. The case study was used because it helps the researcher to understand the case itself and understand the effect the structure has on employee performance in Mash Central.
It can be argued that though that case study is not representative because generalisations cannot be made beyond the case currently being studied. One case cannot therefore explain to a general degree. However a case study can highlight features or attributes of social life like common patterns of behaviour.

3.2.1 Quantitative and Qualitative Research

3.2.1.1 Qualitative Research

Leedy (1993) views a methodology as the underlying principles and roles of organisation of a system or inquiry procedure. Options in research methodology include quantitative and qualitative.

Qualitative research takes the experiences of actors and their points of view, to understand meanings of behaviours and actions. The focus is on interactions and the meanings derived from actions of those studied (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). To understand the impact of organisational structure on employee performance, the feelings, attitudes and perspectives of the participants in the study were taken into account.

Determining the meaning of employee behaviour is important hence actions of respondents are not taken for granted. Method used should give the answer as to how and why things happen the way they do. People need to be studied in the exact environment which influences their behaviour.

Qualitative method looks into aspects that cannot be quantified, it probes social meanings of situations. It allows for in depth discovery of participants’ feelings, perceptions and values. Information obtained describe people and places and involves conversation.

Qualitative approach was employed because data usually provides a true picture of what is being studied hence data validity (Best and Khan, 1993). The researcher had interest in understanding views of subjects on organisational structure and their performance in Mashonaland Central-G.M.B. It gave the researcher the opportunity to probe the employees feelings emotions and perceptions.
3.2.1.2 Quantitative Research

It concerns itself with countable sets of observable facts (Best and Khan, 1993). Analysis of this type of data is quicker since it can be statistically summarised and generalised for large samples. It makes use of numbers hence cannot determine human behaviour.

In this research data that was gathered includes the age of respondents, number of people in specific departments, work experience in the organisation and the ratios of qualifications or highest educational levels attained by the employees. Use of qualitative research methodology on its therefore renders it inadequate which makes it necessary to supplement qualitative with quantitative data.

3.3 Research Instruments

3.3.1 Documentary /Secondary Data

According to best and Khan (1993) documents are information kept and taken down by actual participants or eyewitnesses of events or information transmitted from one generation to the other. Secondary sources are not actually witnessed by the researcher but are second hand information passed on through word of mouth or written documents (Best and Khan, 1993). Examples include books, journals, other case studies etcetera. This study made use of mainly questionnaires and or participative observations, interviews and secondary data.

3.3.2 Questionnaires

Best (1981) describes a questionnaire as a list of questions given to respondents so that he or she may answer in written form and return the questionnaire to the researcher. The researcher made use of both structured and open ended questions. Dooley (1990) indicates that closed or structured questions are those that normally require specific answers for instances “Yes” or “No”. Open ended questionnaires which attempt to build inferences from the patterns of responses. There were also questions that were linked to certain ideas or answers towards which attitudes or feelings, beliefs or concepts were being looked for. There were also completed by questions probing certain results without influencing ideas of respondents.
Researcher used the questionnaire method because it had the capacity for collecting large amounts of information from a large number of people. They further permit the respondents to give considered responses free from pressure generated by presence of the researcher and they are also cost effective. One questionnaire was designed for all respondents.

The researcher self-administered the questionnaire to respondents to ensure a 100% return. However, some respondents were not very willing to take part because they personally felt their contribution was not necessary whilst others were preoccupied with work to participate in research. There were also low chances of further clarification on still ambiguous questions and responses.

At times the respondents were not literate to the extent that they were not able to respond to the questionnaire on their own, hence a need for the researcher to explain. However, because of time the researcher could not always be available to explain. Some respondents in more senior positions were busy attending to other organisational business and could not take part in filling out the questionnaire.

