

Organizational Structure and Employees' Performance: The Case of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya

Gatan, Kirsten Doreen C.; Domincel, Ivory D.; Valdez, Ednaly Jane P.; Adalem, Elnora V.

Saint Mary's University

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803203>

Received: 16 March 2024; Accepted: 23 March 2024; Published: 24 April 2024

ABSTRACT

In the Philippines' social and economic structure, cooperatives play a significant role, particularly in rural areas, by facilitating market access and resource distribution and fostering communal growth. Despite being recognized by government policies as key contributors to financial inclusion, economic growth, and poverty eradication, the effectiveness of cooperatives concerning their organizational structures is often overlooked. This study aims to determine the correlation between Organizational Structure and Employees' Performance: The Case of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya. It employs a quantitative approach, combining descriptive and correlational designs. The survey questionnaire used in this study is adopted from three research sources. The results revealed that most of the cooperative's workforce was comprised of young professional women, with an average age of 29.97. The respondents were predominantly from the Accounting Department, with a notable representation from lower/operational management. Moreover, a substantial portion of the respondents had tenure exceeding six months. The results indicated a positive perception of the subcategories within the organizational structure, significantly influencing employee performance. However, certain aspects of the organizational structure, such as hierarchical structure, formalization, and internal and external boundaries, showed no significant relationship with employee performance. These findings highlight the complex interplay between organizational structure and employee performance in a cooperative setting.

Keywords: Decentralized, internal and external boundary, formalization, hierarchical structure, technology

INTRODUCTION

Cooperatives have a long and rich history in the Philippines. Those living in rural areas, like farmers, fishermen, and other small-scale producers, often utilize this to access markets, loans, and other resources. As stated in an article on the website of the First Community Cooperative in the Philippines, cooperatives enable connections through shared ownership and control and serve the specific needs of their community. This means cooperatives can provide access to goods and services that may otherwise be unavailable. Additionally, cooperatives often reinvest their profits into the community through education, job creation, and charitable giving, promoting community development and improving the local economy. Ultimately, cooperatives help to improve the quality of life for the members of a community by providing a means for them to work together towards shared goals and aspirations (FICCO, 2020).

Article 3 of the Republic Act No. 9520 (RA 9520) defines a cooperative as an autonomous and duly registered association of persons with a common bond of interest who have voluntarily joined together to achieve their social, economic, and cultural needs and aspirations by making equitable contributions to the

capital required, patronizing their products and services and accepting a fair share of the risks and benefits of the undertaking following universally accepted cooperative principles.

The cooperative has been employed as a government policy instrument to promote social justice and economic expansion. The policy is well outlined in the Philippine Constitution of 1987 and in the enabling laws that the Philippine legislature passed at the turn of the century. Under the Philippine Development Plan (2011-2016), cooperatives are anticipated to significantly contribute to the goals of (a) achieving rapid, inclusive, and sustained economic growth, (b) promoting financial inclusion, and (c) lowering poverty (Castillo, 2017).

The cooperative industry is critical in the economy and social development of many communities, including Nueva Vizcaya. However, the success of cooperatives depends on various factors, including the effectiveness of their organizational structure. According to the Republic of the Philippines Cooperative Development Authority (2021), there are currently 231 cooperatives registered in the province of Nueva Vizcaya.

In the broader context of organizational development, it is interesting to note that organizational structures have evolved since the 1800s. During the “Industrial Revolution,” workers were organized to produce parts for the product moving down the assembly line. The scientific management approach developed by Frederick Taylor streamlined how activities were carried out, allowing employees to focus on one task and do it as effectively as possible. Moreover, during the 20th century, General Motors established a groundbreaking organizational structure where each significant division produced its automobiles. Organizational structures like virtual organizations are evolving quickly, moving from traditional to flexible ones (Satyendra, 2020).

