

EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE ON PERFORMANCE OF TELECOMMUNICATION COMPANIES IN ENUGU, NIGERIA

AGU, JUSTINA CHIOMA PhD

Department of Business Administration & Management, School of Business Studies,
Institute of Management and Technology (IMT) Enugu, Nigeria

ERO, KENNETH ABDULKARIM PhD

I.E.E & Co. (Chartered Accountants & Business Consultants)
Benin City, Nigeria

OKORO JOSEPHINE CHIZOBA

Department of Business Administration & Management, School of Business Studies,
Institute of Management and Technology (IMT) Enugu, Nigeria,

CHIKE-ALIOZOR VICTORIA UGOCHI

Department of Business Administration & Management, School of Business Studies,
Institute of Management and Technology (IMT) Enugu, Nigeria

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56293/IJMSSSR.2022.4673>

IJMSSSR 2023

VOLUME 5

ISSUE 4 JULY – AUGUST

ISSN: 2582 - 0265

Abstract: Having a suitable organizational structure in place is a pre-requisite for the long term success of every business organization. Thus, the aim of this study was to investigate the effect of organizational structure on the performance of telecommunication companies in Enugu, Nigeria, with a focus on MTN Telecommunications PLC Enugu. The specific objectives however, were to; examine the effect of mechanistic structure on corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunications PLC Enugu, and also to ascertain the effect of organic structure on employees' commitment in MTN Telecommunications PLC Enugu. The population of the study was 121 main stream staff of MTN Enugu and in order to be truly representative, it was imperative to employ the entire population in conducting the study. Data were collected through questionnaire and oral interview. In the analysis, the study employed the Simple Linear Regression method using a 5% level of significance. And from the analysis, it was revealed that mechanistic structure negatively affect the performance of MTN Telecommunications PLC Enugu, and also that organic structure positively affect employees' commitment in MTN Telecommunications Enugu. Therefore, the study concluded that structure of an organization not only affect efficiency and productivity but also, morale and job satisfaction of employees' of the organization. Consequently, it was recommended that managers should adopt organizational structures that will enable them to successfully combine and maximize available resources for attainment of organizational goals.

Keywords: Organization, Performance, Structure

1. Introduction

No other topic in management has undergone as much change in the past few years as that of organizational structure. Managers are questioning and re-evaluating traditional approaches to organizing work in their search for organizational structures that can achieve efficiency but also have the flexibility necessary for success in today's dynamic environment (Robbins, 2015). This process is important and serves many purposes, hence the challenge for managers is to design an organizational structure that allows employees to work effectively and efficiently. Therefore, to this effect, when managers develop or change the structure, they are engaged in organizational design, a process that involves decisions about six key elements: work specialization, departmentalization, chain of command, span of control, centralization and decentralization, and formalization (Robbins et al., 2015).

The modern economic scenario has required companies to maintain competitiveness in the market. The search for innovation as a factor of differentiation and uncertainty may be influenced by environmental variables that may lead companies to seek a model of organizational structure that fits the environment where they are inserted (Bera-Oshita et al., 2017).

Over the years, organizational structure has attracted research attention from numerous scholars (Nazma et al., 2020). As early as the seventies, Anderson (1976), emphasized the importance of organizational structure to organizational performance, especially as it decides the extent of decisions, assignments, obligations, objectives, points of view, and awards for accomplishing outcomes (Shirazi et al., 2019).

1.2 Problem Statement

Ideally, organizational structure should be shaped and implemented for the primary purpose of facilitating the achievement of organizational goals in an efficient and effective manner. Indeed, having a suitable organizational structure in place is a pre-requisite for long-term success. Nonetheless, every organizational structure does not automatically contribute positively to company's performance. This is usually because some managers go into the design and redesign of their organizational structure to fit into changes occasioned by the dynamic of the work environment. This breeds hardship on structural and communication network of the organization. Consequently, it restricts individual growth, self-fulfillment and psychological health of the workforce thereby leading to problems such as boredom, alienation, job dissatisfaction, increase absenteeism, increase labor turnover and finally low productivity. All these are issues capable of hampering the achievement of the short and long term goals of the organization and hence need to be swiftly addressed and dealt with accordingly.