### 3.3.3 Interview

Borg and Gall (1993) believe that an interview is a conversation between an interviewee and an interviewee, or respondent that is meant to illicit data in a face to face interaction. There are four types of interview namely structured, unstructured, informal conversation and general interviews. Even though unstructured and unstructured are the most common. The researcher managed to make more use of informal conversation and general interview. The researcher was able to avoid a scenario close to the Hawthorne effect. Information of genuine content was solicited for whilst the employee were relaxed. Responses were not conditioned to any specific criteria hence more honest response.

The researcher did all interviews personally. Enlisting the confidence of the respondents was easier when they were approached at a personal level. Quality of responses were more useful to the researcher. Questions were similar and related to questionnaires. Respondents were more willing to discuss matters pertaining to the structure of the organisation and how it affected them as employees. Interview method was employed for the less literate and those in senior posts and had no time to go through the questionnaire.
Interviews further facilitated easier communication between researcher and respondents by giving flexibility of language. Extensive answers yielding more beneficial answers not in the questionnaire.

Some respondents however were untruthful on such questions as professional qualifications or age. They were deliberately misleading because questions were a bit sensitive.

### 3.3.4 Participative Observation

Participative observation involves detailed notation of behaviours events and contexts surrounding the events and contexts surrounding the events and behaviours. Patton (1990) proposed five dimensions on variation of observation:

- Observers role vary from full participation to complete outsider
- Researcher conducted covertly (casually or hidden)
- Those being observed given full explanations, partial none or false
- Duration over an entire period
- Breadth or focus (quite broad/narrow)

The researcher made the observation over the duration of the attachment to the organisation which ran over a year and fully participated in the duties and activities from the Human Resources Department and casually conducted the observation.

This instrument benefited the researcher in that she could record information on events as they happened. Of much significance is that there was time to analyse the cause and effect of events over time as they occurred continuously over time. This helped to reaffirm data collected later through questionnaire and interviews.

However, presence of the researcher was necessary at occurrences of all events some of which the researcher could not attend. Researcher was fully attached to one department hence could not always experience events in other departments making the use of questionnaire and interviews important.
3.4 Population of the study

Population is the aggregate of all elements from which the sample is selected in a study (Leedy, 1993). Best and Khan (1999) see a population as any group of individuals that have one or more characteristics in common that are of interest to the researcher.

The target population in this study consists of all staff at Bindura Depot. However, due to the limitations imposed by financial resources and time, it was found prudent to study staff at Provincial Office and a couple others from the method. This was done to minimise time required to carry out the research.

In this case, data will be collected from the four departments at the provincial office that is Human Resources, Accounts, Loss Control and Operations Department (comprising milling and Bakery). Different views could be gained on the organisational structure and performance at different functions. Researcher did not succeed in getting equal responses from both genders because there are fewer women in the workplace and they were also less willing to take part.

3.4.1 Sample

This is a representative of the target population and picked using characteristics that can be generalised to the target population. Best and Khan (1993) define it as a small proportion of a population selected from the target population for observation and analysis.

Convenience sampling was used for the research and it involves choosing a sample based on one’s personal judgement of respondents present at that particular time. It makes use of researchers own judgement.

Simple random sampling was used because the researcher can select the sample on the basis of his or her own knowledge of the population, its elements and the nature of the study aims. Its advantage is that the researcher can select a sample whose results can be generalised to the whole population. It is however prone to bias.

Leedy (1992) argues that stratified random sampling is economical and also allows for higher representativeness leading to more accurate results. Rationally this method was used to avoid bias in the selection of respondents for the study. (Harper, 1988).
In this research, the sample comprise of respondents from all departments. The population thus had equal representation making it ideal to gain departmental perspectives on how the structure affects how they perform

**Sample Selection of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Permanent Employees/Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Reliability and Validity

Reliability is the degree of consistency that a procedure or instrument demonstrates. Validity is that quantity of data gathering instrument or procedure that enables it to measure what it is supposed to measure. For an instrument to be valid it must be accurate and precise measure of the phenomena under study.

