

## Organizational Structure and Academic Staff Performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University

SALMANULFARISI ABDULRAHAMAN  
Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano, Nigeria

**Abstract.** The objective of the study is to examine the relationship between organizational structure and academic staff performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano. The study employed descriptive research design using researcher made device. The instrument was tested using face validity, and to check the internal consistence test and retest method was employed. The study chooses a sample size of 111 respondents using Slovene's formula from a total population of 154 academic staff in the university. Similarly, proportionate-stratified sampling strategy was use to give employees from each unit chance of participation in the study. To achieve the study objective Pearson Linear Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis was use. The study finding indicated that, nature of hierarchal layer and organizational boundary significantly influences academic staff performance. The result further shows that nature of formalization is not significantly correlated with employee performance. The research recommends that the University should encourage hierarchal layer as a means of influencing employees' performance.

**Keywords:** Organizational Structure, Employees Performance, Nature of Hierarchy, Job Satisfaction

### 1. Introduction

The essence of any organization is to achieve goals and these goals / objectives set by organizations are determined by the level of

employees' commitment and performance towards their jobs. Organizational structure is considered as anatomy of the organization providing skeletal frame, which defines functions and relationships among the organizational members on how organizational goals could be attained. Okafor, Agboeze and Obi (2017) argued that a good organizational structure does not only increase organizational performance but it has positive and significant influence on employees' performances in every system. Most successful organizations despite multiple branches, proved to be a good example of companies that achieves an unspeakable success via a well-coordinated organizational structure (Lunenburg, 2012). The structure further establishes mutual trust between the management, employees and external environment.

Costigan, Ilter and Berman (1998) further explained that organizational structure requires management to place trust in the workers to finish the tasks they are assigned. Similarly, a good organizational structure enables employees to surface their ideas and feelings use as resources to allow them work together. Jordan (1999) opines that without trust, people have a tendency to keep to themselves, rather than share their thoughts, which inhibits creativity.

The Nigerian University structure system (public, private, conventional and specialized) consist of interrelated and interdependent elements, which have influence on one another, meaning that a well define structure will make

tasks to become easy and increases employees performance. Organizational structure in Nigeria University has been the guiding format on task accomplishment and achieving prosperity when properly managed this will lead to quality and performance among students and employees. However, the structure according to Oyebade (2016) varies from one university to another (public, private, conventional and nonconventional) hence considered multidimensional with bureaucratic/nature of hierarchy, collegial political, anarchical and cybernetic structures. This gives both employees and students' sense of directions as various activities such as task allocation; supervision and coordination are well defined.

The effect of organizational structure on employees' performance is a significant issue that has generated opinions in Nigerian university system. Previous studies examined the relationship between organisational structure and employee performance in manufacturing or service industries in Nigeria (Okafor, Kalu, and Anike And Ozioma, 2017, Shabbir, 2017 & Nwankwere , Chibueze, Christopher and Anthony, 2015). Despite the tremendous contributions of organizational structure, extant theories and researches are limited in explaining the impact of organizational structure on academic staff performance in Nigeria university system. The study therefore attempts to bridge the gaps that exists both in methodological and empirical reviews from the previous studies.

### 1.1 Objective of the Study

To Examine the Relationship between Organizational Structure and Academic Staff Performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University.

### 1.2 Hypotheses of the Study

*H<sub>1a</sub>*: Hierarchical layer will be positively associated with Academic Staff Performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University.

*H<sub>1b</sub>*: Nature of Formalization will be positively associated with Academic Staff Performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University.

*H<sub>1c</sub>*: Organizational boundary will be positively associated with employee Academic Staff Performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Organizational Structure

Organizational structure is define as the formal system of authority relationships and tasks that control and coordinate employee actions and behavior to achieve goals in organizations (Zeng, Yeng & Mclean, 2010; John, 2017). It describes the formal arrangement of jobs and tasks in organizations (Tran and Tian, 2013); allocation of authority and responsibility, and how management executes rules and regulations. **Funminiyi (2018) added that organizational structure entails clarity of task responsibilities, which allows harmonious work relation among the employees.**