1.3 Research Objectives

In relation to the problem stated above, this study seek to investigate the effect of organizational structure on the performance of telecommunication companies in Enugu, Nigeria, with a focus on MTN Telecommunications PLC. Specifically, the study addresses the;

- i. Effect of mechanistic structure on corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunications PLC Enugu, Nigeria.
- ii. Effect of organic structure on employees' commitment in MTN Telecommunications PLC Enugu, Nigeria.

1.4 Research Questions

- i. What is the effect of mechanistic structure on corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunication Company in Enugu State, Nigeria?
- ii. What is the effect of Organic Structure on employees' commitment of MTN Telecommunication Company in Enugu State, Nigeria?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

- i. Mechanistic structure affect corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunication Company in Enugu State, Nigeria.
- ii. Organic Structure affect employees' commitment of MTN Telecommunication Company in Enugu State, Nigeria?

2. Conceptual Review

2.1 Organizational Structure

Organization structure can be defined simply as the totality of the ways in which labor is divided into distinct tasks in an organization, and then coordination and integration is achieved among those tasks (Madukoma et al., 2021). It is the map of relationships that lets the firm orchestrate specialized experts and provides the basic foundation

within which an organization function (Mohammed & Saleh, 2013). Organizational structure institutionalizes how people interact with each other, how communication flows, and how power relationships are defined. It reflects the value based choices made by the company. It refers to how job tasks are formally divided, grouped, and coordinated and can provide the link between social and psychological subsystems (Madukoma et al., 2021).

According to McNamera, (2020), organizational structure is a system that determines how tasks are formally structured and coordinated within a group that is intentionally organized to accomplish a common goal. In a related version, Robbins et al. (2014) in their definition of organizational structure, described it as a system that determines how job tasks are formally divided, grouped and coordinated within an organization. Thus, each department or division within an organization directly contributes to the overall organizational performance, thus the need to critically analyze each department's performance in order to determine what impact it has on the overall organizational performance. The business objective is to have an organization in which all departments are in line with the organization's main objectives (Madukoma et al., 2021).

Organization structure can be classified into two types formal and informal. Formal structure directs employees to do things in specific manner, obey orders from designated individuals and cooperate with other. Formal organizations systems do coordinated and controlled activities embedded in complex networks of technical relations and boundary-spanning exchanges. But in modern societies formal structures arise in highly institutionalized contexts (Tasnim, 2018). Accordingly, a typical organizational structure has a clear division of labour, horizontal and vertical differentiation and span of control. The CEO has all authority and important decisions are made by him. The organization has well defined goals and authority, responsibility and accountability of individuals which are well defined (Tasnim, 2018).

In his study, Shields (2016) identified two main organizational structures. These are a mechanistic structure and an organic structure. The mechanistic structure is said to be more formalized with high specialization and high administrative intensity while the organic structure is said to be less formalized. It is thus evident that all organizational structures may experience challenges based on the circumstances around the organization at a given point in time. Since most organizational structures are fixed processes, the process to change them is very lengthy and this process cannot be adapted to all changes within the organization, especially temporal or short-term changes. Therefore, there is need for an organization to ensure that its organizational structure is always effective.

2.2 Mechanistic Organizational Design

In the mechanization approach of management, the working system (structure, process, relations, and outcome) is designed as a machine. One of the reasons behind the development of this approach was to ensure that the individual will behave in a way that advances the organizational goals and objectives rather than their own. Mechanization includes the presence of unity in commands, a clear scalar chain, a well-defined span of regulations (plan, organize, and control), and structured authorities and responsibilities in the form of organizational chart. In addition to that, stability of tenure of the personnel is dependent on the productivity and on how the employee is following the predetermined job description (Alsaman et al., 2022).

However, this approach has been described as bureaucratic, and this could create difficulty for an organization to adapt to the environmental changes. In addition, it has been found that certain aspects of this management approach can have dehumanizing effects upon employees, especially those at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy (Alsaman et al., 2022).

