

The Moderating Effect of Organizational Processes on the Relationship between Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness in Universities in Kenya

¹Mbaraka Razia; ²Prof. Damiannah Kieti; ³Prof. Loice Maru

¹ School of Business and Economics

² School of Tourism, Hospitality and Events Management

³ School of Business and Economics

Abstract: Like other organizations, institutions of higher learning are faced with stiff competition both in terms of their customers and the human resource demand. Consequently, the majority of the institutions are placing special emphasis on their effectiveness particularly in drawing customer acceptance, providing a conducive work environment in terms of employee satisfaction and the modification of their programmes to fit the competitive market. Whatever form of organization, there is a general agreement that organization's structural design is a critical factor in the success or failure of an organization. This paper examines the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness and the moderating effect of organizational processes on the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness based on a study of two universities in Kenya: Moi University (public) and University of East Africa-Baraton (private). The study used a sample of 365 participants (300 from Moi University and 65 from UEA-Baraton). The study utilized a cross-sectional survey design that was descripto-explanatory in nature to identify attributes of the study population using a small sample of individuals. Independent samples t-test was used to test whether there was any significant difference in organizational structure and organizational effectiveness between public and private universities. The regression results indicated that the level of communication had positive and significant effects on productivity stability and human resource satisfaction and development. Besides, the study confirmed that organizational processes moderate the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness. The results highlight the need to improve organizational structure which has positive impacts on organizational effectiveness under the moderation of organizational processes. This move is necessitated by the accelerated pace of business complexity today.

Keywords: Moderating Effect, Organizational Processes, Organizational Structure, Effectiveness

I. Introduction

Organizational structure is critical both for organizations and its employees. Organizational structures can mean the difference between success and failure for an organization as well for the individuals who work there and hence, organizational structure should be aligned with business strategy. Organizational structures need to be adaptive and flexible (Fontaine, 2007). Organizations are structured differently and work differently. Therefore, every organization tends to organize itself differently. Consequently, there is no absolute right and no absolute wrong way to structure an organization. Appropriate organizational structure depends on the unique strategy of the business, unique customer base, its unique services and its management across the organization. There are many types of organizational structures. These include: Tall and Flat Structure; Line Structure Organization; Staff Structure Organization; Line and Staff Structure Organization; Functional Structure Organization; The Divisional Structure; Matrix Structure Organization; Committee Structure Organization, and Bureaucratic Structure Organization.

Tall and Flat Structure

Regardless of whether an organization has a functional or a divisional structure, a decision must be made as to what shape the organization will take. This can either be a flat or tall structure. A flat organization has fewer hierarchical levels with many employees reporting to each boss, that is, there is a wide span of control. A tall organization has many hierarchical levels and few employees reporting to each boss, that is narrow span of control (Robbins, 1983). Two organizations with equal numbers of employees may have quite differently shaped structures. Holding the number of employees constant, an increase in the number of levels decreases the span of control while decreasing the number of levels increases the span of control (Iqbal, 2005).

With respect to the effects on behaviour, Gray and Starke (1984) are of the view that the shape of an organization has an impact on both employee satisfaction and performance in that structure dictates how employees need to behave to adapt to organizational culture based on its rules and regulations.

Line Structure Organization

A line structure is the basic framework for the whole organization, and the backbone of the organizational hierarchy. It points out direct vertical relationships (superior-subordinate relationship) connecting the positions at each level with those above and below (Robins, 1983). This type of structure can be defined as a chain of command where there is a line relationship between the superior and the subordinate. Secondly, it controls the principal flow of work of an organization in a direct line.

Staff Structure Organization

Staff authority is advisory or service oriented in nature. Staff functions have no direct responsibility for accomplishing the objectives of an enterprise. They only help the line managers to work most effectively in achieving the primary objectives of an enterprise. The functions of a pure staff authority are to investigate, research and give advice to line managers to whom they report (Day, 1999).

Line and Staff Structure Organization

Line and staff organization utilizes the advantages of both the line organization and functional organization. The line and staff organization serves to maintain stability and discipline whereas the staff or functional portion brings to bear expert knowledge on specific problems (Iqbal, 2005). The line staff theory recognizes three types of staff, namely personnel, advisory and control. The main function of advisory staff is to advise line managers in their areas whereas control staff are those with the responsibility of controlling some aspects of organizational performance.

Functional Structure Organization

Functional structure organization is designed to bring about specialization of management. It permits a specialist in a given area to enforce his/her directive within the limited and clearly defined scope of authority. It decreases the problems of line managers because it permits order to flow directly to lower levels without attention to routine technical problems tackled by line position (Csazar, 2008; Iqbal, 2005).

