

INNOVATIONS

Organizational structure and employee performance: evidence from pharmaceutical companies in Anambra state, Nigeria

Ezejiofor, Raymond A. & Ezekwesili, Tochukwu P.

Department of Accountancy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Email: thaddray4life@yahoo.com; Ezekwesilitochukwu@gmail.com

Abstract

This study, therefore, sought to ascertain the impact of organizational structure on the employee's performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State of Nigeria. The research was conducted using a descriptive survey research approach. The study's participants include 346 employees from 20 pharmaceutical companies in Nigeria's Anambra State. Using the Borg and Gall (1973) formula, a sample size of 67 was calculated. With the help of SPSS version 20, the researchers used regression analysis to examine the hypothesis. The findings revealed that working conditions and formalization have a positive significant impact on pharmaceutical company employee performance. Based on the findings, the study recommended that management of manufacturing companies in Nigeria should design appropriate organizational structure to improve the productivity of their workers.

Keywords:1. Working condition 2. formalization and employee's performance

Introduction

Manufacturing companies have played a vital part in Nigeria's economic progress over the years and continue to do so. The necessity for effective organizational structures that would support smooth manufacturing processes and hence promote corporate growth has arisen as a result of the competitive business climate and increased demand for goods and services from the manufacturing industry (Bekanwah, Miidom & Ukoah, 2020). Every organization, from the simplest to the most complicated, must have a structure on which to operate. The main purpose of establishing an effective organizational structure is to achieve operational effectiveness and efficiency, which will lead to increased corporate growth. One of the motivations for organizations to function on structure, according to Aluko, Odugbesan, Gbadamosi, and Osuagwu (2011), is to achieve survival, expansion, and profitability. The goal of organizational structure, according to this statement, is to achieve business growth or any of the above-mentioned goals. On the other hand, business growth is dependent on how well an organization's operations and performance are structured.

Organizational structure has gotten a lot of attention in terms of research and debate among managers and academics all around the world. Managers who are tasked with creating an organizational structure must make difficult choices. They must choose from a variety of different employment and department structures. The first option is about individual positions, the second and

third decisions are about departments or groups of jobs, and the fourth decision is about delegation of responsibility across the organization (Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly and Konopaske, 2003). Various businesses use organizational structure as a control mechanism to influence employee work outcomes, ensuring that needed tasks are completed successfully and efficiently, and aid in the achievement of company goals and objectives (Al-Qatawneh, 2014).

An organizational structure, according to Robins, Judge, and Vohra (2011), explains how work tasks are formally separated, categorized, and coordinated. As a result, managers must pursue corporate growth through effective organizational structure, formalization, and chain of command (Robbins et al., 2011; Robbins & Coulter, 2013). The degree of standardization of roles in an organization is referred to as formalization (Robbins et al., 2011), whilst the chain of command is another feature of organizational structure that aids in managing personnel to meet the organization's goals and objectives. As a result, this refers to the chain of command that runs from the top of the organization to the bottom.

The organizational structure is a powerful tool for realizing and achieving organizational objectives. However, it is widely acknowledged that any organization's structure must be based on its goals. Organizational structure had a significant impact on corporate success in Nigeria, according to studies such as Bekanwah, Miidom, and Ukoha (2020); Ogosi and Agbaeze (2018). The structure had a significant effect on organizational effectiveness, according to Ugwu, Onoh Nnadi, Udeze (2019); Okafor, Kalu, and Ozioma (2017). As a result, there is a critical need for more widely recognized empirical research on the impact of organizational structure on employee performance in industrial enterprises in Anambra State. As a result, the state is noted for business ventures of all types and boasts one of West Africa's major markets. As a result, the purpose of this study was to determine the impact of organizational structure on employee performance at pharmaceutical enterprises in Nigeria's Anambra State.

Objectives of the study

Determine the impact of working condition on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Ascertain the impact of formalization on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Research Questions

Does working conditions have impact on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State, Nigeria?

How does formalization impacted employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State, Nigeria?