#### 3.5.1 Reliability of Questionnaire

A pilot study was conducted to ensure reliability of the questionnaire. Questions were pre-tested to remove ambiguous questions which were not properly understood by the respondents. All such questions were restructured or rephrased so that respondents would not be influenced. Length of questions was also shortened and they were cross checked through consultation with others to ensure a certain degree of triangulation reducing the level of subjectivity.
3.5.2 Viability of the Questionnaire

Validity comes in several forms namely content validity, criterion validity, discriminate validity and internal or external validity among others. Content validity measures the correctness with which an instrument focuses on the significant aspects of its purpose. Content validity was mainly employed. Unambiguous questions were asked and questions simplified and meanings clarified.

3.5.3 Validity of Observation

Participant Observation was more valid as respondents were studied in their natural context. This helped to reduce the Hawthorne effect that would have underscored the nature of results. This instrument was less reliable as the findings were subjective and would not have been easy to replicate the results.

3.6 Pilot Study

This is a small preliminary survey conducted before the main research to check feasibility of type design implemented. It is used to test the viability and reliability of the instruments to be used. Small number of persons with similar characteristics to the target group are used. Its essence was to check on ambiguities and unclear terms and questions.

3.7 Data Analysis Procedures

Findings of data involved the use of quantitative and qualitative techniques. The questionnaires and interview responses shall be analysed through the use of tables, graphs, and pie chart. Findings shall be analysed, described, presented, interpreted and conclusions drawn.
3.8 Summary

This chapter looked into the methodology used in the process of data collection. The case study was implemented through the use of questionnaires, observations and informal interviews. The procedure...
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND FINDINGS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the data or information collected from the respondents through the use of the questionnaire, informal interviews and observations. Data is presented in the form of tables and charts with numbers linking respondents to particular response categories. Percentage will also be used to represent occurrences or frequencies over the total of respondents, multiplying the result by a hundred.

4.1 Objective of the study

The objective of the study was to try and show that the organisational structure is influencing nature of employee performance in the organisation. Through the study, its intent was to:

- Identify how best the organisational structure can determine attitudes and behaviours to encourage from the employees
- Assess the extent to which organisational structure influences performance.
- Use research findings to appropriately advise management in light of research findings.
- Assess the attitude of employees towards the organisational structure
- Establish an awareness of the impact of organisational design/structure on employee performance

In essence the research findings should answer the following questions as put forward in the first chapter of the research project:

- Does a flat organisational structure influence the nature of employee performance?
- Does a tall organisational structure influence the nature of employee performance?
- What is the impact of the organizational design/structure on employee performance?
- What relationship is there between organizational structure and performance?
- How can employees identify with the organisational structure and its components?
4.2 Responses in relation to respondent’s experience and qualification

Table 1: Respondent Qualifications and Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Qualifications</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but less than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 show that 15% of the respondents have primary level or ZJC as their highest level of academic education. While 45% of the staff has secondary educations only 5% went through tertiary education, while 35% supposedly attained professional qualifications for their job. The reviews that 60% of the staff are not adequately qualified to hold positions or posts within the organisation. This does not necessarily concur with Max Weber’s and others opinion on bureaucratic way of doing things. They state that a fully developed bureaucratic organisation is characterised by appointments by merit and promotion of people on the basis of ability and experience rather than whim or favouritism.

The structure of the G.M.B is to some extent bureaucratic since it is also characterised by specialisation of tasks, clearly defined rules and chains of command. As stated in chapter two there is also routinization of activities and provision of career opportunities. Members however are guided by quite a sense of duty to the organisation. However career opportunities give rise to staff development so that qualifications can be achieved in order to occupy better positions in future which can greatly impact on structure and performance.
In terms of work experience 90% of the staff population have been with the organisation for more than two years. The researcher also found out that some of the employees had been in the organisation for more than 20 years and either rose up to occupy lower management positions for instance depot managers. Appointments at times were not made on merit or qualifications but rather on experience. Contrasting sharply with the bureaucratic structure as stated in chapter two 5% of the staff’s working experience is less than a year and the same percentage was also met for those who had work experience of less than a year.
4.1.2 Sampled respondents By Department and Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss Control</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents work experience