The Divisional Structure

In the divisional structure, the organization is broken down into divisions, each division operating as a semi-autonomous unit. The divisions may be formed on the basis of product, customer or geography. Whatever basis is used, each division operates almost as a separate business. Divisional performance can be assessed periodically by the mother organization because each division behaves as a separate company (Iqbal, 2005).

Matrix Structure Organization

The matrix organization may be thought of as an organization overlay in which a series of horizontal relationships are super imposed upon the hierarchical structure of the organization. Within the functional department, authority flows vertically, while authority that crosses departmental lines flows horizontally. This two-way flow of authority creates the matrix (Miner, 1982).

Committee Structure Organization

It is a popular method of managerial control and coordination particularly in a big organization. It is a supplementary device of internal organization. A committee is a formally organized or chartered group of individuals who meet repeatedly to consider some problem or problem area. Committee organization plans become usually an integrated part of line and staff organization and they are found at all levels of management hierarchy in large organizations (Iqbal, 2005).

Bureaucratic Structure Organization

The bureaucratic structure was originally designed to minimize the personal influence of the individual employee in decision-making and to coordinate the large number of decisions with the organization's goals.

Organizational Processes

Examining the effects of organizational structure on organizational processes should also consider the impact of those processes on organizational performance (Cheng & McKinley, 1983). An organization processes information to make sense of its environment, to create new knowledge and make decisions (Choo, 2002). Organizations that attain high levels of organizational processes should achieve high levels of performance and hence being effective. The organizational processes include, teamwork, information processing, management support and quality improvement efforts (Hyatt & Ruddy, 1997).

Constructs of Organizational Processes

The constructs used in organizational processes for the purpose of the study include the following:

Teamwork

Teamwork is defined as cooperation between those who are working on a task. Commonly, teamwork is understood as cooperation and willingness to work together. Teams and teamwork has become popular terms in management circles. The team approach to managing organizations is having diverse and substantial impacts on organizations and individuals. According to management expert Peter Drucker in Kreitner and Kinicki (2001), tomorrow's organizations will be flatter, information based, and organized around teams. This means that managers will need to polish their team skills. As competitive pressures intensify, organizational success increasingly will depend on teamwork rather than individual stars. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2001), the four purposes of team building are: to get goals and/or priorities; to analyse or allocate the way work is performed; to examine the way a group is working and its processes (such as norms, decision making, and communication), and to examine relationships among the people doing the work (Cohen & Ledford, 2006; Frobel & Marchington, 2005).

Technology and Information Processing

Technology implies the sequence of physical techniques, knowledge and equipment used to turn organizational inputs into outputs (Vonderembse et al., 1999). The current challenges within the higher education environment are likely to negatively impact on quality of university education considering that students' population is increasing drastically (Moi University Deans/Directors Workshop, 2011). Consequently, Magutu et al. (2010) reiterates that advances in Information Communication Technology have prompted changes in modes of delivery and information processing. There is need to continually expand and strengthen information and communication technologies (ICT) infrastructure by establishing and equipping computer laboratories for students and staff. Universities are within the new global market that is characterized by rapid information change, intense information flow and increasing competition.

Besides, in an attempt to understand management and information science, Woodward (2010), in her studies, concludes that organizations are more effective when their technology matches the organization's structure. Woodward identifies three types of technology, namely small batch, continuous process and mass production. According to Woodward (2010), small batch is the best because the production of custom items requires a good deal of informal communication and adaptation. Mass production is more effective when using a mechanistic structure because control over a complex and repetitive process could be effectively exerted by rules and regulations whereas a continuous process technology fitted an organic structure. Her assessment is that highly trained technicians monitor machines producing the organization's output and need to communicate freely about the production process and any irregularities that are noticed. Conversely, Gautam and Surinder (2007) are of the opinion that for organizations to cope with the ever increasing complexities of the changing environment, they must put in place systems to aid development.

Management Support

Management support implies the support provided to the employees by the top management in the organization in terms of encouraging new ideas and giving support to enable employees to experiment with new things. Several researchers have studied the impact of management support on successful organizational performance (McCann, 2004). They conclude that management support and rewards have a positive relationship with effectiveness variables that include cost leadership and work discretion.