Váchal and Talíř (2020) emphasized the importance of organizational and management structure as a vital component of business architecture because it plays a bigger role in the future as it pursues its business objective. In fact, due to the dynamic business environment, major changes may be seen in the organization and management of business operations that make up its organizational and management structure.

In addition, an organization can be compared to a building whose strength depends on the foundation and structure that supports it. The structure is the arrangement of connected components (resources) in a building that allows it to be stable, withstand stress, and produce the desired form. For an organization’s performance to be effective, it is crucial to comprehend how the organization’s connected components (structure) are arranged (Adekola, Bello, & Eze, 2017).

An organization’s effectiveness, including its employees’ performance, significantly correlates with its organizational structure. Every organization uses organizational structure to regulate employee behavior to ensure that activities are completed successfully and efficiently to achieve the organizational goals. To assist management in regulating employee behavior in organizations, activities are systematically planned, divided, and coordinated, according to Adekola et al. (2017).

Immediate supervisors advocate for employees, gathering and allocating the resources required to execute a successful job and providing reassuring feedback for a job well done. As an element in the workplace environment, a supervisor’s interpersonal function is crucial to promoting goodwill, boosting employee confidence, and improving performance.

Although there is a widespread understanding that organizational structure can significantly impact employee performance, there is still a lack of research regarding the cooperative sector. Therefore, this study aims to address this gap by examining the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance in the cooperative industry of Nueva Vizcaya. Furthermore, it also aims to determine the

respondents' perception of a multipurpose cooperative's organizational structure and employee performance.

Organizational Structure

Organizational structure refers to how an organization arranges its hierarchy of authority, communications, rights, and duties within its workforce. It determines how roles, power, and responsibilities are assigned and how information flows between different levels of management (Aggarwal, 2023). Most organizations comprise individuals who collaborate and coordinate to accomplish their goals. Then, to accomplish organizational objectives, actions are systematized, and an organizational structure is created as a result. Thus, organizational structure is an organization's most fundamental idea and essential component (Lee, 2020).

Moreover, goals, strategy, environment, technology, and organization size can all impact organizational structure. These are the main content-based variables representing the whole organization and its place concerning its surroundings. For any organization to function properly, it just needs a few configurations that are appropriate for the company's needs.

As the University of Minnesota (2017) describes, organizational structure is how team and individual operations are coordinated. Individual work must be controlled and coordinated to accomplish organizational goals and objectives. The structure is important for creating coordination since it defines reporting relationships (who reports to whom), formal communication channels, and how individual actions are connected. In other words, the formal structure establishes the relationships and relative rank of a position inside an organization and its design. It can impact employee performance in various ways such as affecting clear communication, providing resources and support, and defining roles and responsibilities.

Furthermore, Janicijevic (2013) stated that the division of labor, the allocation of power, the grouping of units, and the coordination of activities all constitute formal boundaries within the organizational structure, another extrinsic element that impacts employee behavior from the outside. Therefore, employee behavior in organizations results from the impact of its organizational structure.

In addition to defining how work is distributed and organized inside an organization, organizational structure also refers to the design of systems, processes, and policies. It describes the organization's internal characteristics. These internal traits are emphasized by their importance in determining an organization's success or failure. One of these is organizational commitment (Samphina Academy, 2022). According to Nwonu et al. (2017), organizational structure enhances firms' effectiveness and potential innovation. It facilitates the optimal utilization of resources, leading to improved individual performance within the organization. Therefore, it is essential for organizations to regularly assess their current structure to ensure it aligns with their established goals. Adjustments should be made to support the organization's objectives better if needed.

In conclusion, organizational structure is crucial to any business or cooperative industry (Bartnick, 2023). It regulates employee behavior and ensures that activities are carried out efficiently and effectively to achieve organizational goals. The type of organizational structure adopted can significantly impact employee performance and satisfaction. Therefore, it is essential to carefully consider and design an appropriate organizational structure that meets the organization's or cooperative industry's needs and objectives.

