

Organisation Design and Organisational Effectiveness in the Construction Industry: Evidence from Nigeria

Anietie P. Akpan^{1*}, Christiana B. Nsien²

¹Department of Business Management, University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State

²Department of Business Education, College Of Education, Afaha Nsit, Akwa Ibom State

***Corresponding author**

Anietie P. Akpan

Article History

Received: 09.09.2017

Accepted: 15.09.2017

Published: 30.09.2017

DOI:

10.21276/sjbms.2017.2.9.2



Abstract: This study was designed to examine the relationship between organisation design and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. The population of this study was the entire managerial staff population of Julius Berger Nigeria Plc and Setraco Nigeria Limited, both construction companies in Nigeria. The study adopted the survey research design and copies of structured questionnaire were administered to a sample of 341 respondents. Proxies for organisation design were drawn from Kates and Galbraith “Star Model” of organisation design. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the data, while simple linear regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses formulated for the study. The findings of this study indicate that the five elements under study have strong positive relationship with organisational performance. Consequently, it is recommended that management of organisations in the Nigerian construction industry should consider all five elements when designing or re-designing their organisation.

Keywords: Organisation design, Organisational effectiveness, Strategy, Structure, Rewards, People, Process, Star model

INTRODUCTION

Organisation design has always been an important factor influencing the behaviour of individuals and groups that comprise the organisation; the new rules of operating in today’s global business environment make design considerations even more critical.

Today, managers are faced with an array of different design possibilities. Ultimately, it is through the design of the organisation that management can establish expectations for what individuals and groups will do to achieve the organisation’s purposes. It is through the design of an organisation that managers decide how the goals of the organisation will be accomplished.

Organisation design can be defined narrowly, as the process of reshaping organisation structure and roles, or it can more effectively be defined as the alignment of structure, process, rewards, metrics and talent with the strategy of the business [1]. [2] opined that organisation design is the deliberate process of configuring structures, processes, reward systems, and people practices to create an effective organisation capable of achieving the business strategy.

Many studies have been carried out on organisation design and organisational effectiveness, however, there has been mixed results. While some reported a significant correlation between organisation design and organisational effectiveness [3-5] others did not support a direct positive relationship between this two variables [6,7]. Moreover, majority of the studies on organisation design and organisational effectiveness

focus their attention on other models of organisation design. Therefore, this study is designed to examine organisation design and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry using the [2] model.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An organisation does not simply appear on its own. Organisations are contrived social systems that are created by like-minded groups of persons in order to pursue and hopefully achieve a stated goal or purpose [8]. Organisation design is concerned with the factors and issues that must be considered, and the rules and processes that must be implemented, with respect to the design, development, implementation and maintenance of a successful and effective organisation. Also, since an organisation is perceived as a continuum that exists over a period of time, organisation design is concerned with maintaining coherence over the life of the organisation.

A wide range of methods and models have been used to identify and depict the elements that must be considered in the organisation design process. One of the most popular is the “Star Model”, which was first developed by Galbraith in 1977 and which emphasizes the following five major components: tasks, structure,

information and decision processes, compensation and reward systems and people (i.e., human resources management) [8].

[9] modified the five elements of the Star Model to include strategy along with other elements of structure, business processes and lateral linkages, compensation and reward systems, and human resource management. [2] further modified the Star Model of organisation design to include the following five elements: strategy, structure, process, people and reward.

Several other models of organisation design have evolved and been popularized by business consultants and academics. For example, [10] added information technology to structure, process, people, culture and strategy to form a 6-point model of organisation design which emphasises how the choice made with respect to organisational strategy should be tightly aligned with the other organisational elements.

Another model of organisation design is based on taking a strategic focus toward the following five areas: vision and strategy, values and culture, leadership and management, business processes, including information technology; and organisational structure, both formal and informal [8].