Quality Improvement Efforts

Approaches to organizational performance were put up by quality authorities like Joseph Juran (1950s) and Edward Deming (1950s) which are embodied in a set of quality management practices (Magutu et al., 2010). As a result, different approaches have been adopted for the introduction of quality management in universities, such as self assessment and external assessment, accreditation and certification systems. Quality management presents a strategic option and an integrated management philosophy for organizations, which allows them to reach their objectives effectively and efficiently and to achieve sustainable competitive advantage (Hinnings et al., 2009). Quality accepts the need for complete customer satisfaction, but also recognizes that the organization itself needs to design, install and operate high quality internal systems that allow customer satisfaction to occur, and the organization must operate in a strategic context that is satisfactory to all stakeholders and not just customers. Quality, with reference to this paper, means customer/employee satisfaction, excitement or delight with the final product or service.

Organizational actors and processes do not exist in a vacuum; they are embedded in a larger organizational system with distinct structural characteristics. Organizations have employed a wide range of

structural options in dealing with the increased complexity, uncertainty, and interdependence that accompany quality implementation (Lorenz et al., 2006). Hence understanding the organization's structure should provide a greater insight into the effective implementation of quality management. Although a few researchers have suggested that quality management effectiveness necessitates changes in organizational structure and design (Tata & Prasad, 1998; Sohal & Ramsay, 1998), the issue has not been empirically examined in the literature.

This moderating variable plays a major role in the facilitation of organizational effectiveness. The organization creates and sustains an environment by responding to those environmental factors that enable the organization achieve the outcomes that organization intends to produce. Organizations face different environments, they produce different products; their organizational members are made up of different kinds of people, and so on.

Statement of the Problem

Organizational effectiveness in the institutions of higher learning should involve an internal functioning that is smooth and without strain and which will earn credit for the services offered and enabling employee satisfaction (McShanne & Glinow, 2008; Gibson et al., 1994). The nature of services in institutions of higher learning requires that all the stakeholders – managers, students, employees both teaching and non-teaching, suppliers – play positive roles in the sustainability of the organization's survival and progress towards giving quality teaching to their students and community as part of their corporate social responsibility.

A growing body of research has shown that relationship management has a positive impact on organizational objectives (Grunig & Hon, 1999; Huang, 2001; Ledingham, 2000). Building favourable relationships between an organization and its public contributes to desirable organizational outcomes such as organizational effectiveness. An organization with poor leadership is like a ship on the high seas without a captain. In such an institution, resources become wasted in fruitless ventures. Typically, all managerial situations are significantly influenced by the structure and processes prevailing in an organization (McCann, 2004). Consequently, understanding the relationship between structure and processes is a core requirement for gauging organizational effectiveness. Organizational structure can spell the difference between success and failure for an organization, as well as for the individuals who work there. Whereas very little is known about the role of organizational structures in terms of level of horizontal integration and nature of formalization, it has also emerged that communication and decision-making could also contribute to the achievement of organizational effectiveness. The study, therefore, examined the relationship among various structural constructs (including level of horizontal integration, nature of formalization, communication and decision making) that are applicable to institutions of higher learning in Kenya and its impact on organizational effectiveness.

II. Materials And Methods

The research was carried out in Moi University and University of Eastern Africa-Baraton both in Kenya. The two universities were targeted because they are both situated in a rural setting, accredited by the Commission for Higher Education (CHE), are members of the Inter-University Council of East Africa (IUCEA), Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), and the Association of African Universities (AAU).

Moi University is a public university. Its Main Campus is endowed with ample land located in Uasin Gishu County, 310 kilometres northwest of Nairobi. The Main Campus is located 36 kilometres South East of Eldoret town on a 1,632.04 hectares of land which was originally a wattle tree plantation formerly owned by EATEC (Moi University Calendar, 1996/1997). Its other campuses include Annex Campus (School of Law) located 5 kilometres South of Eldoret on a 45.4 hectare land, Town Campus situated within Eldoret town, off Eldoret-Iten road, and Eldoret West Campus situated five kilometres on the Eldoret-Turbo road. The University also has eight satellite campuses and Constituent Colleges distributed across the country.

University of East Africa, Baraton was established on December 21, 1978 as a private university owned, managed and run by the Seventh-Day Adventist Church. It is situated in Kapsabet Municipality, Nandi County, 9km off the main Eldoret-Kapsabet-Kisumu highway. It is situated on 339 acres of land about 50km from Eldoret town in the western side of the Nandi County. The Eldoret International Airport is only 35km away, a forty-minute ride to the institution. Baraton University has five schools with 18 academic departments and seven administrative departments (Moi University Calendar, 1996/1997).