Organizational Structure

Due to the diverse applications of organizational structure by managers and scholars across disciplines, it is difficult to describe. However, we would benefit from an explanation of the concept based on this context. In one sense, structure is the ordering of responsibilities for the work to be done, which is best depicted by the organization chart (Coase, 2000). The architecture of business competency, leadership, talent, functional linkages, and arrangement is also termed as structure (Cyert, 2000). As a result, organizational structure has an impact on managers' work and job-related

decisions (Schilling & Steensma, 2001). Controlling organizational activities involves promoting the implementation of policies (Ireland, Hitt, and Sirmon 2003) and structures (Child & McGrath, 2001). Effective structures give a company the stability it needs to implement its strategy and maintain its current competitive advantages, while also allowing it to generate competitive advantages that are suited for its strategic planning (Ireland, Hitt & Sirmon, 2003).

The structure of an organization denotes a long-term arrangement of duties and operations. In other words, organizational structure is a set of strategies for dividing an organization into discrete jobs and then achieving a balance between various responsibilities. The formal system of task and reporting relationships that manages, directs, and motivates personnel to work together to achieve an organization's goal is referred to as organizational structure. It includes of employment positions, their interrelationships, and accountability for process and sub process outputs (Daniel, 2006).

The way responsibility and power are distributed and work procedures are carried out among organizational members is defined by organizational structure. Formalization, centralization, and control are the most significant aspects of organizational structure (David, and Young, 2006)

Employee Performance

The output-to-input ratio is used to measure productivity. It is a metric for determining how an individual, company, or industry converts input resources into goods and services. The amount of output produced per unit of resources used is measured by this metric (Armour, 2009). Quality is a feature of products or services that demonstrates their capacity to meet expressed or implicit needs (Kinicki, & Kreitner, 2007). It is achieving increasingly better products and services at increasingly lower prices. Employee performance is higher among happy and satisfied workers, according to Koufteros and Peng (2012), and management finds it easy to motivate high performers to meet company targets.

One of the most significant factors in management research, and possibly the most important indicator of organizational performance, is organizational performance. The idea of organizational performance is widely used in academic literature; nevertheless, due to its multiple definitions, defining it is problematic. As a result, no commonly agreed definition of this idea exists (Gavrea, Ilies, and Stegorean, 2011). The concept of organizational performance is founded on the premise that an organization is a voluntary alliance of productive assets, such as human, physical, and financial resources, with the goal of achieving a common goal (Barney, 2001).

Employee performance is usually measured in terms of results. It can, however, be viewed in terms of conduct (Thompson, and Lawrence, 2010). Employee performance is judged against the organization's performance standards (Tolbert and Hall (2009). When evaluating performance, a variety of factors can be considered, including productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, quality, and profitability (Wood, & Sangster, 2002). Efficiency and effectiveness are two different concepts. Efficiency is the ability to generate desirable outcomes with the least amount of resources necessary, whereas effectiveness is the ability of personnel to fulfill the intended objectives.

Working conditions and Formalization

Although working conditions do not have a direct impact on production or output, they do have an indirect effect. For example, if the manual or mental labor involved in certain factory jobs is exhausting, it will endanger not only company property but also lead to accidents, which may result in incidents such as death. This could have a negative impact on the entire workforce's morale. As a

result, businesses should provide working settings that do not negatively impact employees, such as noise-free workplaces, enough lighting, and comfortable temperatures.

According to Robbins and Coulter (2013), formalization refers to how well a company's functions are organized and how much the corporation is governed by rules and procedures. In highly organized organizations, it considers precise job criteria, numerous organizational norms and clearly defined policies, as well as work processes. As a result, formalization refers to the process of standardizing work within an organization (Robbins et al., 2011). When a job is highly formalized, people have little control over what they do, where they do it, and how they do it.

The amount of written documentation in an organization is referred to as formalization (Daft, 1995). It denotes the extent to which official regulations and procedures define job tasks (Al-Qatawneh, 2014). These policies and procedures are created to help organizations standardize their operations. The degree to which an organization employs rules and procedures to prescribe behavior is measured by formalization (Liao 2011). The degree to which workers are provided with rules and processes is defined as formalization (Nahm, Vonderembse, and Koufteros 2003).