Mechanic organizational structures are efficient, rigid, predictable, and standardized. Specifically, mechanistic organizations are characterized by a rigid hierarchy; high levels of formalization; a heavy reliance on rules, policies, and procedures; vertical specialization; centralized decision making; downward communication flows; and narrowly defined tasks. The mechanistic structure of organizations in terms of complexity has few training opportunities for their employees and less job specialty within the organization (Madukoma et al, 2021)

Mechanistic organizational structures have many stages, low absence of focus, vertical correspondence, high authority rules, and small control region (Clement & Puranam, 2018). This method works very well in conditions where there is a straightforward task to be performed in a stable environment by compliant professionals, when

one wishes to produce the same product over time and when precision is at a premium.

Furthermore, this form of structure is referred to as an organization with an open system thinking approach of management. It is a method of self-leadership in which individuals effectively participate in the movement of an organization with their own strengths. This leads to a decentralized structure of the organization and eventually to faster decision-making, lower overhead, and leaders who are more in touch with their followers. It is important to understand both approaches, as different styles of management may need to be applied in different tasks within the same organization (Alsaman et al., 2022).

2.3 Organic Organizational Design

The term organic and mechanistic describes both culture and organizational structure. An organization or department is said to have an organic organizational structure if therein, employees' decisions, ideas are respected, they have the freedom to utilize their ideas in their projects and innovation and creativity are encouraged (Tasnim, 2018). In the late eras, because of natural variations and emotional mechanical progress, the organizational structure has adjusted from mechanistic to organic (Shirazi et al., 2019).

Nevertheless, Organic organizational structures are flexible, adaptable, and team directed. In particular, organic organizational structures are characterized by weak or multiple hierarchies; low levels of formalization; loose rules, policies, and procedures; horizontal specialization; decentralized decision making; communication flows in all directions; and fluidity of tasks adaptable to changing conditions (Madukoma et al., 2021). Thus, the organic form is seen as being one where individual responsibilities in an organization keep on changing and are frequently redefined with time portraying low levels of formalization. In this structure, communication, control and power are in the form of a network configuration as an authority and decision making is spread throughout the organization thus depicting low centralization. Organic organizational structures are based on interpersonal transactions; they mostly rely on interpersonal factors such as face-to-face communication (Rober & Olive, 2013).

Thus where the environment is not stable, and where immediate actions and reactions are needed, machines are usually not expected to work well. In these cases, flexibility to adapt to situations is of higher importance. Such flexibility requires more satisfied workers arranged in a more even level of authority, with special concentration on their motivation. This necessitates the organic approach of organizational management (Alsaman et al., 2022).

2.4 Organizational structure and Environment

An organization does not exist all alone instead it operates within an external environment. It is part of a larger system with other elements which mutually influence each other. For instance, Apple as an organization is into the business which includes PCs and laptop, tablets, smart phones, music devices and other gadgets. The environment in which Apple operates is highly unstable with the emerging technologies and fierce competition. The elements of changes in the environment are low cost substitute products, intense competition, ease of entrance of competitors into the market and new emerging technologies. The elements of stability are the brand name, quality standards maintained, the constantly innovating culture, the culture of secrecy which gives a complete advantage over other manufacturers in the same industry (Tasnim, 2018). Organizations experiencing fast changes with a turbulent environment are effective when they have more flat and organic structures. This provides flexibility for changes with organizational environment. The flat commanding structure enabled an organization to shift its gears and grab opportunities quickly. For example, Apple has changed its product pricing just 48 hours before launch to the market. The flat structure has enabled Apple to implement the changes spontaneously and maintain constant "course of correction". This shows Apple's structure has a by and large good fit with the external environment (Tasnim, 2018).

2.5 Organizational structure and Technology

Technology is the combination of skills, knowledge, abilities, techniques, machines, people use which convert raw materials and new ideas into valuable goods and services. Charles Perrow in his typology framework used task analysability (extent to which an exception is encountered) and task variability (extent to which search is required) to classify four types of technologies used in organization: routine, craft, engineering and non-routine research

technology (Tasnim, 2018).