In the same vein, [10] referenced informal and formal organisational structure, business processes and human resources. [11] focused on vision, strategic goals and strategic management, organisational culture and organisational structure. [12] mentioned the role of the organisation (i.e., strategy and purpose), reward systems, groupings (i.e., organisational structure) and business processes and work design. However, this study is predicated upon [2] model of organisation design which stipulates the five elements as strategy, structure process, people and reward.

Strategy

Strategy is a company's formula for success. It sets the organisation's direction and encompasses the company's vision and mission, as well as its short and long term goals [2]. Strategy is derived from the leadership's understanding of the external factors (competitors, suppliers, customers, and emerging technologies) that bear on the firm, combined with their understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the organisation in relationship to those factors. The organisation's strategy is the cornerstone of the organisation design process [2,8,13]. The purpose of a strategy is to gain competitive advantage. This advantage can be gained through both the external factors and superior internal organisational capabilities. Creating superior organisational capabilities in order to

gain competitive advantage is the goal of organisation design.

Organisation design is a series of choices and decisions. In any decision making process, clear criteria serve the purpose of allowing alternatives to be evaluated against agreed-on standards [2]. The further opined that the criteria used for organisation design decisions are the organisational capabilities that will differentiate the organisation and help it execute its strategy. The organisational capabilities are the link between the strategy and organisational requirements the strategy demands.

How a company chooses to compete determines the most important organisational capabilities. As a company's strategy changes, so do the differentiating organisational capabilities it needs. The process of identifying the most important organisational capabilities is the first step in drawing the connection between the strategy and the form of the organisation. Once the capabilities have been identified, a set of organisational implications can be generated to form the basis for a discussion of alternatives.

Structure

An organisation's structure determines where formal power and authority are located. Typically, units are formed around functions, products, geographies, or customers, and are then configured into a hierarchy for management and decision making [14]. The structure is what is shown on a typical organisation chart.

Organisation design is not limited to structural considerations, and many variations of a structure can be made to work. However, if the structure is not approximately right, then it will be harder to align the other design elements with the strategy [15]. The structure sets out the reporting relationships, power distribution, and communication channels. It determines who comes in contact with whom. The structure projects a message about what work is most important. If the structure does not support the strategy, then everyone in the organization would be working against an obstacle.

According to [16], there are four elements that organisational structure are derived from. These elements are function, product, geography, and customer. It is these four elements that bring about the four structures namely; functional product, geographical, and customer structures.

Process

Process means a series of connected activities that move information up and down and cross the organisation [2]. This includes work processes, such as developing a new product, closing a deal, or filling an

order. It also includes management processes, such as planning and forecasting sales, business portfolio management, price setting, standards development, capacity management, and conflict resolution. Processes that cross organisational boundaries force organisational units to work together. Their design has a significant impact on how well units work together vertically or laterally. Clear articulation of roles and responsibilities is essential for the design of good processes. A consequence of a process are terms like team, integrative roles and matrix.

Teams are cross-business structures that bring people together to work interdependently and share collective responsibility for outcomes. A team can be configured around any dimension. Teams are more formal and membership is on appointment not voluntary. Also, a team's charter will specify accountability and expected outcomes. Teams typically require a leader, dedicated resources, and senior-level sponsorship and attention.

Integrative roles provide a higher level of coordination than teams [2]. Teams are typically staffed by people who remain in their business unit and devote part of their time to the team's mission, or are pulled out of their unit to participate on the team for a limited period of time. An integrative role is a full-time job for a manager who is in charge with orchestrating work across units. People with integrative roles have accountability for results but do not directly manage the resources they need to achieve these results. Successful integrators are people who have high credibility and strong influence skills [2].