Empirical Review

In Nigeria, Bekanwah, Miidom, and Ukoha (2020) investigated the relationship between organizational structure and business growth. Using Yamene's sample size determination technique, a sample size of 192 respondents was determined from a population of 220 managers and supervisors. A questionnaire was utilized to collect data, and copies of the questionnaire were circulated, with 187 being filled out for data analysis. On SPSS Version 23.0, regression analysis was used to evaluate the data. According to the data, organizational structure has a large and strong link to corporate growth. Ugwu, Onoh Nnadi, Udeze (2019) looked at the organizational structure and employee performance of a few microfinance banks in Enugu State. The study used a survey design and gathered data from both primary and secondary sources. The participants in this study were 67 members of staff from Enugu State's three microfinance institutions. Using the 15.0 version of the Minitab statistical program, the data was examined using the Non-Parametric Kruskalwallis test (MSS). In the selected microfinance institutions, the key findings demonstrated that organizational structure has a considerable impact on staff performance.

The structure and performance of Nigerian banks were investigated by Ogosi and Agbaeze (2018). For the eleven (11) year period 2005-2015, the M-form theory of firm structure was used to investigate the effect of structure on performance of five selected banks in Nigeria. Correlation and regression test statistics were used to assess the panel data set derived from bank financial statements and accounts. All of the structure factors exhibited a favorable link with performance, according to the findings. The study found that structure factors (bank divisions/departments, bank branches) had a favorable and significant impact on performance, whereas the number of personnel had a negative impact. Okafor, Kalu, and Ozioma (2017) looked at the impact of organizational structure on the performance of a few manufacturing firms in Enugu, Nigeria. The importance of the structure to manufacturing enterprises, notably in Nigeria's pharmaceutical industry, has gotten little attention, especially in terms of empirical evidence. The structure had a significant impact on organizational efficiency, according to the study. The study concludes that, with the exception of its growth goal, the organizational structure of pharmaceutical manufacturing enterprises has an impact on production. Shabbir (2017) investigated the organizational structure and personnel efficiency in Nigerian brewing companies. The overall number of people in the study is 6468, which represents the entire number of

people employed by Nigeria's five breweries. The study's findings revealed that the nature of hierarchical levels had a substantial impact on employee performance in Brewing firms, and that formalization had a considerable positive impact on employee performance. The study concludes that the adoption of the proper structure is the main point for the effectiveness of Brewing enterprises by workers, based on the above data. The effect of organizational structure on the performance of selected manufacturing enterprises in Enugu State, Nigeria, was investigated by Nwonu, Kalu, and Obi-Anike (2017), with a focus on pharmaceutical manufacturing firms. The questionnaire served as the major data collection tool. To assess the effect of organizational structure (Independent Variable) on organizational performance, descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation, variance, etc.), simple linear regression, and correlation (bivariate) were employed to analyze the data (dependent variables). The study discovered that organizational structure has a considerable impact on performance. The study comes to the conclusion that organizational culture is important. In the Nigerian banking sector, Olajide (2015) investigated the effects of organizational structure on employee satisfaction. This study gathered empirical data from a number of top banks in Lagos, Nigeria. Data was acquired from primary sources for the study using a survey design. Three hundred and thirty-five questionnaires were distributed at random to 3711 employees from big banks. Only 280 questionnaires were returned, though. Only 259 of the returned questionnaires were useful for analysis. The findings of the hypotheses revealed a link between organizational structure and optimal work satisfaction. Chigozie and Chijioke (2015) investigate the impact of organizational structure on manufacturing business performance in South East Nigeria. The findings revealed that worker training had a beneficial impact on the company's product service quality. The study found that organizational success is determined by the essence of the organizational structure, and that management that focuses on the workers' knowledge through training will have a positive impact on the quality of the organization's product service, as well as on the organization's sales turnover. Organizational structure has a large and strong association with corporate growth, according to Bekanwah, Miidom, and Ukoha (2020); Ogosi and Agbaeze (2018). The study indicated that organizational structure has a significant impact on business success in Nigeria based on these findings. The current structure implemented by selected micro-finance institutions in Enugu State, according to Ugwu, Onoh Nnadi, and Udeze (2019), is supportive of improved staff performance and should thus be supported. Shabbir (2017); Nwonu, Kalu and Obi-Anike (2017) Olajide (2015) results of the study showed that the nature of hierarchical layers had a significant influence on the performance of Brewing firms by employees, and that formalization had a significant positive effect on the performance of employees.