Since modern technology and industry are directly affecting cultural and social behavior, people’s dependency on each other is eventually increased. This leads directly and indirectly to the formation of today’s different organizational shapes (Alsalman et al., 2022). An organization’s structure is strongly influenced by the central technology the organization uses. A technology might be selected not because of its innate superiority, but because it meets the need of the power holders within that organizations. In order to be successful, an organization needs to match its organizational structures and processes to the technologies it employs.

2.6 Mechanistic Organizational Structure and Performance

In today’s variable working environment, organizational structure occupy a central place in the management of organizations. Organizational structures are considered as important components of organizations due to their significance on the effectiveness of operations and performing of goals (Armstrong & Rasheed, 2013). Thus, Mechanistic structure in relation to organizational performance, profit from high formalization, particularly in the allocation of resources, centralization in decision-making, excessive division of labour leads to limitation and weakness in fulfilling personnel’s opinions and beliefs and also hindered development of psychological empowerment. Mechanistic organization are often rigid and resist change, making them unsuitable for innovativeness and quick action. These forms have the downside of inhibiting entrepreneurial action and discouraging the use of individual initiative on part of employees. Nevertheless, the main advantage of a mechanistic structure is its efficiency. Mechanistic structures can also be advantageous when a company is new.

2.7 Organic Organizational Structure and Performance

Most organizational administrators understand that change is a consistent occurrence that must be overseen appropriately for organizational sustainability (Thurshika & Andrew, 2016). In today’s era, organizations are adopting organic structure, and organic structure represents change, and employees JS and JP. The essential and central objective of each organization is employees’ JS and JP, existence, and development. Research proved that there is a significant connection between OS and JS, also between OS and JP (Thurshika & Andrew, 2016). In other words, in organic structures open communication, empowerment and delegation of authority exists which creates the path for innovation and results in higher performance of organization. Organizations operating in highly dynamic environment often need to settle for organic structure due to the fact that it has lesser degree of formalization. It is note - worthy to state that high level of formalization is extremely negative as it reduces the flexibility of the system which is necessary to process information. And also, the excessive level of formalization in the organization usually create hindrance in identifying and perceiving the problem especially when level of uncertainty and ambiguity increases in the business environment.

Table2. 1 Features and Conditions of the Mechanistic and Organic Structures

Narrow positions	Position contents widely defined
Many rules and procedures	With few rules and procedures
Clear responsibilities	Ambiguous Responsibilities
Hierarchy	
Goals and rewards systems	Subjective Systems of rewards
Objective criteria	
	Subjective selection Systems selection
Official and impersonal	Personal and Informal
Mechanistic	
Tasks and goals known	Organic
	Tasks and targets slots
Divisible tasks	
	Tasks indivisible
Performance by objective measures	Performance by subjective measures

Responsive and monetary rewards Employees motivated by complex needs employees

Authority accepted as lawful

Authority challenged

Source: Bera-Oshita et al., 2017

2.2 Research Theory

This study is based on contingency theory of organizational structure. According to the contingency theory the organization is seen as an open system, varying according to the environment, the technology and strategy; pointed by relativity, to the extent that nothing can be regarded as absolute within companies (Bera – Oshita et al., 2017).

In other words, the contingency theory implies that there is no ideal structure suitable for all situations; that the most effective organizational structural design is where the structure fits its framework and structural contingencies. In other words, the contingency theory assumes that the structure of the organization involves environment, people, technologies and administrative techniques for achieving the objectives of the company, which must comply with the contingent factors and the environment in which it is inserted. Being that, by the evolution of technology companies must be innovative from an organic structure (Bera – Oshita et al., 2017).

Thus, the Contingency approach to organizational management, attempts to examine the linkages between the environment and the organization and also seek to find the patterns of organizational structure- such as formalization and administrative intensity that are typically associated, or have the best 'fit', with contextual factors such as size and technological uncertainty. According to this theory an organization in fit enjoys higher performance, which generates surplus resources and leads to expansion such as growth in size geographic extension, innovation, or diversification. This increases the level of the contingency variables, such as size leading to a misfit with the existing structure. The misfit lowers performance, eventually leading to a performance crisis and adaptive structural change into fit- that is from mechanistic to organic structures in response to technological and market change in the environment (Richard, 2012).