Employee Performance

Employee performance is a crucial factor that influences the successful execution of tasks at any point in time. The researchers clarified that performance refers to an employee effectively carrying out a task following the leader's expectations. In this context, Nguyen et al. (2020) stated that effort can be understood

as the enthusiastic force an employee puts forth to attain measurable and optimal outcomes.

Likewise, according to Nzyoka and Orwa (2016), employee performance is defined by an employee's ability to meet an organization's anticipated results, objectives, and standards. Meeting these criteria is vital for the overall success of the organization.

Furthermore, Zhenjing et al. (2022) add another dimension to the understanding of employee performance, highlighting that exceptional organizations thrive on employees who fulfill their regular duties and those who willingly go above and beyond. Such employees actively contribute to performance that exceeds the goals and expectations set by the organization, elevating the overall effectiveness and success of the company.

Employee performance is important for several reasons. For employers, high levels of employee performance can lead to increased productivity, improved customer satisfaction, and higher profits. As for employees, good performance can lead to job satisfaction, career advancement, and financial rewards. However, it isn't easy to establish employee job satisfaction since it requires consistency in work motivation, leadership, and the business's organizational culture that can be adapted to and accepted by all employees. Individual performance affects organizational performance, or put another way, and its creation will influence organizational performance (Akob et al., 2020; Haerani et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2019). As a result, corporate members control how the organization performs because individual and collective conduct impacts motivation.

A study by Bozorov et al. (2017) the mediating role of innovative behavior on the relationship between organizational structure and organizational innovation performance. Findings indicate that innovative employees' behavior does not mediate the relationship between integration and organizational innovation performance. The empirical findings revealed that organizational structure is associated with less innovative employee behavior.

Evaluating employee performance typically involves setting goals and expectations, providing feedback and coaching, and conducting performance reviews or evaluations. This can help employees identify improvement areas and develop new skills and knowledge.

There are also various factors in the workplace where employee performance is influenced. These factors include the manager's disposition, organizational culture, personal problems, job demands, and financial incentives (Iqbal et al., 2013). All these factors, except personal problems, affect how well employees perform.

Every organization has performance management that maintains, develops, and motivates the people at work to give better results. In the present competitive situation, the organization that gives better results can survive, stabilize, grow, and excel in performance (Desta, 2019)

Relationship between Organizational Structure and Employee Performance

The relationship between organizational structure and job performance is complex and multifaceted. Specialization, departmentalization, effective communication, and a decision-making hierarchy are the main components of organizational structure, each relating to one or more dimensions of job performance. According to an article on Edubirdie, Kevin R. Murphy's "Dimensions of Job Performance" includes effectiveness in a position, task performance, down-time behaviors, social relationships, job proficiency, and job-related skills or knowledge. Organizations can improve their structures to enhance employee productivity and effectiveness by understanding the relationship between these components and job performance dimensions. As stated in an article on Edubirdie, strategies such as cross-training, open

communication, employee empowerment, and a flatter decision-making hierarchy can improve job performance and, ultimately, organizational success.

Based on Shabbir's (2017) study, businesses that do not create appropriate structures to accommodate organizational staff will encounter employee performance issues. The study concludes that organizational structure has a considerable positive effect as a result of this with the individual's work output.

The study of Nnadi, Sunday, Udeze & Ugwu (2019) has emphasized that organizational structure has always served as an internal organizational procedure that establishes communication and responds to an organization's trend in terms of speed and accuracy in solving problems and diminishing the existence of it. Consequently, if employees must give their all to the task they were contracted to complete, the setup must be consistent throughout the company, considering the nature and difficulty of their work.

Furthermore, the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance can vary depending on various factors, including industry, cultural norms, and management practices. However, some general patterns can be observed globally. Thus, the study's outcome determined the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance.