- Less than 1 year
- More than 1 year but less than
- More than 2 years
- More than 5 years
Amongst the respondents 5% from the operations department only had primary level education as their highest educational level of academic education. 25% have O’ and A’ Level or Secondary level education as their highest qualification. This reviews that 30% of the employees are not adequately qualified for the work they are doing, mostly in the operations and accounting department. 20% of the employees have Diploma level qualification while 50% possess Degree level qualifications. Employee need to have adequate qualification to fill most posts. Degree of qualification can affect how well employee perform because they might in a slightly less position to understand organisational procedures and duties.

4.1.3 Age and Sex Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a greater distribution of male than female respondents. This is a typical reflection of the fact that the organisation employs more male staff than females. Less women occupy top positions in the organisation, most of them occupy secretarial posts or clerical posts while
the males occupy most of the management and decision making oriented posts. Most of the female population is less than 25 years of age and have worked for fewer years in the organisation. As illustrated in the diagram below there is more males in the 35-50 range than there are females even though it can safely be said there is an equal number in the 20-25 age range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Employee performance and the organisational structure

- Does a flat organisational structure influence the nature of employee performance?
- Does a tall organisational structure influence the nature of employee performance?

Unstructured questions were used to try and determine whether the type of organisational structure can influence the nature of employee performance. Researcher tried to determine whether a flat structure or tall structure can influence the way the respondents perform their work or job descriptions. The structure of the company can be termed tall because of the long reporting channels and other aspects characteristic of a tall structure but it is rather wide at the centre that is there is a lot of middle management. On asked whether they thought big or tall organisational structure made it difficult to perform, 13 out the total respondents, where asked if they agreed and given the option of answering Yes, No, Not Sure and To a certain degree all answered Yes, making up for 65% of the respondents. They also agreed that their work was affected by the number of people that they worked with and that the size of their
organisation did influence how well they worked. Respondents agreed that the bigger or taller the structure the less they could make a significant or recognisable difference to the organisation. There are so many people above them and respondents believe that at the end of the day they are more or less not apart of the organisation.

Only 25% of the respondents were of the opinion that a tall or big structure makes for difficulty in performance ‘To a certain degree’. They argued in an informal interview that performance is not influenced by size of the organisation but by how well top management can coordinate the activities of the organisation. Respondents mainly argued that the more organised the organisation was from the top management down to the lowest level individual the better they can work. They perform better when they feel part of the organisation and are included in how it run.

**4.2.1 What is the impact of organisational design on employee performance?**

The table below shows list of answers given by respondents when asked if they thought knowing the design of their structure or how their organisation is structured influenced the way they worked. 17 out of the respondents who made a total of 20 answered Yes giving a total percent of 85. The rest that is 15 percent disagreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to give a reason for their answer and these were varied. Security came out in one of their answers to the question were they said that they could execute their duties more freely without fear. This is directly linked to the importance of posts in the design of the organisational structure. Most respondents went on to express that the importance of their posts in the design of structure is determined by the importance given to departments they work in. They expressed that the lower in the organisation the least importance are you to the organisation. Employees associate the designation of their jobs with worth to and within the organisation. Other respondents reasoned that it gave them prestige and helped them to be self motivated hence they can work better knowing their structure. Some also placed importance of design giving them knowledge on their roles in the organisation and what can be done to empower the organisation through performing well.
4.2.2 What relationship is there between organisational structure and performance?