Methodology

The study adopted descriptive survey research design since the primary objectives of the study is to examine relationship between variables.

The population of the study consists of 346 staff of 20 Pharmaceutical Companies in Anambra State (see appendix).

Sampling design is a part of the basic business research process. Therefore, this section addresses the issue of sample size as well as sampling technique adopted for this study. A sample size 67 was obtained using Borg and Gall (1973) formula as stated below:

$$n = (Z_a)^2 eN$$

Where:

n= sample size to be determined

Za = 95% confidence interval (1.960) at 5% level of significance

a = significance level (0.05)

e = margin of error which is 0.05

N = Entire population

N.B. Target population is 346

Substituting the population variables of this study into the formula above, the sample size can be computed as follows:

$$n = (1.960)^2 0.05 \times 346$$

$$n = (3.8416) (0.05 \times 346)$$

$$n = 3.8416 \times 17.3$$

$$n = 67$$

Method of Data Collection

The data was collected utilizing a direct approach method with ten (10) research assistants. This means that the surveys were given to respondents directly by well-informed research assistants who worked for the companies. The questionnaire was prepared in a structured format and consisted of generic questions with responses ranging from strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (U), strongly disagree (SD), and disagreed (D), giving respondents the option of ticking the most perceived alternative.

Model Specification

The researcher specified the regression equation model, which took the following form:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \mu$$

Where:

Y = performance (dependent variable)

X = Organizational Structure (explanatory/independent Variable)

β_0 = constant term (intercept)

β_1 - β_2 = Coefficients of performance

μ = Error term (stochastic term)

Explicitly, the equation can be defined as:

$$\text{Organizational structure} = f(\text{Employee Performance}) + \mu$$

Representing the equations with the variables of the construct, hence the equations below are formulated:

$$EMP_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 WKC_{it} + \mu_{it} \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad i$$

$$EMP_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_2 FLZ_{it} + \mu_{it} \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad ii$$

Where:

β_0 = Constant term (intercept)

β_{it} = Coefficients to be estimated for firm i in period t

μ_{it} = Error term/Stochastic term for firm i in period t

EMP_{it} = Employee Performance i in period t

WKC_{it} = Working condition *i* in period *t*

FLZ_{it} = Formalization *i* in period *t*

Method of Data Analysis

To test the significant effect and the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables, Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses with the aid of SPSS version 20. 0. at 5% level of significance.

Decision Rule:

The decision for the hypotheses is to accept the alternative hypotheses if the p-value of the test statistic is less or equal to the alpha at 5% and to reject the alternative hypotheses if the p-value of the test statistic is greater than alpha at 5% significance level.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Data Presentation

Out of 67 copies of questionnaires distributed 59 were completed and returned. This represents 88%.

Table 1: Analysis of data collected for objective one. “Does working conditions have impact on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State, Nigeria?”

S/N	Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
1	The current working circumstances stimulate employees.	12	37	0	8	2
2	The comfortable working environment allows employees to increase their productivity.	15	30	1	10	3
3	The organization's welfare staff is superior to that of the other establishment.	10	22	2	17	8
4	The working circumstances in my organization motivate my employees.	12	30	0	10	7
5	Employees are provided with working environments that are not harmful to them, such as enough lighting and acceptable temperatures.	16	28	2	13	0

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 2: Analysis of Data collected on objective two “How does formalization impacted on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State, Nigeria?”