The contingency theory opposes Administration's classical school, which defend the existence of a single structure that could be used by various organizations and would be efficient for all (Silva et al., 2014). Hence, the contingency approach is based on the fact that there is no better way to administer, everything depends on the environment in question, and the leadership must worry about how to achieve goals effectively with "good" adjustments to the environment and the organization, and that different approaches and different types and species of organizations might be required in different types of organizations and environment (Bera – Oshita et al., 2017).

2.3 Empirical Review

Mishra & Maharana (2019) empirically investigated the effects of dimensions of organizational structure on innovation in business school libraries in India. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data for this study. Survey research design was used questionnaire was used as instrument of data collection. A total number of twenty copies of questionnaire were distributed among the librarians of all leading libraries in India. The quantitative data were analyzed to test the hypothesis. The dimensions of organizational structure i.e., vertical complexity, employee participation and organizational complexity are positively related to innovation and have higher OS influence in innovation among business school libraries. On the other hand, increase in formalization, the degree of centralization and strict adherence to pre-defined roles and rigid rules in the organization are negatively related to innovation.

Mon (2019) conducted research on the effect of organizational structure on company performance in manufacturing industry. This research was to investigate the effect of complexity, formalization, nature of hierarchical and technology on company performance in Indonesia. A total of three hundred and eighty copies of questionnaire was filled and returned by respondents. Data was collected using a questionnaire, in order to measure how much influence the organizational structure has on the firm performance. Data was processed using

the SPSS program. The results of the analysis show that the organizational structure for complexity and nature of hierarchical variables has a positive but not significant effect while formalization and technology have a positive and significant effect on firm performance. Furthermore, adjusted R square obtained at 59.1% is influenced by the four variables the other 40.9% is the contribution of other variables not included in this study.

Nene & Pillay (2019) investigated the impact of organizational structure on organizational performance. This study examined the impact of organizational structure on the organizational performance of the Property Administration Services Department (PAS) within an organization located at the Rosherville Industrial Area in Johannesburg South, South Africa. The study intended to give a practical perspective on the impact of a complex organizational structure on elements of personnel job satisfaction and departmental performance. Survey research design was used and a total of two hundred and fifty copies of questionnaire was filled and returned by respondents. The research instrument was designed to establish the elements that influence the composition of the organizational structure. Data analysis was done through descriptive and inferential statistics. The conclusion showed the inference between these elements and the actual aim of this study. The study did not directly compare the analysis of performance and organizational structure influence on it but rather aimed at establishing the general consensus by the participants on the likelihood of them accepting suggestions and recommendations of the study.

Nitzl et al. (2020) investigated the influence of the organizational structure, environment, and resource provision on the use of accrual accounting in municipalities. Postal survey was used. The survey was sent to the public financial managers of all German cities and counties with more than 20,000 inhabitants. In addition, questionnaire was pretested by both practitioners and scholars. After minor adjustments of the items based on their feedback, the questionnaire was sent to 1006 municipalities. The final survey was conducted in autumn 2016. Two hundred and fifty five copies of the questionnaire were received, yielding a response rate of 25.3%. The research found that the most relevant driver for a more sophisticated use of accrual accounting is the contextual situation in which the municipality is embedded. In the research model, a municipality's contextual situation consists of fiscal stress, its political competition and culture, and the relevant legal system. Another important factor is the adequate provision of resources, such as an IT system that delivers easily accessible and accurate accounting information. Organizational structure of the municipality was found to be highly bureaucratic and is regarded as the main obstruction to organizational reforms.

Shirazi et al. (2019) concluded from their research that organic structures enhance performance measurements. Al Shobaki et al., (2018) identified the performance of the managerial staff. They concluded from this study that employees should participate in making decisions as it enhances their performance. Alipoor, et al., (2017) showed that OS (basic viewpoints) has a critical negative impact on workers' JP. Moreover, in the presence of mechanistic OS workers' job performance reduces.