The following responses were given for the to determine from the employee’s perspective whether the structure and performance go hand in hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the size of your organisation structure can hinder your performance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the structure of your organisation affect the way you do your duties</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your own opinion can the structure of your organisation determine type of results</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30% of the respondents did not agree that the size organisational structure could hinder their performance or rather make them perform badly .In other words they thought the organisations completely divorced from influencing how they work and their results. The rest of the 70% of total respondents agreed that the size of the structure can impact negatively on their performance .While 10% did not agree that their performance can be hindered by structure only 5% said there were not sure of whether it did or not the rest of the respondents that is 85% thought the structure could hinder their performance. 95% of the respondents agreed that the structure of the organisation can influence results .Only 5% did not agree that the stricture can influence results.

They gave reasons for their answers ranging from reporting relationships between employees and their positions. Respondents expressed concern that the bigger the structure the more
duties are duplicated hindering progress and also that a bigger organisation requires more experienced staff and resources to produce quantifiable results. Reporting structures and duties were also given by respondents as affecting results. Others expressed the opinion that a smaller structure of their organisation would result in speedy decision making and responsiveness to the external business environment. In other words quite a strong relationship exists between the structure of the organisation and the performance that the employee will portray.

**4.2.3 How can employees identify with the organisational structure and its components?**

Respondents were asked if they thought that an employee needs to be part of the process of organisational design. Answers from respondents were that they should be a part of design because they thought they have hands on experience of the work they perform. Respondents also agreed that being a part of organisational design gave them a sense of belonging; they felt a part of the organisation. They felt that they could perform much better with an in-depth understanding of their organisation. Other respondents thought involvement in the organisational design process enabled crafting of duties and responsibilities for each posts and avoid duplication of jobs and tasks. Most respondents emphasised a sense of belonging as the most important reason for involving employees in design because it ultimately affects how they perform. The table below shows answers given by the respondents in trying to determine whether employees can identify with their organisational structure and its components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you know your organisational structure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know your position in the structure of your organisation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think it is important</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an employee do you understand how the organisation works</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
90% of the respondents agreed to know their organisational structure while 10% said they were not sure. In a follow up to determine reason for this response they cited inability of management to correctly communicate changes or reshuffles within the structure or abolitions of otherwise irrelevant posts and reassigning elsewhere. All of the respondents are however aware of their positions in the structure with a total of 65% thought their positions were important and 35% were not sure of their importance. 60% of the respondents understand how the organisation works, 15% do not understand how the organisation works and 25% are not sure they understand how the organisation works.

4.3 Conclusion

The chapter looked into data analysis and presentation. The researcher was putting forward the results gathered from the respondents through the use of questionnaires and the informal interviews and observations. The researcher made use of mainly tables to present the findings and tables and pie charts for the purpose of comparisons and analysis.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter shall outline the summary of findings; conclusions as well as recommendations made by the researcher. These will be put forward with the hope that they will aid management in aligning the structure of the organisation to best aid employee performance to the benefit of the organisation.

5.1 Summary of findings

This research was meant to assess and determine the impact of the organisational structure on employee performance. It involved the study of a case of Grain Marketing Board Mashonaland Central – Provincial Office and Bindura Depot. Other models on the design of structure were discussed and the main data collection tools were questionnaires, unstructured interviews and observations.

Data was gathered mainly through the use of the questionnaire self administered by the researcher to a convenient sample of 20 individuals from the Provincial office and Bindura depot. The findings of the study indicated that a great number of the staff at G.M.B believed that in one way or the other the organisational structure does influence their performance. The employees expressed a greater wish to be more involved in the design and implementation of structure so that jobs can be defined and actual value be assigned to certain posts and activities. Staff opted for a structure which is such that they are recognised and made to feel part of the group.

Employees also expressed the concern on the duplication of tasks and activities resulting in work becoming boring to perform and at times loosing the skills that should otherwise be capitalised on by the organisation.
There is also not enough clarification of working relationships within the structure hence staff is not adequately aware of the worth of their duties and jobs and they become more aware of the lack of recognition and alienation from the activities of the organisation as a whole.