**Oyebade (2011) opines that organizational structure in the Nigerian universities unlike other structures are more complex due to fragmentation pattern in arrangement, hierarchy in structure, participatory in decision-making, centralization of authority and high level of formalization. The complex organizational structure in Nigerian universities paves the way for different crises such as funding, admission and issues relating to staff and students management practices (Abdulkareem and Gabadeen, 2015).**

**The structure of an organization influences the way in which workflows; different design or structure can help or hinder different strategic objectives and also aid or hinder employees in their role (Lunenburg, 2012).** Similarly, the structure dictates the means to which strategies are design to assist in examining employees' performance. Studies indicated many aspects of organizational structure including: the number of layers in the hierarchy, the nature of formalization, loose/blurred internal and external boundaries and appropriate technology, standardization, productivity and efficiency (Zheng, Yang, and McLean, 2010; Lunenburg, 2012 & Tran and Tian, 2013). These dimensions can make or mar the effect of structure on employees' performance if not appropriately situated.

#### *Nature of Layers in the Hierarchy*

Is the system hierarchy of reporting relationships in the organization from the top level to the

bottom. The more layers organization have the more complex the structure of the organization, the more complex the structure, the more difficult the coordination and integration of organizational system become. Okafor, Agbaeze and Obi, (2017) citing Nahm, (2003) forwarded that lesser layer in organizational hierarchy facilitates decision-making and facilitate employee performance.

#### *Nature of Formalization*

John (2017) defines formalization as degree to which rules and procedures shapes employee's jobs. The nature of formalization depends on the size of the organization, some organizations add more rules to become formal where other organizations are becoming less formalized for the fear that formalization provides employees with rules and procedures that not only deprive but also discourage creativity, autonomous work and learning activity (Shabbir, 2017).

#### *Organizational Boundary*

Organizational boundary is a term used in business and legal profession mainly to distinguish one company from a separate but related company (Alipoor, Ahmadi, Pouya,., Ahmadi, and Mowlaie, (2017). It is use to isolate a unit/department from other external stakeholders as well as internal links. For an organization to operate effectively and efficiently, Ann, Nwakwere and Orga (2015) suggest that there must be a good structure with blurred boundaries. Organizational boundary plays two important roles: it clarifies the roles for each member and dictates the amount of control each member possesses in the organization.

### **2.2 Employee Performance**

Efficiency is achieving maximum satisfaction with minimum or no cost (Abdulrahman, 2016). Employee performance is a complex measurable parameter, which characterizes an output produced by efforts and by achievement of an employee compared with the standard output set by the organization or with the output of another employee working under the same

conditions. Similarly, the term according to Gunuraja (2014) is the ability of employee to maximize their productivity with minimum effort or expense.

However, in general, productivity tends to be associated with production-oriented terms (e.g. profit and turnover) while employee performance is linked to efficiency or perception-oriented terms (e.g. supervisory ratings and goal accomplishments). Organizations need good employees and appropriate structure that will enhance their performance. Employee performance according to Abdulrahman (2016) depends on employee's job knowledge, his dependability to undertake/execute a task with less or no supervision, and his compliance to organizational policies and regulations. Similarly, Shabbir (2017) included supervisory rating, quality and quantity as well as his efficiency and effectiveness in discharging tasks assigned to him. Other researches included punctuality in class lectures, submission of exam results in time and effectiveness in students project supervision (Faith, 2014 and [Ishola, Adeleye, & Tanimola, 2018](#)) to determine academic staff performance in academic institutions.

### **2.3 Review of Empirical Studies**

Empirical studies were conducted across the globe to explain the effect of organizational structure on employee performance. For example in their study Okafor, Kalu, and Anike And Ozioma, (2017) the effect of organizational structure on performance of selected manufacturing companies in Enugu state Nigeria the study found that structure significantly affects organizational performance. The study concludes that organizational structure in pharmaceutical manufacturing firms affects performance except in its growth objective. In examining the Impact of organizational structure on performance of selected technical and service firms in Nigeria, Nwankwere , Chibueze, Christopher and Anthony, (2015) found that decentralization enhanced better and more informed decision making in technical and service firms in Nigeria. Similarly, task routine affected staff productivity both positively and

negatively; equally a significant positive relationship existed between narrow span of control and performance.