According to a study by Nnadi et al. (2019), how a company is set up can greatly impact how satisfied, motivated, and productive employees are. The study suggests that a well-designed organizational structure can positively affect employee performance. At the same time, a poorly designed one can negatively impact it. The study found that the organizational structure can greatly influence employee motivation and job satisfaction, affecting performance. An organic structure that promotes communication, teamwork, and collaboration can motivate and satisfy employees, resulting in better performance. In contrast, a mechanical structure that is rigid, hierarchical, and bureaucratic can lead to dissatisfaction and lack of motivation, which results in lower performance. Therefore, organizations need to consider how their structure affects their employees and create a structure that promotes communication, teamwork, and collaboration to keep their employees motivated and performing well.

Ultimately, this study is significant for several reasons. First, it provides valuable insights into the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance in Nueva Vizcaya's cooperative sector. Second, it contributes to understanding the factors that drive success in the cooperative industry and informs the development of strategies to improve the performance of cooperatives in Nueva Vizcaya. Finally, the findings of this study have practical implications for the development of the cooperative sector and for benefiting the employees, members, and communities served by cooperatives in Nueva Vizcaya.

Understanding this relationship is important as it can help organizations optimize their structure to improve employee performance, increasing efficiency, productivity, and overall success. The study of the cooperative industry in Nueva Vizcaya provides a unique perspective, as cooperatives have a different organizational structure than traditional businesses. By conducting this research, the findings can contribute to the existing literature on the topic and provide insights for cooperative organizations to enhance their performance.

Statement of the Problem

The cooperative industry in Nueva Vizcaya faces numerous challenges, including improving employee performance. Organizational structure is a critical factor that can impact employee performance. Yet, its role in the cooperative sector has not been adequately explored.

The researchers aimed to determine the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance of a multipurpose cooperative in the province of Nueva Vizcaya for the first semester of the 2023-2024 academic year.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

A. What is the perception of the respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of:

1. Hierarchical Structure;
2. Formalization;
3. Internal and External boundaries; and
4. Technology?

B. What is the respondents' perception of Employee Performance of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya?

C. Is there a significant relationship between Organizational Structure and Employee Performance of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of:

1. Hierarchical Structure;
2. Formalization;
3. Internal and External boundary; and
4. Technology?

Statement of Null Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between Organizational Structure and Employee Performance of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative research method that involves the collection and analysis of numerical data through the use of statistical techniques. The descriptive design deals with the profile of the respondents and the perception of the respondents on the organizational structure and employee performance. Furthermore, the correlational design determines the relationship between the two variables, organizational structure and employee performance.

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational design to analyze the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance through a questionnaire.

Research Locale

The research locale for this study was a Multipurpose Cooperative located in the province of Nueva Vizcaya in the Philippines. The cooperative offers financial services such as savings and deposit accounts and quick loans to its members.

The study focused on analyzing the current organizational structure of the cooperative and how it affected employee performance. It is also limited to a single cooperative. It has 15 branches in the province of Nueva Vizcaya, which do not represent the entire cooperative sector.

All the respondents came from each of the 15 branches of this Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya. This cooperative served as an ideal research locale for this study as it presented a unique opportunity to

examine the connection between organizational structure and employee performance in a rural cooperative environment that provides financial services to its members.

The rural setting was of particular interest because the organizational structures of rural cooperatives tended to differ from those in urban settings. This was due to rural communities' unique challenges and opportunities, such as limited access to resources and markets, dispersed populations, and different cultural values and practices. As such, studying the organizational structure of a rural cooperative will provide insights into how such structures affect employee performance in this particular context.

Furthermore, the organizational structure's distribution of roles and responsibilities among employees is a critical aspect. The cooperative's organizational structure was expected to significantly impact employee performance because the allocation of roles and responsibilities affects employee motivation, job satisfaction, and the ability to perform their duties effectively. Therefore, examining the relationship between the distribution of roles and responsibilities and employee performance in this cooperative setting will likely reveal valuable insights into improving employee performance in similar organizations.