The study employed a cross-sectional survey design that was descripto-explanatory in nature since the study focused on constructing the causal relationships of variables as having explanatory objective that can be implemented by analyzing quantitative data or qualitative information (Saunders et al., 2007; Zikmund, 2000). The study targeted employees (teaching and non-teaching staff) of Moi University, as well as those of the University of Eastern Africa- Baraton. Table 2 below presents the total number of teaching and non-teaching employees in both institutions.

Table 2: Survey Target Population

Institution	Teaching	Non-teaching	Total
Moi University	934	1096	2030
UEA-Baraton	293	130	423
Total	1227	1226	2453

Source: Moi University Human Resource Records (2011); UEA-Baraton Human Resource Records (2011)

In order to ensure a high rate of response, the research opted for a sample size of 365 which is approximately closer to the desired sample size of 344. This was necessary so as to take into consideration the non-responses. Stratified random sampling proportionate to strata size was employed in the selection of the 365 respondents. In this case, the researcher stratified the population into teaching and non-teaching staff. Employment numbers were used to randomly pick the respondents from each stratum to participate in the study. This was achieved using proportionate sampling of both the non-teaching and teaching staff from the two universities.

Consequently, a total of 300 respondents were sampled from Moi University and comprised 138 teaching staff and 162 non-teaching staff. Similarly, a total of 65 respondents were sampled from the University of Eastern Africa-Baraton, and consisted of 45 teaching staff and 20 non-teaching staff. Simple random sampling method was used to identify the teaching and non-teaching staff to be selected from each university population. Thus each of the 934 teaching staff from Moi University was assigned a number from 001 to 934. Random numbers were then picked to identify the required 138 teaching staff.

The primary data for the study was obtained through a questionnaire. Secondary data was obtained from existing literature under the topic and title of study. These included written information such as organization policies obtained from records/reports and/or University Calendar, published and unpublished books, journals, theses and dissertations, Ministry of Education documents, the internet, and previous research works done by other scholars. Two main tools were used to collect data, namely the questionnaire and a document analysis protocol.

Organizational processes were measured indirectly using four domains, namely team work, information processing and technology, management support and quality improvement efforts. Organizational effectiveness was measured indirectly using four dimensions. These were: productivity, stability, resource acquisition, and human resource satisfaction and development. Institutional organization structure was measured indirectly using four dimensions. These were: nature of formalization, level of horizontal integration, level of communication and locus of decision making (Adapted from Nahm et al., 2003 and modified by the researcher).

The data obtained was first screened and cleaned for missing values, normality and outliers. The missing values were replaced using the series means as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). Moreover, univariate outliers were identified using standardized residuals with items with standardized residuals of more than +3.0 and less than -3.0 being considered outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Such items were deleted from further analysis. Multivariate outliers were assessed using Mahalanobis distance (D^2). First, the Principal Components Factor Analysis (PCA) was used to determine the factor structure of the constructs. Construct means and standard deviations were computed to examine the variance in responses within constructs. The Shapiro-wilk test together with the normal Q-Q plots were used to help explain the normality of the data. Inter-variable correlation was then used to establish the degree of linear relationship between the study variables. Independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean differences in organizational structure and organizational effectiveness between the two groups drawn from the two universities.

Firstly, multiple regression analyses were conducted to test whether nature of formalization and level of horizontal integration were antecedents of level of communication and locus of decision making respectively. Secondly, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to test the predictive ability of organizational structure on organizational effectiveness while controlling for the influence of respondents background characteristics of gender, level of education and duration served in institution.

III. Results

The Effect of Organizational Structure on Organizational Effectiveness

The research sought to examine the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness. It was hypothesized that there was no significant statistical relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness. Organizational effectiveness was measured using productivity, stability, resource acquisition and human resource satisfaction and development. The indexes representing each of these factors were developed by averaging responses on items measuring each of them. Hierarchical regression analysis was then used to test the hypothesis. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis of organizational effectiveness on organizational structure were as presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Results of Regression Analysis: Effect of Organizational Structure on Organizational Effectiveness

Predictors	Organizational Effectiveness							
	Productivity		Stability		Resource Acq.		Hr S & D	
	Model1 Std.β	Model2 Std.β	Model1 Std.β	Model2 Std.β	Model1 Std.β	Model2 Std.β	Model1 Std.β	Model2 Std.β
Step1:								
Controls								
Gender	.005	.014	.026	.056	.048	.054	.036	.009
Education	.006	.045	.060	.027	.098	.130	.047	.002
Duration	.229**	.115**	.165**	.074	.172**	.106	.155**	.045
Step2:								
Org.struct.								
LC		.293**		.335**		.136		.337**
LDM		.360**		.193**		.244**		.296**
R ²	.053	.386	.035	.256	.036	.150	.028	.340
Adj.R ²	.043	.375	.026	.243	.026	.135	.019	.329
ΔR ²	.053	.333	.036	.221	.036	.114	.028	.312
Δ F-value	5.499**	79.595**	3.636*	43.580**	3.702*	19.637**	2.886*	64.479**
Durbin-Watson	2.162		1.953		1.827		1.901	