S/N	Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
6	Employee performance is determined by the efficiency of the organization's system.	15	32	0	10	2
7	Our company is really well-organized.	10	31	1	9	8
8	Our company takes into account certain job requirements, many organizational conventions, and well-defined policies.	20	32	0	7	0
9	The organization's standards ensure that operations are effective and efficient.	17	25	1	10	6
10	Formalization establishes formal rules and procedures to verify that the standard and the real purpose are in sync.	16	30	2	11	0

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Table 3: Analysis of data collected on employee performance”

S/N	Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
11	My performance has improved thanks to the management.	10	37	0	12	0
12	When my employer took a lengthy time to rotate the personnel, my performance suffered.	17	30	1	10	1
13	Employees always give it their all to get the job done.	15	22	2	12	8
14	Employee performance has been harmed as a result of existing motivational techniques at my workplace.	13	30	0	9	7
15	Employees frequently strive to accomplish defined goals and objectives in order to receive bonus payments.	14	33	2	10	0

Source: Field Survey, 2021

Data Analysis

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
EMP	5	5.00	152.00	59.0000	58.20223
WKC	5	5.00	147.00	59.0000	55.26753
FLZ	5	4.00	150.00	59.0000	58.43800
Valid (listwise)	N 5				

The descriptive analysis showed that the mean (average) of the pharmaceutical companies are around 59.0 with the highest score of 152.00. More so, the lowest score is 5.00. This implies that, the aggregate average of the variables is about 56% for the study.

Furthermore, the standard deviation values of the variables employee performance, working condition and formalization (EMP, WKC and FLM), 58.20, 55.27 and 58.44 respectively indicated that the variables are dispersed from each other; an indication that most likely some variables performed superior than others.

Test of Hypotheses (Null)

Hypothesis One

H₀₁: Working condition has no positive significant impact on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State Nigeria.

In testing this hypothesis, questions that contain in table 1 and 3 were used.

Table 5: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.998 ^a	.996	.995	4.08366

a. Predictors: (Constant), WKC

The coefficient of determination, or adjusted R squared, shows us how much variation in the dependent variable is caused by changes in the independent variable. According to the findings in table 5, the corrected R squared value was 0.995, indicating that employee performance varied by about 100% due to variations in working conditions. This means that working conditions can account for 100 percent of variations in company employee performance.

Table 6: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13499.971	1	13499.971	809.533	.000 ^b
	Residual	50.029	3	16.676		
	Total	13550.000	4			

a. Dependent Variable: EMP
b. Predictors: (Constant), WKC

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-3.018	2.844		-1.061	.366
	WKC	1.051	.037	.998	28.452	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EMP

In table 6, it reveals that the p-value (sig.) is 0.00 indicates that the hypothesis is statistically significant at level of significance (5%); hence p-value of the test statistic is less than alpha value (0.00<0.05).

table 7, regressed result indicated that an evaluation of the working condition of the explanatory variable (Beta Column) shows that employee performance is positive significant, hence coefficient value is 1.051, while t-statistic value is 28.452, showing that working condition is positive and statistically significant on employee performance. This can actually be used by the companies in their decision making and policies as it concern both the interest of the companies and their staff working conditions.

Decision:

Since p-value of the test statistic is less than alpha, we therefore, reject null hypothesis and uphold alternative hypothesis which state that the working condition has a positive significant impact on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State Nigeria

Hypothesis Two

H₀₂: Formalization has no positive significant impact on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State Nigeria.

In testing this hypothesis, questions that contain in table 2 and 3 were used.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.996 ^a	.991	.988	6.35124

a. Predictors: (Constant), FLZ

Adjusted R squared is coefficient of determination which tells us the variation in the dependent variable due to changes in the independent variable. From the findings in the table 8, the value of adjusted R squared was 0.991, an indication that there was variation of about 100% on employee performance due to changes in formalization. This implies that 100% changes in employee performance of the companies could be accounted for by formalization.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13428.985	1	13428.985	332.909	.000 ^b
	Residual	121.015	3	40.338		
	Total	13550.000	4			
a. Dependent Variable: EMP						
b. Predictors: (Constant), FLZ						

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.501	4.283		.117	.914
	FLZ	.992	.054	.996	18.246	.000
a. Dependent Variable: EMP						

In table 9, it reveals that the p-value (Sig.) is 0.000 indicates that the hypothesis is statistically significant at level of significance (5%); hence p-value of the test statistic is less than alpha value (0.000<0.05).

table 10, regressed result indicated that an evaluation of the working condition of the explanatory variable (Beta Column) shows that employee performance is positive significant, hence coefficient value is 0.992, while t-statistic value is 18.246, showing that formalization is positive and statistically significant on employee performance. This can actually be used by the companies in their decision making and policies as it concern both the interest of the companies and their staff welfare.