A matrix is a set of dual reporting relationships used to balance two or more dimensions in an organisation [2]. Networks, teams, and integrative roles all serve to integrate a secondary dimension. The matrix allow both dimensions to be equal. Selected roles in the organisation report to two managers from different units, representing distinct structural dimensions. Since these managers are required to jointly set objectives, resolve conflicting priorities, and manage performance of the shared resources, they are forced to take a broader view than if they focused solely on one dimension of the business. The matrix forces managers at a lower level in the organisation to make decisions from a general management perspective. The matrix can also promote a much more flexible and efficient use of resources, since teams do not have to be duplicated along every dimension.

Processes are the principal means of coordinating activities. Well-designed processes and ensure that the right people are brought together for quick decision making. It allow more decisions to be made closer to customers and the activities affected,

and also allow the company to be responsive to multiple constituencies [2].

Rewards

Rewards align individual behaviours and performance with the organisation's goals. This is so because the reward system in an organisation communicates what the organisation values more clearly than any written statement can. The reward system motivates employees and reinforces the behaviours that add value to the organisation through salary, bonuses, stock, recognition, benefits, among others.

[17] stated that for reward to be effective, it must be formulated and built on transparency, fairness and controllability. These features have a linkage with each other

i. Transparency

A transparent reward system would not only inform employees who would not want to take risk of the rules of the reward system, but it also keeps them abreast with the objectives of the organisation. The policies of the system, if effectively communicated to these employees, will facilitate their understanding of how the system works and create an environment to support the implementation of the reward system. Perceived uncertainty decreases the effectiveness of reward system [18].

In short, how employees perceive reward systems to be transparent will have a positive and propelling effect on their level of motivation to perform. Lessening the risk of working hard and not getting rewarded accordingly in return is projected to make employees want to put in more effort and therefore enhance effectiveness.

ii. Fairness

According to [18] although economic theory of trust is not well developed, the reliability and trustworthiness of the principal is expected to influence the actions of the employee greatly. Other theories like the Reciprocity theory have also concentrated on the concept of fairness as well, but have used different angles. It mentions that in relation to the employer, employee's reward should be an amount that is fair. According to this theory in the agency contract any surpluses created must be divided fairly so as to enhance incentives. If the employee perceives that this concept of fairness has not been delivered in any way, there is the likelihood that their motivation to perform will be reduced hence reducing organisational effectiveness.

Moreover, according to [19] equity theory emphasizes the fact that employee's need to receive a

fair amount of reward relative to the other employees and that the employee is expected to compare his/her ratio of performance over reward to the same ratio of other employees. Any deviation in this ratio causes a state of inequity. A study by [20] has shown that managers who perceive effort-reward fairness perform better and feel more satisfied than managers who perceive under-reward unfairness. However, inaccurate or untrue and undifferentiated evaluations reduce the effectiveness of incentives in organisations [18]. Hence, perceived fairness is expected to be a determinant to motivate performance and organisational effectiveness.

iii. Controllability

The third characteristic we use to evaluate the reward system's effectiveness is controllability. [21] defines controllability as the extent to which the employee is able to control or influence the outcome of the process of determining performance measures that are to be rewarded. Within the cognitive evaluation theory, the controlling and informing elements of a reward system are expected to have an effect not only on performance but on motivation as well [22]. An employee, who is involved in determining the performance measures that are used in an incentive program, will perceive the performance measurement itself as less controlling. Implementing reward system effectively has the potential to motivate employees to improve their effort and ability to perform desirably.

People

This implies the human resource management practices of an organisation. These practices include selection, staffing, training, and development that are established to help form the capabilities and mind-sets necessary to carry out the organisation's strategy. An organisation requires an effective management team that understands how to use the organisation as a lever for competitive advantage. Also, an organisation requires employees at all levels to have a fundamental set of competencies to interact across organisational boundaries, participate on teams, and make decisions that take multiple perspectives into account.