Note: LC- Level of communication, LDM- Locus of decision making, P- Productivity, S- Stability, RA- Resource acquisition, HSD- Human resource satisfaction and development
Source: Survey Data (2012)

From the results in the table above, it is evident that both gender and level of education had no significant effect on productivity (R² value = 0.053), stability (R² value = 0.035), resource acquisition (R² value = 0.036), and human resource satisfaction and development (R² value = 0.028). However, duration served in the institution had a significant effect on productivity (β = 0.229, p<0.01), stability (β=0.165, p<0.01), resource acquisition (β=0.172, p<0.01), and human resource satisfaction and development (β=0.155, p<0.01). On adding the organizational structure variables, the R² of productivity increased to 0.386 indicating that the two dimensions of organizational structure contributed an additional 33.3% to the variance in productivity.

Similarly, the R² of stability increased from 0.036 to 0.256 showing that level of communication and locus of decision-making contributed an additional 22.1% to the variance in organizational stability. The R² of resource acquisition increased to 0.150 meaning that the level of communication and locus of decision-making contributed an additional 11.4% to the variance in resource acquisition. The R² of human resource satisfaction and development increased to 0.340 indicating that the level of communication and locus of decision-making contributed an additional 31.2% to the variance in human resource satisfaction and development.

Of the two organizational structure dimensions, level of communication was found to be positively and significantly related to productivity (β=0.293, p<0.01), stability (β=0.335, p<0.01), and human resource satisfaction and development (β=0.136, p<0.01). However, it had no significant relationship with resource acquisition (β=0.136, p>0.05). Locus of decision-making was found to be positively and significantly related to productivity (β=0.360, p<0.01), stability (β=0.193, p<0.01), resource acquisition (β=0.244, p<0.01), and human resource satisfaction and development). The hypothesis was, therefore, not supported.

Testing for Moderation

The research further sought to establish the moderating effect of organizational processes on the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness. Consequently, the following multiple regression equation was estimated:

$$Y = i + aX + bM + c XM + \epsilon$$

Where Y = Organizational effectiveness

X = Organizational structure

M= Organizational process

XM = Interaction between organizational structure and organizational processes

a = main effect of X on Y, and

c = moderation effect

The study tested the interaction between organizational structure which was the independent variable and organizational process which was the moderating variable. Hierarchical regression was used by first entering organizational structure and organizational processes in step 1 and then entering the interaction variable (standardized organizational structure * standardized organizational processes) in step 2. The standardized values were used for the interaction variable so as to reduce multi-collinearity by reducing the size of any high correlation of organizational structure or the organizational processes with the new interaction variable. The

change in R² value was then assessed. If R² increase was found to be significant, then the moderating effect was confirmed. Results shown in Table 3 indicate that the R² change was 0.221 when the interaction variable was added to the predictor and moderator variables. This change was significant, Change in F = 43.580. This significant interaction indicates that the presumed moderator (organizational processes) does actually moderate the effects of the predictor (organizational structure) on the outcome variable (organizational effectiveness). Ho₄ was, therefore, not supported.

Table 3: Testing the Moderating Effect of Organizational Processes on the Relationship between Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Durbin-Watson	
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		Sig. F Change
1	.187 ^a	.035	.026	.44762	.035	3.636	2	297	.025	
2	.506 ^b	.256	.243	.44740	.221	43.580	1	296	.000	1.976

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational structure, Organizational processes,
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational structure, Organizational processes, Organizational structure*Organizational processes

Dependent Variable: Organizational effectiveness

Source: Survey Data (2012)

Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness.

The significant coefficient between level of communication and productivity (0.293), stability (0.335), human resource satisfaction and development (0.337) as well as the significant coefficients between locus of decision making and productivity (0.360), stability (0.193), resource acquisition (0.244) and human resource development (0.296) indicate that the hypotheses was not supported. These results further show that a 1% increase in communication is likely to result in a 0.293% increase in productivity, a 0.335% increase in stability, and a 0.337% increase in human resource satisfaction and development. Similarly, a 1% increase locus of decision making is likely to lead a 0.360% increase in productivity, a 0.193% in stability, a 0.244% increase in resource acquisition, and a 0.296% increase in human resource satisfaction and development.