Decision:

Since p-value of the test statistic is less than alpha, we therefore, reject null hypothesis and uphold alternative hypothesis which state that the formalization has a positive significant impact on employee performance of pharmaceutical companies in Anambra State Nigeria.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The impact of organizational structure on employee performance is investigated using pharmaceutical enterprises in Nigeria's Anambra State. To determine the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance, a simple regression analysis was used. Working conditions and formalization have a favorable significant impact on employee performance at pharmaceutical enterprises in Anambra State, Nigeria, according to the findings.

It demonstrates that these organizations' working conditions were favorable in attaining both the company's aims and serving as a motivator for its employees to improve their productivity. These prove that organizational structure has a significant impact on employee performance in pharmaceutical companies in Nigeria. The study concluded that management of manufacturing enterprises in Nigeria should build appropriate organizational structures to boost their workers'

productivity. Also, management should not give up on maintaining their working conditions, as it is a valuable tool for improving the structural expansion of the organization.

References

1. *Bekanwah, D. S., Miidom, D. F. & Ukoah, O. (2020). Organizational structure and business growth in manufacturing firms in Nigeria. International Journal of Advanced Academic Research Social and Management Sciences. 6(5); ISSN: 2488-9849, (May 2020) 30*
2. *Aluko, M., Odugbesan, O., Gbadamosi, G. & Osuagwu, L.(2011). Business policy and strategy. Lagos; Longman Nigeria Plc.*
3. *Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly and Konopaske, (2003). Organizations: Behaviour, Structure, Processes, (14th Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.*
4. *Al-Qatawneh, M. I. (2014). The Impact of Organisational Structure on Organizational Commitment: A Comparison between Public and Private Sector Firms in Jordan. European Journal of Business and Management, 6(12), 30-37*
5. *Robins S.P., Judge, T. & Vohra, N.. (2011). Organizational behavior 14th edition. Pearson Education, Inc., Publishing as Prentice Hall.*
6. *Robbins, S.P. & Coulter, M. (2013). Management. Eleventh Edition. England Pearson Education Limited.*
7. *Ogosi, C. D. & Agbaeze, E.K. (2018). Structure and Organizational Performance in the Nigerian Banking System. European Journal of Social Sciences. 56(1), ISSN 1450-2267; pp.37-48 www.europeanjournalofsocialsciences.com*
8. *Ugwu, J. N., Onoh Nnadi, C. S. & Udeze, C. C.(2019). Organizational Structure and Employee's Performance in Selected Micro-Finance Banks in Enugu State, Nigeria. International Digital Organization for Scientific Research ISSN: 2550-7966 Idosr Journal Of Humanities And Social Sciences 4(1): 38-52,.*
9. *Okafor, N.C., Kalu, A.E. & Ozioma, O.H. (2017). Effect of Organizational Structure on Performance of Selected Manufacturing Companies in Enugu State Nigeria. The International Journal Of Business & Management, 5(5), 2-12.*
10. *Coase, R. (2000). Organizational structure and performance. Journal of Management science 1(3). 59-68.*
11. *Cyert, H. (2000). Organizational form and environment: An analysis of between-form and within-form responses to environmental change. Strategic management journal, 21(7), 753-773.*
12. *Schilling, M.A. & Steensma, H.K. (2001). The use of modular organizational forms: An industry-level analysis. Academy of Management Journal, 44; 1149-1168.*
13. *Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., & Sirmon, D. G. (2003). A Model of Strategic Entrepreneurship: The Construct and its Dimensions. Journal of Management, 29, 963-989*
14. *Daniel, L. (2006). Delegation and organizational structure in small businesses. Group and Organization Management, 2(2), 14-31.*
15. *David, F. and Young, T. (2006). Adoption and abandonment of matrix management programs: Effects of organizational characteristics and inter-organizational networks. Academy of Management Journal, 15(9), 36-40.*
16. *Armour, H.(2009). Organizational structure and economic performance: a test of the multidivisional hypothesis. Bell Journal of Economics, 2 (2), 23-45*