In Kenya Awino, (2015) conducted a study on Organizational Structure and Performance of Large Manufacturing Firms, using regression analysis result shows that organizational structure on its own using Return on Assets (ROA) does not influence performance. However, a further test using non-financial measures such as internal processes, customer perspective and performance produced a different result, which influenced performance of large manufacturing firms. Similarly, in Iran a study was conducted on the effect of organizational structure on employees' job performance in private hospitals of Ahvaz, the results indicate that organizational structure (structural aspects) has a significant negative effect on job performance of employees in a private hospital of Ahvaz (Alipoor, Ahmadi, Pouya, Ahmadi & Mowlaie, 2017).

[Ishola](#), Adeleye, and Tanimola, (2018) the result from their study using multiple regression analysis results shows that, Bursary staff with professional qualification reported more job performance than non-certified staff. Bursary staff with higher tertiary education performed better in accounting task than those with lower qualification. Thirdly, significant results were found for gender and age as predictors of job performance. From the finding of his study Faith, (2014) revealed that academic qualification as perceived to have a positive relationship with job performance. The study concluded that academic qualification has a positive relationship with employee performance.

Ann, Nwankwere and Orga (2015) investigated the correlation between structure and the organizational performance in technical and service firms in Nigeria. Results revealed that decentralization enhanced better and more informed decision-making in technical and service firms in Nigeria. Similarly, positive relationship existed between narrow span of control and efficiency in organizations. In another development Zia-UD-Din and Shafique

(2018) in their study, the result indicates that organizational structure is significantly correlated with organizational performance under moderator of marketing strategy. For that reason, all the hypotheses showed significant outcomes. The study further guides the organization to figure out the role of marketing strategy as a moderator in training employees to achieve competitive advantage.

Furthermore, Funminiyi (2018) investigated the impact of organizational structure on employees' performance. Results from the study indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between decentralization system of control and employee productivity. Similarly, the result further indicated that standardization system of control positively affect employee performance.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

The study adopted descriptive research design, to allow the study to describe and analyzed the effect of organizational structure on Academic staff performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano.

#### **3.2 Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique**

The study is conducted in Yusuf Maitama Sule University, which is public university and owned by Kano State government with the total population of one hundred and fifty four (154) academic staffs (YUMSUK, 2018). A sample size of one hundred and eleven respondents (111) using Slovenes formula was selected. Similarly, stratified proportionate sampling strategy is employed to ensure each stratum is duly represented. Ahuja (2009) opines that stratified proportionate sampling has the advantage of given units in the strata's chance to participate in the study.

#### **3.3 Research Instruments**

The study employed questionnaire method using Likert's 4 rating scale. Mubaraka (2013) and

Ahmed (2010) argue that the scale has the advantage of not including undecided responses.

*OGB* Organizational boundary  
*é* Error term

**3.4 Data Analysis Technique**

Descriptive statistical tools were used to provide descriptive statistics of the respondents and the study variables. Similarly, Pearson Linear correlation coefficient is used to explain the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables (Mubaraka, 2013) and Multiple Regression analysis to neutrality of assessing the degree and character between independent variables and dependent variable (Ahmed, 2010).

**3.5 Research Model**

Using multiple regression analysis the statistical model for the study is express as follows:

$$Y = \beta + .NHLx_1 + NOF x_2 + .OGB x_3 + \acute{e}$$

Where; *Y* Employee Performance  
*β* the slop of the regression line  
*NHL* Nature of Hierarchical layer  
*NOF* Nature of Formalization

**3.6 Operationalization and Measurement of the Study Variables**

Organizational Structure is considered as anatomy of an organization, providing a skeletal framework defining the functions and relationship within the organizational setting (Faith 2014 & John, 2017). The variable is measured based on nature of hierarchical layer, nature of formalization and organizational boundary, with five, six and seven items respectively. Academic staff performance is define as the academic staff ability to exert his output when compared to the standard output or compared with the output of another employee working in another condition under the same condition (Faith, 2014; Ishola, Adeleye and Tanimola, 2018). The variable is measured using punctuality in class lectures, submission of exam results in time and effectiveness in students’ project supervision, with six, seven and six items respectively.

**4. Results and Discussions**

**4.1 Response Rate**

To achieve the objective of the study, 111(100%) questionnaires were distributed, 108 (97%) questionnaires were returned, and 3 (3%) questionnaires are invalid. A return of 108 questionnaires equating to 97% indicated a good response rate according to Sekran (2003) to make an informed decision.