Hypothesis Ho₂: Organizational processes do not significantly moderate the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness.

The R² change value of 0.221 and the F-change value of 43.580 were significant. The hypothesis was therefore not supported. This confirms that organizational processes significantly moderate the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness.

IV. Discussion

Relationship between Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness

The study postulated a lack of relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness. The study found out that there was a positive and significant relationship between organizational structure through its dimensions of level of communication and locus of decision-making and organizational effectiveness through its dimensions of productivity, stability, resource acquisition, and human resource satisfaction and development. These findings were consistent with those of other scholars in the reviewed literature.

According to Daft (1995), a high level of communication facilitates coordinated actions, which is critical to the successful implementation of any radical innovation and hence increased production, stability and resource acquisition. In supporting these views, Walton (1995) notes that the creation of organizational practices depends on fast, easy and abundant communication across the value chain and up the hierarchy. Consequently, organizational processes such as meeting deadlines, adhering to scheduled times, meeting the needs of the employees, and building customer relationships all of which define effectiveness are based on high levels of communication. In essence, therefore, effective communication complements effectiveness in organizations.

The study also found that locus of decision making has a direct and positive impact on organizational effectiveness. This was more so with regards to human resource satisfaction and development. This finding lends support to findings by Chew (2004) and Peterson (2008) that training provides employees with specific skills or helps correct deficiencies in their performances, while development is an effort to provide employees with abilities the organization will need to be effective. Decisions regarding employee development continue to be an important aspect associated with effectiveness. This is more so considering that professional development is the engine that keeps the universities true to their mandate as centres of ideas and innovation (Raisch &

Birkinshaw, 2008). Besides, the ability of professionals to decide work patterns, actively participate in major academic decision-making, and to be relatively free of bureaucratic regulations and restrictions (Gay et al., 2006) is likely to structure the organization to maximize professional concerns.

The positive and significant relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness strongly supports the views of Daft (1995). Accordingly, it is logical to expect an organization's structure and situation to have an impact on its effectiveness and hence on its performance, or on its potential for performing well. However, Daft (1995) notes that it also seems reasonable to expect the actions of management, based on its perceptions of situational and structural constraints, to have a great deal to do with the organization's chances for success. Indeed, the findings in the study showing more autonomy to work teams in UEA-Baraton as opposed to Moi university lend support to the findings of Welsh and MetCalf (2003) and Rainey (2009) which suggest that resistance to organizational effectiveness stems more from concerns about lack of management support and suspicions about the true motivation behind management call for organizational effectiveness activities than from an inherent values fit problem.

The Moderating Effect of Organizational Processes on the Relationship between Organizational Structure and Organizational Effectiveness

The study hypothesized that organizational processes do not significantly moderate the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness. The hierarchical regression results indicated that organizational processes do actually moderate the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness.

This finding supports the findings of other studies which suggest that organizational processes contribute significantly to organizational effectiveness by addressing factors inherent within these processes such as team-cohesion, group potency, management support, among others. According to Gully (2002), group potency refers to the collective beliefs about the group members' capability that the group can be effective in adverse condition of task. Consequently, group potency helps to motivate a workforce towards organizational effectiveness.

In supporting these views, Ensley and Pearson (2005) note that the degree to which members of a team are attracted to each other continues to unite employees within a group in pursuit of organizational goals and objectives. In turn, such cohesion indicates high significant effect on performance. How people seek out and access the resources necessary to perform their work is relevant to a range of organizational process that hinge on informal networks. Cross functional teams are, therefore, seen as channels for knowledge transfer and integration across organizational boundaries. This clearly shows that despite the positive and significant influences of organizational structure on organizational effectiveness, teamwork as a facet of organizational processes moderates this relationship.

The finding that organizational processes moderate the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness also concurs with the findings by Jong et al. (2005) and Huang (2001) who posit that management support, which is also founded in organizational process, has a positive effect on group potency and hence organizational effectiveness. This implies that management support does moderate the relationship between teamwork and organizational effectiveness. In supporting these assertions, Fedor et al. (2003) and Kuo (2004) observe that leadership of team plays a significant role in the level of achievement realization. Besides, several researchers indicate that team leadership is positively related to a team's satisfaction, and hence effectiveness (Qzaralli, 2003; Fedor et al., 2003; Stock, 2006). To improve efficiency and effectiveness in delivering their services, staff must feel satisfied and there needs to be clear policies outlining their strategy for human resource development.