3. Methodology

The population of the study was one hundred and twenty one (121) staff of MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu state, Nigeria. However, some categories of staff such as securities, cleaners, and drivers were excluded due to the fact that they could not make meaningful contributions to the study. Besides, due to the size of the population the researchers decided to employ the whole population. Based on the aforementioned there was no need for sample size determination. The primary data were collected through questionnaire administration supported with personal interview while secondary data were sourced from journals, textbooks and the internet. The questionnaire was well designed and structured. One hundred and twenty one copies of questionnaire were administered. All the copies were duly completed and returned. The data collected from the field were presented and analyzed with descriptive statistic while the corresponding hypotheses were tested with Simple Linear Regression at 0.05 alpha level with the aid of computer through the application of Statistical Package for Social Science.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion of Findings

The data obtained from the field were presented and analyzed with descriptive statistics to provide answers for the research questions while the corresponding hypotheses were tested with Simple Linear Regression at 0.05 alpha

level.

Table 4.1:

	Questionnaire items	S. Agree/ Agree	Disagree/ S.Disagree	Undecided	Total
1	Mechanistic structure hinders creativity and innovation and adversely affect goal attainment	113 (93%)	2 (2%)	6 (5%)	121
2	Mechanistic organizations are often rigid and resist change, thereby discouraging innovativeness	118 (97%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	121
3	Mechanistic structure limit individual autonomy and self-determination, which lead to lower levels of intrinsic motivation and performance	108 (89%)	6 (5%)	7 (6%)	121
	Grand Total	339 (93%)	9 (2.5%)	13 (4.5%)	363

Three (3) questions were designed in the questionnaire to examine the effect of mechanistic structure on corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State, Nigeria. The result of the analysis based on the cumulative response as shown in table 4.1 reveals an expected response frequency of 363. The observed response rate of strongly agree/ agree of 330(93%), 9(2.5%) of disagree/strongly disagree and 13(4.5%) rate of undecided. This implied that 93% of the participants agree that mechanistic structure affect corporate goal attainment 2.5% disagree while 4.5% indifferent.

Table 4. 2: Organic Structure and Employees Commitment

	Questionnaire items	S. Agree/ Agree	Disagree/ S.Disagree	Undecided	Total
1	Organic structures encourages participative decision making which affect commitment?	103 85%	7 6%	11 9%	121
2	Organic structure affects not only the productivity and efficiency of the organization but also the morale and job satisfaction of the workforce due to lesser degree of formalization?	112 92%	2 2%	7 6%	121
3	Organic structures enable open communication, empowerment and delegation of authority exists which creates the path for innovation and results in higher performance?	115 95%	3 2.5%	3 2.5%	121
	Grand Total	330 (91%)	12 (3%)	21 (6%)	363

Three (3) questions were designed in the questionnaire to examine the organic structure on employees' commitment in MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State. The result of the analysis based on the cumulative response as shown in table 4.2 reveals an expected response frequency of 363. The observed response rate of strongly agree/ agree of 330(91%), 12(3%) of disagree/strongly disagree and 21(6%) rate of undecided. This implied that 91% of the participants agree that organic structure affects employees' commitment 3% disagree while 8% were indifferent.

4.2 Test of Hypotheses

The results from the tests of the various hypotheses are presented below.

Test of Hypothesis one

H₀: Mechanistic structure does not affect corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State.

H₁: Mechanistic structure affects corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State.