Research Respondents

The study participants were regular employees of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya who have worked for more than a year. They were chosen as the sample population for the study because of their familiarity with the cooperative's organizational structure and operations. The regular employees were expected to understand the roles and responsibilities within the cooperative and how they relate to employee performance.

Table 1 *The Population and Size Distribution of Respondents Per Branch*

Branch	Population of Participants	Sample Size
1	6	3
2	6	3
3	5	3
4	5	2
5	4	2
6	6	3
7	4	2
8	5	3
9	4	2
10	5	3
11	4	2
12	5	3
13	6	3
14	5	3
15	5	3
Total number of Employees in Multipurpose Cooperative	75	40

From the population of 15 branches in the Province of Nueva Vizcaya, a targeted number of 60 respondents was intended. However, due to the busy schedules of the respondents, only 40 were able to participate in the

study. These 40 respondents were randomly selected to take part in the study. The sample size of 40 respondents was considered appropriate for the study, as it allowed for a sufficient population representation while ensuring that the data collected were manageable and feasible to analyze. Additionally, the sample size was determined following the estimated number of employees per branch given by the Executive Secretary. She mentioned 4-6 employees per branch here in Nueva Vizcaya. The researchers then considered their availability and time to answer the survey questionnaire. This led the researchers to have 2-3 questionnaires with the informed consent form attached on the front page that the main office distributed to each of the 15 branches, which resulted in a sample size of 40.

The demographic profile of the respondents illustrates the following:

In terms of sex, there were 27 (67.5%) female respondents and 13 (32.5%) male respondents. The data suggests a dominance of women in the Multipurpose Cooperative workforce. Regarding age, more than one-third were 30 years old, followed by 27 years old, constituting 6 respondents or 15%. Additionally, there were 4 respondents each, or 10%, at the ages of 28 and 29. The mean age was 29.97. This profile variable indicates that Multipurpose Cooperative has relatively young employees considered to be in their prime time. Regarding the distribution of respondents in terms of position, more were sampled in lower/operational management, with a frequency of 27 or 67.5% of the respondents. This was followed by middle management, with 11 (27.5%) respondents, and lastly, top management, with a frequency of 2 (5%) respondents. Concerning the department, most of the respondents came from the Accounting Department, with 29 (72.5%) respondents, followed by the Administrative (Managerial) Department, with 6 (15%) respondents, and the Loans Department, with 5 (12.5%) respondents. This implies that, in the findings, most information was gathered from the Accounting Department of that Multipurpose Cooperative. Lastly, the profile of the respondents in terms of the number of years of service reflects that among the respondents, there were more who had been employed for more than 6 months, with 26 (65%) respondents, while 14 (35%) respondents were employed for less than 6 months.

Research Instruments

For this study, the researchers adopted a survey questionnaire from a previous study entitled “Organizational Structure and Employee’s Performance: A Study of Brewing Firms in Nigeria” conducted by Malik Shahzad Shabbir (2017) for the Organizational Structure and Employees’ Performance part. Additionally, both Caminos, Kirah (2004) in “A Study of the Effect of Organizational Structure on Employee Satisfaction in Youth-Serving Organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area,” and Eze, Sunday C., et al. (2017) in “The Effects of Organizational Structure on the Performance of Organizations” were also adapted for the Employee’s Performance part of the survey questionnaire. This research instrument was used to collect data from the participants. The questionnaire is divided into three parts:

1. **Demographic Profile.** This section contained questions on the respondents’ demographic information, including their age, sex, position, department, and number of years employed.
2. **Organizational Structure and Employees’ Performance.** This section contained a total of 24 questions that were divided into four subcategories: hierarchical structure, formalization, internal and external boundaries, and technology. These questions aimed to examine the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance. All the indicators in these four subcategories are parallel, except for items 1 and 7 of the hierarchical structure. These were then reversely coded to be consistent with the other indicators.
3. **Employee’s Performance.** This section comprises 15 questions designed to measure employee performance and organizational satisfaction. These questions aim to identify the factors contributing to employee performance and satisfaction in the cooperative.