Apart from management support and teamwork, information processing and technology was also found to moderate effectiveness mainly through reduction of turn-around time and especially in diverse learning environments where the influence of technology and policies shape decisions and outcomes. According to Bretschneider (2011), Muherji et al. (2004) and Woodward (2010), management information systems are increasingly becoming important to both private and public sector organizations. Access to accurate information available in a timely fashion can influence decision making and hence affect the level of effectiveness of employees. Consequently, information processing and technology could be used as a tool for moderating the relationship between management of information and organizational effectiveness. The swiftness of information technology developments and availability has major implications for the work environment. There is, therefore, need to exploit the potential of information technology to strengthen managements systems in the institutions of higher learning in order to improve access to information by all concerned.

V. Conclusion And Recommendations

From a practical and managerial contribution, many important insights can be gained from the findings of the research. Understanding how important organizational structure is in contemporary

organizational effectiveness, the study demonstrates to managers that for effectiveness to be achieved, they must develop and maintain teamwork, provide support, have turn-around strategies in information systems as well as create an environment of satisfaction and development of its employees. Management of the existing infrastructural and human resource capacity must, however, be effective and be utilized for the benefit of the society. Unplanned growth of university education without commensurate rise in the level of decentralization of activities is a threat to effectiveness – efficiency in public universities. Planning for internal logistics improvement can help enhance effectiveness. If these are combined together they can assure organizational success.

As institutions grow larger, a certain amount of formalization is inevitable. Employees require some direction in their job responsibilities and in the procedures required for consistency within the organization's production schema. When organizing, however, managers should be aware of the costs of excessive formalization, which may include stifling employee creativity and innovation as well as slowing the organization's responsiveness to critical issues and problems.

High performing organizations need to move beyond conventional approaches and continually re-examine their approach to effectiveness assessment in the context of current and emerging market forces. There is need to document performances using indicators that reflect the needs and expectations of multiple stakeholders. The appearance of constraints, negative consequences, and the focus on peripheral areas will further limit positive outcomes. Organizational improvements are a combination of changes in the organizational structure variables and organizational processes that culminate in organizational effectiveness. The outcomes generated by organizations are the ultimate measure of effectiveness.

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that organizational structures arise as reflections of rationalized organizational rules which account for the expansion and increased complexity of formal organizational structures, hence formal procedures make it difficult for employees to be creative. Therefore, there is need to put procedures in place that can help ensure that all members have the opportunity to present their ideas. There is also a need to compile and report information on work and education outcomes to enable the commitment of resources to ailing units. This means that the models and measures for assessing effectiveness must be flexible and dynamic and ones that can change to fit the demands of the market. In addition, external forces are driving heightened expectations for technology in organizations. The large scale movement towards online communication has fuelled an expectation among employees that technology can resolve pressure capacity problems for less money and less paper work. This needs to be facilitated to provide for more effective services.

References

- [1]. Bretschneider, S. (2011). Management Information Systems in Public and Private Organizations. An empirical Test. *Public Administration Review*, 50(5).
- [2]. Chew, J. (2004). Managing MNC Expatriates through Crises: A challenge for International Human Resource Management. *Research and Practice in Human Resource management*, 12(2), 1-30.
- [3]. Choo, C. W. (2002). Sense making, Knowledge Creation, and Decision-Making: Organizational Knowing as Emergent Strategy. *Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital and Organizational Knowledge*.
- [4]. Cohen, S., & Ledford, G. (2006). *The effectiveness of self-managing teams: A Quasi Experiment In Human Relations* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- [5]. Daft, R. L. (1995). *Organization Theory and Design* (5th ed.). New York: West Publishing Company.
- [6]. Day, G. (1999). *Aligning Organizational Structure to the Market*. Business Strategy Review. Autumn.
- [7]. Ensley, M. D., & Pearson, A. W. (2005). An exploratory comparison of the behavioural dynamics of top management teams in family and nonfamily new ventures: Cohesion, Conflict, potency, and consensus. *Baylor University*, 267-284.
- [8]. Fedor, D. B. (2003). Team effectiveness in Multinational organization. *Group and Organization Management*, 28, 4, 444 -474.
- [9]. Frobels, P., & Marchington, M. (2005). Team working: Structure and Worker Perceptions. A Cross-National study in Pharmaceuticals. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(2), 256-276.
- [10]. Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (8th ed.). Upper /Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- [11]. Gautam, V., & Surinder, B. K. (2007). *Organization Development Systems*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- [12]. Gray, J. L., & Starke, F. A. (1984). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts and Application*. Columbus Merrill Publishing Company.
- [13]. Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. Jr. (1994). *Organizations: Behaviour, Structure, Processes* (8th ed.). Boston: Richard D. Irwin.
- [14]. Gully, S. M. A. (2002). A meta-analysis of team-efficacy, potency, and performance: Interdependence and level of analysis as moderators of observed relationships. *J. Apply Psychology*, 87(5), 819-832.
- [15]. Grung J. E., & Hon, L. C. (1999). *Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations*. Gainesville, FL: The Institute for Public Relations.
- [16]. Huang, J. (2001). *From Organizational Effectiveness to Relationship Indicators*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [17]. Hinings, C. R., Thibault, L., & Kikulis, L. M. (2009). Values and Organizational Structure. *Human Relations*, 49(7), 885-915.
- [18]. Hyatt, D. E., & Ruddy, T. M. (1997). An examination of the relationship between work group characteristics and performance: Once more into the breach. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 533-555.
- [19]. Iqbal, M. (2005). *A study of Leadership Behaviour and effectiveness of Secondary School Heads in Pakistan* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Lahore, Institute of education and research, University of Punjab.
- [20]. Jong, A. D., Ruyter, K. D., & Wetzels, M. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of group potency: A study of self-managing service team. *Management Science*, 51(11), 1610-1625.