In testing this hypothesis, data presented in table 4.1 were tested using Simple Linear Regression. The result of the regression analysis of effect of mechanistic structure on corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State, are shown thus:

Table 4.3a: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	-.816	-.805	.658	.3671	1.877

- a. Predictors: (constant), Mechanistic structure
- b. Dependent Variable: Corporate goal attainment

Table 4.3b: ANOVA^b

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	89.216	1	68.516	63.117	0.001 ^a
Residua	75.681	18	2.131		
Total	164.897	19			

- a. Predictors: (constant), Mechanistic structure
- b. Dependent Variable: Corporate goal attainment

Table 4.3c: Coefficient^c

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		P
1(Constant) mechanistic structure	5.342	10.175		6.312	0.061
	-.491	2.312	-.816	6.282	0.061

- a. Dependent Variable: Corporate goal attainment

Table 4.3a and 4.3b shows the analysis of variance of the fitted regression equation significant with F value of 63.117, this is an indication that the variation explained is not due to chance. Since the p-value (0.061) is greater than 0.05, it shows no statistically significant negative effect between the variables at 95 percent confidence level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant effect is accepted. Thus, mechanistic structure has a significant negative effect on corporate goal attainment in MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State. The R² statistic in table 4.3a indicates that the model as fitted explains -80.5 percent of the total variability in corporate goal attainment. In other words, -80.5 percent of the total variability in corporate goal attainment can be explained by mechanistic structure. The value of R² -0.805 shows that firm’s mechanistic structure is not good predictor of corporate goal attainment. The standardized coefficient (Beta) value of -0.816 in Table 3c reveals that the independent variable is not statistically significant at 0.05 significant level. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted and the alternative hypothesis rejected. Thus we conclude that mechanistic structure negatively affects corporate goal attainment in MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State.

Test of Hypothesis Two

H₀: Organic structure does not affect employees’ commitment in MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State.

H₁: Organic structure affect employees’ commitment in MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State.

The result of the regression analysis of effect of organic structure on employees’ commitment in MTN Telecommunication PLC in Enugu State, are shown thus:

Table 4.4a: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.677 ^a	.634	.512	.2671	1.607

- c. Predictors: (constant), Organic structure
- d. Dependent Variable: Employees’ commitment

Table 4.4b: ANOVA^b

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	19.216	1	8.516	13.017	0.001 ^a
Residua	15.618	14	2.131		
Total	34.897	15			

- c. Predictors: (constant), Organic structure
- d. Dependent Variable: Employees’ commitment

Table 4.4c: Coefficient^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1(Constant)	4.342	11.175		4.424	0.001
mechanistic structure	.391	3.312	.677	4.282	0.001

- b. Dependent Variable: Employees’ commitment

Table 4.4a and 4.4b shows the analysis of variance of the fitted regression equation is significant with F value of 13.017, this is an indication that the variation explained is not due to chance. Since the p-value (0.001) is greater than 0.05, it show no statistically significant negative effect between the variables at 95 percent confidence level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant effect is accepted. Thus, organic structure has a significant negative effect on employees’ commitment in selected MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu. The R² statistic in table 4.4a indicates that the model as fitted explains 63.4 percent of the total variability in employees’ commitment. In other words, 63.4 percent of the total variability in employees’ commitment can be explained by organic structure. The value of R² -0.634 shows that organic structure is a good predictor that induces employees’ commitment. The standardized coefficient (Beta) value of 0.677 in Table 4.4c reveals that the independent variable is statistically significant at 0.05 significant level. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Thus we conclude that organic structure positively affects employees’ commitment in MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study found that:

- i. Mechanistic structure negatively affected corporate goal attainment of MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State, Nigeria ($r = -0.816$; $t = 6.312$; $F = 63.177$; $p = 0.061 > 0.05$).
- ii. Organic structure positively affected employees' commitment MTN Telecommunication PLC Enugu State, Nigeria ($r = -0.816$; $t = 6.312$; $F = 63.177$; $p = 0.061 > 0.05$).

5.2 Conclusion

Deducing from the analysis, this study concludes that the structure of an organization affects not only the productivity and efficiency of the organization but also the morale and job satisfaction of the workforce. Furthermore, poor organizational structure restricts individual growth, self-fulfillment and psychological health of the workforce which results to frustrations and conflict in the organization and thus, hindering organizational growth.

5.3 Recommendations

Consequent on the above conclusion, this study thus recommend that in as much as there is no particular structure suitable for all situations, managers should however design organizational structure that will enable them to successfully integrate and maximize available resources within the internal and external environment of the organization, as this is of paramount necessity for attainment of organizational and societal goals.