According to [2], the competencies that the organisation needs to select for and develop include the ability to: view issues holistically and from cross-functional and cross-cultural perspectives; negotiate and influence without formal authority or positional power; build relationships and networks and skilfully work through informal channels; advocate and collaborate without bullying or compromising; and share decision rights and resources and make joint decisions with peers. Others are exhibit flexibility and resolve conflicts; manage projects with discipline; and make decisions in situations of ambiguity and change

Management must also model these abilities and behaviours. Transparency and open communication channels between employees and managers create an important foundation for all of these competencies thereby enhancing organisational effectiveness.

Organisational Effectiveness

The concept of organizational effectiveness is ordinarily used to refer to goal-attainment i.e. "how well" an organization is doing, or to organisation's relative "overall success" and the adequacy with which it operates given certain facilities and resources [23]. Traditionally, in management researches, effectiveness has been viewed and operationalized mainly in terms of organizational productivity, net profit, the extent to which the organization accomplishes its various missions, success of the organization in maintaining or expanding itself, morale, commitment to the organization, personnel turnover and absenteeism, and member satisfactions [18,23-25].

With the exception of organizational productivity, practically all variables which have been used in research as measures of organizational effectiveness have been found to be inadequate and unsatisfactory [26,27]. For example, previous findings regarding morale and member satisfaction in relation to effectiveness have frequently been inconsistent, non-significant, and difficult to evaluate and interpret. The case of turnover and absenteeism is similar. A major problem in using these variables as criteria of effectiveness is their differential sensitivity to such third considerations as the nature and volume of work to be processed, organizational level affected, and season of occurrence apart from the degree of such occurrence [28,29]. Net profit is likewise a poor criterion in view of many unanticipated fluctuations external to the system, e.g., fluctuations in the general economy, markets, sales, and prices.

In view of these and related inadequacies, we have conceptually defined organizational effectiveness according to [28] as the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members. This conception of effectiveness subsumes three general criteria: (1) organizational productivity; (2) organizational flexibility in the form of successful adjustment to internal organizational changes and successful adaptation to externally induced change; and (3) absence of intra-organizational strain, or tension and conflict between organizational subgroups. These three criteria both relate to the means-end dimension of organizations and, potentially, apply to nearly all organizations. For this study, organisational effectiveness was measured using organisational

productivity, organisational flexibility and intra-organisational strain.

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses of the study were formulated as follows:

- a. There is no significant relationship between strategy and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry;
- b. There is no significant relationship between structure and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry;
- c. There is no significant relationship between process and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry;
- d. There is no significant relationship between rewards and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry; and
- e. There is no significant relationship between people and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a survey research design. The target population of the study comprised all the staff of Julius Berger Nigeria Plc and Setraco Construction Limited, both construction companies in Nigeria. From their combined managerial (i.e. from supervisors and above) staff population, a sample size of 360 employees (180 from each organisation) was selected for this study.

The major instrument for data collection was the Organisation Design Survey Instrument (ODSI). Organisation Design Survey Instrument (ODSI) is a multi-rater survey instrument that is based on the elements of organisation design as put across by Kates

and Galbraith as well as the measures of organisational effectiveness (i.e organisational productivity, organisational flexibility and intra-organisational strain). For this study, organisational productivity was measured on the basis of standard, companywide records of individual performance vis-a-vis established work-standards, and the number of units of work accomplished during a certain time interval. Organizational flexibility was measured as the extent to which the organization is able to absorb relevant endogenous and exogenous changes, or its ability to adjust to internally induced change and to adapt to externally induced change. While intra-organizational strain was conceptualized as the incidence and rate of tension or conflict existing between organizational subgroups.

The instrument was subjected to face and content validity. It was trial-tested through pilot study using 15 employees of Julius Berger Plc. The pilot study helped to enhance the validation process for the instrument. Cronbach Alpha reliability statistics was adopted to test the reliability of the instrument with the items having a reliability coefficient of 0.81. The validated questionnaire was then used in collecting data from the respondents. Copies of the questionnaire were administered to the respondents at their place of work during official hours. 341 copies of the questionnaire representing 94.7% were completed and returned. Descriptive statistics (simple percentages and frequencies count) were used to analyse the data, while regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses formulated.