17. Koufteros, Y. and Peng D. (2012) *Organizational structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, and interactional justice. Academy of Management Journal* , 3 (3), 21-33
18. Gavrea, C., Ilies, L. and Stegerea, R. (2011). *Determinants of Organizational Performance: The Case of Romania. Management and Marketing Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, 6(2), 285-300
19. Barney, J. (2001). *Is the Resource-Based View a Useful Perspective for Strategic Management Research? Yes. Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 41-56.
20. Thompson, K. and Lawrence, H. (2010) *Organizational structure and firm performance. Academy of Management Journal* , 2 (1), 31-43
21. Tolbert and Hall (2009) *Effect of organizational structure on firm performance. Academy of Management Journal* , 4 (2), 31-43
22. Daft, R. (1995). *Organisation Theory and Design, (5th Ed.)*. New York: West Publishing Company.
23. Liao, C. C.. (2011). *How Knowledge Management Mediates the Relation between Environment and Organizational Structure. Journal of Business Research*, 64(7), 728-736.
24. Nahm, A., Vonderembse, M. & Koufteros, X. (2003). *The Impact of Organisational Structure on Time-based Manufacturing and Plant performance. Journal of Operations Management*, 21(3), 281-306
25. Shabbir, M.S. (2017). *Organizational Structure and Employee's Performance: A Study of Brewing Firms in Nigeria. American Research Journal of Business and Management*, 3, 11, 1-16.
26. Nwonu, C. O. Agbaeze, E. K. & Obi-Anike, H. O. (2017). *Effect of Organizational Structure on Performance of Selected Manufacturing Companies in Enugu State Nigeria. The International Journal Of Business & Management*. 5(5), (ISSN 2321–8916) www.theijbm.com
27. Olajide, O.T. (2015). *Effects of Organisational Structure on Job Satisfaction in the Nigerian Financial Sector: Empirical Insight from Selected Banks in Lagos State. NG-Journal of Social Development*, 5(1), 96-108
28. Chigozie, M.P. & Chijioko, E. (2015). *Effect of organizational structure on performance of manufacturing firms in South East Nigeria. GE-International Journal of Management Research*, 3(12), 2-6.

Appendix

S/N	Pharmaceutical firms	Staff Numbers
1	Gauze pharmaceuticals and laboratory limited, Awka	10
2	Joez Pharmaceuticals Nigeria Ltd, Awka	11
3	God's pharmaceutical company, Obosi	23
4	Juhel Nigeria Ltd, Awka	7
5	Chazmax Pharmaceutical, Onitsha	21

6	Annygod Pharma Co Lt, Onitsha	12
7	Zidec Pharmaceutical Ltd, Awka	8
8	Alben Healthcare Industries Limited, Ogidi	5
9	Bichan Pharmacy Ltd, Awka	10
10	New Divine Favour Pharmaceuticals, Nkpor	14
11	Juhel Parenteral Factory, Awka	39
12	Gauze Pharmaceuticals Actual Location, Ifite, Awka	14
13	Megacenter Pharmaceutical, Onitsha	17
14	Manfes Pharmaceutical Company Nigeria Limited, Onitsha	35
15	Lin-Kabs Pharmaceutical Limited, Onitsha	32
16	PX SIMED Pharmacy Nig, Awka	12
17	Alben Pharmaceuticals, Ogidi	11
18	Zunamediks pharmaceuticals limited., Onitsha	22
19	Chez Resources Pharmaceuticals Limited, Onitsha	28
20	Ndubusi Pharmacy Awka Road Onitsha	15
	Total	346