REFERENCES

1. Al Shobaki, M. J., Abu-Naser, S. S., El Talla, S. A., & Abu Amuna, Y. M. (2018). Performance Reality of Administrative Staff in Palestinian Universities, *International Journal of Academic Information Systems Research*, 2(4), 1-17.
2. Alipoor, H., Ahmadi, K., Pouya, S. Ahmad, K., & Mowlaie, S. (2017). The effect of organizational structure on employees' job performance in private hospitals of Ahvaz. *Journal of Ecophysiology and Occupational Health*, 17 (3 & 4), 119-123.
3. Alsaman, W. T., Alharbi, S.M., Almutairi, N. S., Almuzaini, M. B., Albattah, A. H. (2022) Organizational Structure Models in Dental Services: Cross-Sectional Study and Review. *Saudi Journal of Health System Research*, 2: 146-155
4. Armstrong, O.E., & Rasheed, A. (2013). Structural Dimensions and Functions of Structure Influencing Agribusiness Enterprises: Mechanistic Vs Organic Systems Approach, *Journal of Business and Management*, 6 (6), 1-63.
5. Bera-Oshita, M. G., Pavao, J. A., Borges, I. M. (2017) Analysis of the organizational structure of enterprises of technological basis with projects without incubators. *International journal of innovation*, 5(2), 214-221
6. Clement, J., &Puranam, P. (2018). Searching for structure: Formal organization design as a guide to network evolution. *Management Science*, 64(8), 3469-3480.
7. Madukoma, E., Soyemi, O., Godwin, L.S. (2021). Influence of Mechanic and Organic Organizational Structure on E-Library Service Delivery in University Libraries in South-South, Nigeria. *Inter. J. Acad. Lib. Info. Sci.* 9(4): 165-171
8. Mishra, C., & Maharana, B. (2019). The effects of dimensions of organizational structure on innovation in business school libraries in India: An empirical study. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 56(4), 216-221.
9. Mohammed, F., & Saleh, F, (2013). Surveying the impact of organization structure on employees' job satisfaction of agricultural bank in Ardebil province. *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research*, 2(3), 76-80
10. Mon, M. D. (2019). Effect of organizational structure on company performance in manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 3(5), 265-270.

11. Nazma, B. (2020) Relationship of organizational structure with job satisfaction and task performance of teaching faculty at universities in Punjab. *Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online*, 19 (6), 3659 - 3669
12. Nene, S. W., & Pillay, A. S. (2019). An investigation of the impact of organizational structure on organizational performance. *Financial Risk and Management Reviews*, 5(1), 10-24.
13. Nitzl, C., Hilgers, D., Hirsch, B., & Lindermüller, D. (2020). The influence of the organizational structure, environment, and resource provision on the use of accrual accounting in municipalities. *Schmalenbach Business Review*
14. Robbins, S. P., Cenzo, D. A. D., & Coulter, M. (2015) Organizational Structure and Design: in *Fundamentals of Management, Management Myths Debunked* (106). London: Pearsons Higher Ed.
15. Rober, W. and Olive, M. (2013). The effect of formal organizational structures on inter-organizational networks: A study on OEMs in the forest technology industry of Northern Sweden. Master thesis of Umeå School of Business and Economics
16. Shields, J., (2016). Organizational structure in managing employee performance and rewards: Concepts, practices, strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
17. Shirazi, S. A., Rezazadeh, J., & Kordestani, G. (2019). The Role of Organizational Structure in Designing Performance Measurement Systems. *Environmental Energy and Economic Research*, 3(1), 61-74.
18. Silva, M. Z., Scarpin, J. E., Rocha, W., & Domenico, D. (2014). Fatores contingenciais que contribuem para a decisão de modificação do sistema de custeio: estudo de caso em uma indústria moageira. *Revista de Administração*, 49(2), 267-279.
19. Tasnim, M. (2018) an organizational analysis on Apple. *European journal of business and management*, 10 (11), 35 - 40
20. Thurshika, S., & Andrew, A. (2016). The influence of organization structure for change on employee performance. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning*, 2(5), 258-269.