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION
Demographic Characteristics

Table 1: Respondents' Profile

S/N	Sample Characteristics	Number of Respondents	Respondents (%)
1	Sex		
	Male	292	85.6
	Female	49	14.4
2	Age		
	21-30	33	9.7
	31-40	140	41.0
	41-50	136	39.9
	Above 50	32	9.4

Source: Field survey 2017

Table 1 shows that male respondents were more than female respondents in the study. The male respondents represented 54.8% while the remaining 45.2% were of the female category. Those between the ages of 21-30 constituted 62.9% of the population,

27% were between 31-40 years while 9.7% were those of 41-50 years bracket. Those above 50 years were

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between strategy and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry

Table 2: Regression analysis results for Hypothesis 1
Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.582 ^a	.339	.334	1.17473		
a Predictors: (Constant), strategy						
ANOVA^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
1	Regression	30.700	1	30.700	22.241	.000 ^b
	Residual	469.321	340	1.380		
	Total	500.021	341			
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						
b. Predictors: (Constant), strategy						
Coefficients						
		Unstandardised Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient	t	Sig.
Model		Beta	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.300	.180		18.324	.000
	strategy	.228	.048	.582	4.716	.000
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						

Source: Analysis of data collected from field work

Results of analysis from Table 2 indicates that the there is a strong and positive correlation ($r = 0.582$) between strategy and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. Overall, the regression model indicates that 33.9% of the variance in organisational performance in the Nigerian construction industry can be explained by strategy. Also, the F-value of 22.241 is significant at 5% level of significance ($F = 22.241$, $p = 0.00$ two-tailed), therefore, the null

hypothesis one (H_{01}) is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between strategy and organisations performance in the Nigerian construction industry.

H_{02} : There is no significant relationship between structure and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry

Table 3: Regression analysis results for Hypothesis 2
Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.488 ^a	.238	.233	1.16335		
a Predictors: (Constant), structure						
ANOVA^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
1	Regression	39.872	1	39.872	29.461	.000 ^b
	Residual	460.149	340	1.353		
	Total	500.021	341			
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						
b. Predictors: (Constant), structure						
Coefficients						
		Unstandardised Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient	t	Sig.
Model		Beta	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.749	.256		10.743	.006
	structure	.365	.067	.488	5.428	.000
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						

Source: Analysis of data collected from field work

Results of analysis from Table 3 indicates that there is a moderately strong correlation ($r = 0.488$) between structure and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. Also, the regression model indicates that 23.8% of the variation in organisational performance in the Nigerian construction industry can be explained by structure. Furthermore, the F-value of 29.461 is significant at 5% level of significance ($F = 29.461$, $p = 0.00$ two-tailed),

therefore, the null hypothesis two (H_{02}) is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between structure and organisations performance in the Nigerian construction industry.

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between process and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry

Table 4: Regression analysis results for Hypothesis 3

Model Summary						
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square		Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.235 ^a	.055	.053		1.17865	
a Predictors: (Constant), process						
ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.686	1	27.686	19.929	.000 ^b
	Residual	472.335	340	1.389		
	Total	500.021	341			
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						
b. Predictors: (Constant), process						
Coefficients						
		Unstandardised Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient	T	Sig.
Model		Beta	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.336	.182		18.369	.000
	process	.218	.049	.235	4.468	.000
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						

Source: Analysis of data collected from field work

Results of analysis from Table 4 indicates that there is a fair degree of correlation ($r = 0.235$) between process and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. Also, the regression model indicates that 5.5% of the variation in organisational performance in the Nigerian construction industry can be explained by process. Furthermore, the F-value of 19.929 is significant at 5% level of significance ($F = 19.929$, $p = 0.00$ two-tailed),

therefore, the null hypothesis three (H_{03}) is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between process and organisations performance in the Nigerian construction industry.