**Table 4.1 Questionnaire Distribution and Retention**

Item	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Distributed Questionnaires	111	100
Returned Questionnaires	108	97
Rejected (Outliers) Questionnaires	3	3

*Source: Field Survey, 2018*

**4.2 Descriptive Characteristics of the Study Variables**

In order to make a summary of the observed data, the researcher established means and standard deviations. Basing on guidelines by Field (2009), the means represent a summary of the data and the standard deviations indicate the extent to which the means represent the data. In essence, they establish the goodness of fit of the data (Field, 2009). Table 4.2 shows the summary of means and standard deviations.

**Table 4.2 Descriptive characteristics of study variables**

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation
Organizational Structure	3.00	.53
Academic staff Performance	2.21	.42

*Source: Primary Data*

From table 4.2, the average scores for the variables of study lies between 3.00 and 2.21 using four-point Likert scale. Field (2009) suggested that small standard deviation relative to the mean values is a good manifestation that the mean represents the data observed. The mean averages for the two variables are above the mid-score (2.0), which is an indication that respondents in Yusuf Maitama Sule University understand organizational structure and its effects on their performance.

**4.3 Correlation Analysis**

To determine the causal relationship between the variables of the study, Pearson Linear Correlation Coefficient is used. The results (table 4.3).shows that there is positive relationship between nature of hierarchical layer and nature of formalization .383, there is also a positive relationship of .312 between nature of formalization and organizational boundary. Similarly, a positive relationship, of .412 exist between organizational boundary and nature of hierachy. Concisely, there is positive relationship between nature of hierarchical layer and academic staff performance .246, also there is negative relationship between nature of formulization and academic staff performance -.424. Furthermore, table 4.3 indicated a positive relationship .457 between academic staff performance and organizational boundary. Similarly, the result indicated that there is no problem of Multicollinearity, hence none of the variables of the study has correlation coefficient of 0.9 and above.

**Table 4 .3 Correlation Analysis Table**

	NOH	NOF	OGB	ACC PERF
Nature of Hierarchical Layer (NOH )	1			
Nature Of Formalization (NOF)	.383**	1		
Organizational Boundary ( OGB )	.412**	.312**	1	
ACADEMIS STAFF PERF ( 4 )	.246**	-.424**	.457**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Source: Generated from SPSS, 21 Version*

**4.4 Regression Analysis**

To examine the effect of organizational structure and employee’s performance, the study conducted a multiple regression analysis. Three (3) predicting variables including Nature of Hierarchical Layer (NOH), Nature of Formalization (NOF), Organizational Boundary (OGB) were used.

The regression result presented in table 4.5 shows a correlation coefficient of R=.790 meaning that the predictor variable (organizational structure) was able to predict 79% of the predicated variable (employee performance) of the study. While R<sup>2</sup> of .52 implies that predicting variables (NOH, NOF, OGB) under the study were able to account or explain 52% variance in the dependent variable (performance), while the

remaining 48% was not captured by this study. The results also show adjusted  $R^2$  of .75 which implies that organizational structure was able to explain 75% variation in the academic staff performance. The significant F.test of (17.990,  $p < 0.000$ ) signifies that the overall significant prediction of independent variables to the dependent variable, this further implies that, p value of 0.000 the model fitness in regressing the relationship between organizational structure and academic staff performance.

Based on the result from table 4.5 nature of hierarchy (NOH) is the variable that best predict the employee performance with the following values ( $\beta = .269$ ,  $t = 5.259$ , p value = 0.000 and  $\alpha = 0.05$ ). The next vital predictor in order of importance is the nature of formalization (NOF) ( $\beta = .052$ ,  $t = 2.485$ , p value = 0.014 and  $\alpha = 0.05$ ). However, organizational boundary (OGB) found with ( $\beta = .055$ ,  $t = 1.185$ , p value = 0.235 and  $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

**Table 4. 5** Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	P. Value	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2.013	.200		10.044	.000		
NOH	.269	.051	.293	5.259	.000	.905	1.105
NOF	.055	.046	.068	1.189	.235	.862	1.160
OGB	.082	.033	.146	2.485	.014	.818	1.223
<b>R</b>	<b>.790</b>						
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.52</b>						
<b>Adj. R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.75</b>						
<b>R<sup>2</sup> Change</b>	<b>.152</b>						
<b>F. Change</b>	<b>17.99</b>						
<b>Df 1</b>	<b>173</b>						
<b>Df 2</b>	<b>179</b>						
<b>Sig.</b>	<b>0.0000</b>						

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE PERFOR.