There is little or no proper communication within the organisations structure hence in most instances employees are unaware of their positions within the structure. Employees’ realise their importance within the structure in terms of posts and positions (inputs clerk, production supervisor depot manager etc) not in terms of the individual contribution they can make towards the improvement of structural functions.

People want to be a part of the process that makes or shapes their working environment but at most times they do not have a say in the processes of designing the structure even though in most instances they have direct experience of what happens at the ground.

Communication within the structure leaves a lot to be desired as half the time employees are not aware of the changes or activities taking place within the organisation. Employees are not well informed in the company which directly questions the reporting structures and relationships within the organisation.

A tall organisational structure is difficult to manage and affects the performance of the employee. Control of mangers grows slack and alienation of employees as they feel less and less a part of the whole group .The long chains of command result cause quite a number of difficulties unlike the flat structure which is more manageable and effectively even though they are not very common in parastatals.

5.2 Conclusion

The study set out to assess the impact of organisational structure on employee performance of personnel at G.M.B. The researcher after conducting the study came to the conclusion that the hypothesis as stated in chapter one of the research project are true The basis of these conclusions came from review of the related literature by prominent and recognised individuals in the history of management and done by the researcher in the second Chapter .However the findings established and presented in chapter four indicate that the use of proper methods in the design of organisational structure can aid management in harnessing the correct performance from employees. Results from the investigation indicated more than half of the respondents indicated the need to be involved in the structuring of the organisation and also expressed dissatisfaction at not being made a part of decision making that might
affect how well they perform. The reason they fail to perform is because of too many unclear reporting lines or structures, ineffective communication channels and at times an unrewarding structure however loyal employees might be to the organisation

5.3 Recommendations

In line with the findings made in chapter four from the staff at G.M.B Mash Central that the nature of the structure is resulting in poor employee performance. It is recommended that management adopt a more flexible structure that will motivate people to perform better within the organisation. It is not only salaries, wages and benefits that motivate people to perform.

It must be noted that people need to be more involved in deciding their fate. More involvement in how their organisation should be designed will go a long way in improving performance.

Employees should not be ignorant of or unsure of their worth in an organisation but should be constantly reminded of what their jobs are about and how they contribute to the effective running of the organisation.

Particular attention should also be given to also informing employees of any changes in structure that might prove beneficial to the organisation but affect the performance of the individual. This will go a long way in retaining skilled labour, reducing the high labour turnover and ensuring the loyalty of employees.
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Appendix 1(a)

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR ALL STAFF

Agatha R. Rondoza is a student with Bindura University of Science Education and is carrying out a survey to find the impact of organisational structure on employee performance. This information is important to find whether structure does influence performance and if so how best the two variables can be used to give the best results.

Instructions

- Read through each question carefully before answering
- Please answer all questions as honestly as you can
- Where answers are provided please tick against one appropriate answer
- All other answers to questions to be completed in the spaces provided below

Please complete the following

SECTION A

1. Age of respondent  ....................
2. Gender  ....................
3. Status  ....................
4. Designation  ....................
5. Department /Section  ....................
6. a) Work Experience within the organisation
   - less than a year
   - more than a year
   - less than two years
   - more than two years
   - more than five years
7. Qualifications / highest educational level attained
   - Primary
8. Do you know your organisational structure?
   - Yes
   - No

9a) Do you know your position in the organisational structure?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure

b) Do you think it is important?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Maybe

c) Are there roles or positions within the structure that you think are unimportant or not necessary and why

…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..
…………………………………………………………………………………………..

10a) Does knowing the importance of your post cause you to work better as an employee?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

b) Why?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Is your work affected by the number of people that you work with?
12. The size of your organisation makes it difficult for you to perform” Do you agree?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure
- To a certain degree

13. Can you identify with the structure of your organisation?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

14. As an employee do you understand how your organisation works?

- Yes
- Not Enough

THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART IN THIS RESEARCH