Ho₄: There is no significant relationship between rewards and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry

Table 5: Regression analysis results for Hypothesis 4

Model Summary						
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square		Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	0.306 ^a	0.094	0.091		1.15442	
a Predictors: (Constant), rewards						
ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
1	Regression	46.909	1	46.909	35.199	.000 ^b
	Residual	453.112	340	1.333		
	Total	500.021	341			
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						
b. Predictors: (Constant), rewards						

Coefficients						
		Unstandardised Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient	t	Sig.
Model		Beta	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.201	.325		6.770	.000
	rewards	.478	.081	.306	5.933	.000

a. Dependent Variable: org_eff

Source: Analysis of data collected from field work

Results of analysis from Table 5 indicates that the there is a fair degree of correlation ($r = 0.306$) between rewards and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. Also, the regression model indicates that 9.4% of the variation in organisational performance in the Nigerian construction industry can be explained by rewards. Furthermore, the F-value of 35.199 is significant at 5% level of significance ($F = 35.199$, $p = 0.00$ two-tailed),

therefore, the null hypothesis four (H_{04}) is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between rewards and organisations performance in the Nigerian construction industry.

H_{05} : There is no significant relationship between people and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry

Table 6: Regression analysis results for Hypothesis 5

Model Summary						
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	0.520 ^a	0.270	0.231	1.10059		
a Predictors: (Constant), people						
ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
1	Regression	88.178	1	88.178	72.796	.000 ^b
	Residual	411.843	340	1.211		
	Total	500.021	341			
a. Dependent Variable: org_eff						
b. Predictors: (Constant), people						
Coefficients						
		Unstandardised Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient	t	Sig.
Model		Beta	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.798	.276		6.521	.000
	people	.577	.068	.520	8.532	.000

a. Dependent Variable: org_eff

Source: Analysis of data collected from field work

Results of analysis from Table 6 indicates that the there is a strong correlation ($r = 0.520$) between people and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. Also, the regression model indicates that 9.4% of the variation in organisational performance in the Nigerian construction industry can be explained by people. Furthermore, the F-value of 35.199 is significant at 5% level of significance ($F = 72.795$, $p = 0.01$ two-tailed), therefore, the null hypothesis five (H_{05}) is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between people and organisations performance in the Nigerian construction industry.

CONCLUSION

Results from Tables 2, 3, 4 5 and 6 show significant relationship between the studied organization design elements (i.e. strategy, structure, process, rewards and people) and organisational effectiveness. This implies that there is significant relationship between organization design and organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. However, the results of analysis of this study indicate that the cluster of stratey ($r = 0.582$), people ($r = 520$) and structure ($r = 0.488$) show the strongest relationship with organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian construction industry. This suggests that strategy, people and structure in that order

are highly significantly related to organisational effectiveness in this industry. Beyond, the three elements mentioned above, the findings of this study corroborate the finding of [4] who similarly found a strong relationship between organisation design elements of strategy, structure, process, rewards, and people and organisational effectiveness. According to [4] this finding emphasises the importance of organisation design as an organisation strive towards performing at optimal effectiveness. It could be inferred from these results that the elements of organisation design operate together in an integrated fashion, forming a meaningful alignment to facilitate organisational effectiveness in the Nigerian environment. Also, this result is in agreement with the findings of [2,14,27] who found that organisation design is significantly related to organisational effectiveness and opine that properly aligned organisation design elements allows individual motivations to be align with the interests of the organization and make it easier for individual employees to make the right decisions every day. Furthermore, a well-designed organization makes the collective work of accomplishing complex tasks easier thereby contributing to and enhancing organisational effectiveness.