Source: Generated from SPSS, 21 Version

$$Y = 2.013 + .269NOH + .055NOF + .082OGB + \epsilon$$

#### 4.5 Hypotheses Testing

Based on the result from table 4.3, the study hypotheses are tested as follows:

At 95% confidence level,  $\alpha = 0.05$  is statistically large enough when compared to p value = .000, hence it is accepted that hierarchical layer will have significant and positive relationship on academic staff performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano. hypothesis 1 is therefore accepted.

However, in testing hypothesis 2 at 95% confidence level  $\alpha = 0.05$  is not statistically significant when compared with p value = .235, the study therefore rejected the hypothesis that nature of formalization will have no significant positive relationship on academic staff's performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano.

Furthermore, at 95% confidence level  $\alpha = 0.05$  is statistically significant and large enough when compared to p value = .014. The study accepted that organizational boundary has significant and positive relationship on academic staff's performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano. With this result hypothesis 3 is accepted.

#### 4.6 Discussion of Findings

In trying to achieve the objective of the study, result shows positive relationship between nature of hierarchical layer and employee performance. Meaning that hierarchical structure of the university system improves academic staff's performance. However the finding is contrary to the assertion made by Funminiya (2018), Okafor, Agbaeze and Obi, (2017) citing Nahm, (2003) and Ann, Nwankwere and Orga (2015) that lesser layer in organizational hierarchy/decentralization facilitates decision-making and facilitate employee performance.

The reason of the disagreement could be, previous studies were conducted in non-educational institutions where hierarchy is not much required, unlike in university system where hierarchy and seniority play an important role in administration

Nature of formalization is said to have no positive relationship with the academic staff performance, this result support the earlier finding of a study conducted by Fischer, Ferrier and Meurs (2019) that in context of low uncertainty organizational formalization is not necessary in providing structures that will increase performance, but may increase constraints on discretionary behavior. The point to note is that employees in the study area are skeptical, looking at the bureaucratic procedures involves in decision-making. For example, it takes time before approval granted to attend a workshops, seminars or international conferences.

Furthermore, the study found that organizational boundary lead to employee efficiency, this finding explain how powers are shared, exercise and limited within a given scope. In university system a good example in how the university organizational structure spelt out the roles and functions of every department, faculty, senate and council each have powers and these powers are limited within a given boundary. Employees given chance to exercise his power within the boundary given to them increases their performance.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

### 5.1 Conclusion

The main objective of the study is to examine the impact of organizational structure on employee performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University. To achieve the objective of the study, questionnaires were distributed to 197 sampled respondents and 191 questionnaires were administered using SPSS. From the findings and summary results, the study concludes that; hierarchical layer is positively associated with employee performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University, this provide basis for

accepting the study alternate hypothesis. Similarly, the study concludes that organisational boundary is positively related with academic staff performance. The study concludes that nature of formalisation is not significantly correlated with academic staff performance in Yusuf Maitama Sule University.

### 5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings from regression table, the study recommends that the university should maintain nature of hierarchy and organizational boundary at all times to ensure high performance of its academic staff. However, the study recommends that the University should not impose nature of formalization as it negatively affects academic staff performance.

### References

- Abdulrahaman, S.F (2016) Bank Consolidation and Employee Efficiency; An Unpublished PhD Dissertation Submitted To Postgraduate School, Kampala International University, Uganda
- Abdulkareem, and Gabadeen, (2015)* Organisational Structure and Personnel Management Practices in Public Universities in Nigeria. *Public Policy and Administration Research* Vol. 5 (12)
- Ahmed, J.A. (2010) Research Methods in the Social Sciences, Holway Speed Link Investment Limited, Kano, Nigeria
- Ahuja, R. (2009) Research Methods RAWAT PUBLICATIONS, New Delhi, India
- Alipoor, H., Ahmadi, K., Pouya, S. Ahmadi, K. and Mowlaie, S (2017) The Effect of Organizational Structure on Employees' Job Performance in Private Hospitals of Ahvaz *Journal of Ecophysiology and Occupational Health*, Vol 17 (3&4) 119- 123,
- Ann, I.O; Nwankwere, F.C and Orga, C.C (2015) Impact of Structure on Organizational Performance of Selected Technical and Service Firms in Nigeria. *Corporate Ownership and Control*. Vol 13(1) 1278-1284