- [21]. Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour* (5th ed.). Burr ridge, ILL; Irwin/McGraw Hill.
- [22]. Kuo, C. C. (2004). Research on impacts of team leadership on team effectiveness. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5(1/2), 266-277. Cambridge.
- [23]. Ledingham, J. A. (2000). Guidelines to Building and Maintaining Strong Organization Public Relations. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 45(3), 44-46.
- [24]. Lorenz, E. et al. (2006). *The Organization of Work and Innovative Performance*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- [25]. Magutu, P. O., et al. (2010). *Quality Management Practices in Kenyan Education Institutions: The Case of the University of Nairobi*. Longhorn Publishers.
- [26]. McCann, J. (2004). *Organizational Effectiveness: Changing Concepts for Changing Environments*. Human Resource Planning, March 2004 issue.
- [27]. McShane, S. L., & Glinow M. A. V. (2008). *Organizational behaviour, Emerging Realities for the Workplace Revolution* (4th ed.). McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- [28]. Miner, J. B. (1982). *Theories of Organizational Structure and Process*. Chicago, IL: The Dryden Press.
- [29]. Moi University Deans/Directors Workshop Report held at Hotel Cathay, Nakuru, 24th-25th March, 2011.
- [30]. Nahm, A. Y., et al. (2003). The Impact of Organizational structure on time-based manufacturing and plant performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 21, 281-306.
- [31]. Peterson, J. (2008). The effect of personnel stability on organizational performance. RAND Corporation. Retrieved August 2, 2012 from RAN URL:<http://www.rand.org>
- [32]. Qzaralli, N. (2003). Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 24(5/6), 335-344.
- [33]. Raisch, S., & Birkinshaw, J. M. (2008). Organizational Ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes and moderators. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 375-409.
- [34]. Robbins, S. P. (1983). *Organizational Theory: The Structure and Design of Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [35]. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students* (4th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- [36]. Sohal, A. S., & Ramsay, L. (1998). Requirements for successful implementation of total quality management. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 16, 505-519.
- [37]. Stock, R. R. (2006). Inter-organizational Teams as boundary spanners between supplier and customer companies. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 34(4), 588-599.
- [38]. Tata, I., & Prasad, S. (1998). Quality management strategies at the United States-Mexico border. *International Journal of Management*, 15, 212-217.
- [39]. Tabachnik B. G., & Fidell, A. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Pearson: Allyn and Bacon.
- [40]. Vonderembse, M. A., Rangunathan, T. S., & Rao, S. S. (1999). A post-industrial paradigm: to integrate and automate manufacturing. *International Journal of Production Research*, 35(9), 2579-2599.
- [41]. Walton, R. E. (1985). *From control to commitment: transforming work force management in the United States*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, pp. 237-265.
- [42]. Welsh, J. F., & Metcalf, J. (2003). Faculty and Administrative Support for Institutional Effectiveness Activities: A Bridge Across the Chasm? *Journal of Higher Education*, 74 (4), 445-68.
- [43]. Woodward, J. (2010). *Management and Information Science. Organizational Effectiveness, Structure and Technology 2010*. Retrieved June 10, 2012 from mhtml:file://C:\Documents and Settings\USER\Organiza effectiveness.mht