This study concludes that there is significant relationship between organisation design and organisational effectiveness since all the organisation design elements under study show significant relationship with organisational effectiveness. Consequently, it is recommended that management of organisations in the Nigerian construction industry should consider all five elements when designing or re-designing their organisation rather than consider some out of the five. Also, management of organisations in the Nigerian construction industry should consider proper alignment of these five elements for enhance organisational effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- Zajac, E. J., & Shortell, S. M. (1989). Changing Generic Strategies: Likelihood, Direction, and Performance Implications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(5), 413-430.
- Kates, A., & Galbraith, J. R. (2007). *Designing Your Organisation: Using the Star Model to Solve Five Critical Design Challenges*. San-Francisco: Jossey Bass
- Jorry, A. C. (2016). *How Do Public Managers Manage? Bureaucratic Constraints, Organizational Culture, and the Potential for Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wendy, P. Y., & Wilmar, T. W. (2014). High-Involvement Innovation through Continuous Improvement. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 14(1), 14–22.
- Gilbert, G. A., & deyemi, J. M. (2016). Human Resource Management in the Public and Private Sectors: An Empirical Comparison. *Public Administration*, 77(2), 407–420.
- Eden, Q. B. (2015). No Such Thing as...a"one best way" to Manage Organizational Change. *Management Decision*, 34(10), 11–18.
- Bernard, M. B. (2015). *Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics*. Harlow, UK: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Gutterman, M. K. U. (2015). Organisational Change Management: A Critical Review. *Journal of Change Management*, 5(4), 369–380.
- Galbraith J. R. (1995). *Designing the Customer-Centric Organization a Guide to Strategy, Structure, and Process*. San-Francisco: Jossey Bass
- Adam, J. D. (2011). Strategic Innovation: Leveraging Creative Action for more Profitable Growth. *Strategy and Leadership*, 29(1), 21–26.
- Merron, K. (1997). *Riding the Wave: Designing Your Organization's Architecture for Enduring Success*. New York, NY: John Wiley
- Henning, J. (1997). *The Future of Staff Groups*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Brian, K. S., & Joyce, P. W. (2007). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture, Based on the Competing Values Framework*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Mcfaden, D., & Lansbury, L. (2011). The Strategic Management of Corporate Change. *Human Relations*, 46(8), 905–918.
- Simmons, S., & Simmons, R. G. (2013). Managing Successful Organizational Change in the Public Sector. *Public Administration Review*, 66(2), 168–176.
- Ibitayo, B. B., & Essien, G. S. S. (2016). A Framework for Quality Management Research and An Associated Measurement Instrument. *Journal of Operations Management*, 11(4), 339–366.
- Thierry, L. W. (2016). Validating the Competing Values Model as a Representation of Organizational Cultures. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 6(3), 231–250.
- Gibbons, A. J. (2008). Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations. *Journal of Business Studies* 28(4), 1-177.
- Thame, G., & Henne, P. N. (2016). Decision Process Models and Organizational Context: Level and Sector Make a Difference. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 14(4), 397-413.
- Janssen, J. P. (2001). Leading change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 59–67.
- Baker, D. (2007). *Strategic change management in public sector organisations*. Oxford, UK: Chandos.
- Frey, L. A. (2007). Organizational Innovation. In J. Fagerberg, D. Mowery & R. Nelson (Eds.),

- Handbook of Innovation* (pp. 115–148). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
23. Edom, G. E., & Edom, A. K. (2009). Toward a Theory of Organizational Culture and Effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6(2), 204–223.
 24. Huwins, A. S. (2013). Organizational change: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 293–315.
 25. Odhiambo M. Y. F. (2016). Contextual Determinants of Strategic Planning Processes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34(5), 729-767
 - 30.
 26. Rodriguez-Campos, L. (2005). Collaborative evaluations: A step-by-step model for the evaluator. Tamarac, FL: Llumina Press.
 27. Smithsword, H. Y. (2016). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
 28. Scriven, M. (2007). The logic and methodology of checklist. Retrieved September 04, 2017 from http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/papers/logic&methodology_dec07.pdf
 29. Iravo, D. E. (2013). *Managing the Public's Business*. New York: Basic Books.