- Awino, Z.B (2015) Organizational Structure and Performance of Large Manufacturing Firms: An Empirical Investigation in Kenya: *Journal of Business and Economics*, Volume 6, (11), 1883-1891
- Costigan, R.D., Ilter, S.S., & Berman, J.J. (1998). A Multi-Dimensional Study of Trust in Organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 10 (3), 303-317.
- Faith, J.A (2014) Perceived Relationship between Employee Academic Qualifications and Job Performance in Mukuru Slums Development Projects, Nairobi County. Un published Research Project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the Degree of Master of Business Administration, School of Business, University of Nairobi
- Fischer, R; Ferreira, M.C and Meurs, N.V (2019) Does Organizational Formalization Facilitate Voice and Helping Organizational Citizenship Behaviors? *Journal of International Business Studies February*, Vol. 50 (1) 125–134
- Field, A. (2006). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. 2nd Ed. Sage
- Funmiyi, A. K (2018) Impact of Organisational Structure on Employee Engagement: Evidence from North Central Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management and Science*. Vol.4 (8)579-589
- Gunaraja, T.M (2014) Organisational Corporate Culture on Employee Efficiency. *Journal of Business and Management*. 16 (11) 38- 42
- Ishola, A.A; Adeleye, S.T and Tanimola, F.A (2018) Impact of Educational, Professional Qualification and Years of Experience on Accountants' Job Performance. *Journal of Accounting and Financial Management*. Vol. 4 (1), 35-46
- Jordan, S.A. (1999). Innovative cultures + empowered employees = high performance organizations. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 23, 109-115.
- John, S. (2017) How Does Organizational Structure Affect Performance Measurement? Retrieved on 15<sup>th</sup> October, 2019 from <https://bizfluent.com/facts->
- Lunenburg, F.C. (2012). Mechanistic-Organic Organizations-An Axiomatic Theory: Authority Based on Bureaucracy or Professional Norms. *International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity*, 14(1) 1-7
- Mubaraka, C.M (2013) Research Made Easy TFK Luminary Publishers, Kampala, Uganda
- Nwankwere F. Chibueze,N.F; Christopher, O.C; Anthony, I.G (2015) Impact of Structure on Organizational Performance of Selected Technical and Service Firms in Nigeria. *Corporate Ownership & Control* Vol. 13, ( 1) 1278-1284
- Okafor, N.C; Agboeze, E.K and Obi, H.O (2017)Effect of Organisational Structure on Organisational Performance. *The International Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 5 (5)
- Okafor, N.C; Kalu, A.E ; Anike O. And , Ozioma, H. (2017) Effect of organizational structure on performance of selected manufacturing companies in Enugu state Nigeria. *International Journal of Business & Management* Vol. 5 ( 5 )190- 202
- Oyebade, F. (2016) Working Orgonogram and Working Procedures in Universities. Paper Presented at the Orientation Workshop for The Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff At The University of Medical Sciences, Ondo City, Ondo State, Nigeria
- Shabbir, M.S (2017) Organizational Structure and Employee's Performance: A Study of Brewing Firms in Nigeria. *American Research Journal for Business and Management*, Vol. 3 (1)1-16
- Tran, Q. and Tian, Y. (2013). Organisational Structure: Influencing Factors and Impact on a Firm. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, Vol. 3, 229-236
- YUMSUK (2018) Staff Strength. Retrieved from

[https://www.nwu.edu.ng/staff\\_directory.php](https://www.nwu.edu.ng/staff_directory.php)

Zheng, W., Yang, B., and McLean, G. N. (2010). Linking Organizational Culture, Structure, Strategy and Organizational Effectiveness: Mediating Role of Knowledge Management. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 63(2), 763-77

Zia-UD-Din, M. & Shafique, M.Z ( 2018). [Effects of Employees Experience on Employees Performance on Textile Sector](#), *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 8(7), 257-268,