The questionnaire was set to pre-engagement with the respondent, as requested by the management, to ensure that it was clear, understandable, and able to capture the required data. The study results were obtained from the data gathered through the survey questionnaires. Furthermore, the study analyzed the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance. It did not cover other factors that may affect the employee performance. Lastly, the study relied on the data obtained from the cooperative itself and self-reported surveys, which may be subject to bias.

Data Gathering Procedure

The first step of the data-gathering procedure involved requesting permission from the company management to conduct the study. The researchers then adapted the questionnaire with items related to organizational structure and employee performance. Then, it was verified by the research adviser. The questionnaire was set to pre-engagement with the respondent, as requested by the management, to check the questionnaire’s unity with the company’s policies concerning confidentiality.

After the pre-engagement with the respondents, as per the management’s request, the researchers distributed the informed consent form attached to the questionnaire to a sample of regular employees in the company. The participants were given a detailed explanation of the study’s purpose, and they were assured of the confidentiality of their responses.

The participants were given enough time to complete the questionnaire and were encouraged to answer truthfully. Once the participants completed the questionnaire, the researchers collected and analyzed the data using appropriate statistical techniques.

Treatment of Data

The collected data were analyzed using several statistical techniques. The data were encoded, and the responses were tabulated using Microsoft Excel. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used in the data analysis.

For the profile variables, frequency and percentages were presented. The perception of the organizational structure and employee performance were shown through mean ratings and standard deviations. Quantitative Description of Responses was utilized in the description and interpretation of data.

Table 2. *Quantitative Description of Responses*

Likert Scale	Mean Range	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
4	3.50-4.00	Strongly Agree	Positive perception of organizational structure and employee performance.
3	2.50-3.49	Agree	
2	1.50-2.49	Disagree	Negative perception of organizational structure and employee performance.
1	1.00-1.49	Strongly Disagree	

Lastly, for the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance, the normality test was first sought and found to be abnormal; thus, the non-parametric Spearman rho test was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Section 1. Perception of the Respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative

This study presented four aspects of organizational structure: hierarchical structure, formalization, internal and external boundaries, and technology.

According to Bragg (2022), a hierarchical structure has numerous layers of management, each with specialized duties or decision-making levels. Formalization is one of the pillars of a bureaucratic system, as underlined by Skorková's (2020) research. This idea refers to an organization having many formally established rules, procedures, and written standards. According to Shabbir (2017), the notion of organizational boundary (internal and external boundary) refers to the separation of one firm from another related company and the separation of a corporation from external stakeholders and internal ties. Additionally, Beer, P., and R. Mulder (2020) defined technology as a digital, electrical, or mechanical instrument that influences how activities are accomplished at work. Technology tremendously influences the organizational structure and employee performance in cooperatives and enterprises.

A. On Hierarchical Structure

Table 3. Perception of the Respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Hierarchical Structure

Hierarchical Structure Indicators	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description
1. The organization has few branches/departments (structure) in the hierarchy.	3.35	.48	Agree
2. Due to a few branches/departments (structure) in the organization, decisions do not take longer.	3.12	.91	Agree
3. The few layers of the organizational structure in my organization enable a high level of integration, allowing certain decisions to be made at the operational level rather than entirely at higher levels due to decentralization.	3.05	.74	Agree
4. Certain decisions are not always taken at a higher level but at an operational level due to decentralization due to having few structures.	2.82	.74	Agree
5. Engaging lower employees in decision-making facilitates employee empowerment and a sense of belongingness.	3.05	.59	Agree
6. Reducing layers of the organizational structure and empowering low-level employees facilitate employees' devotion to the vision and objective of our organization.	2.92	.65	Agree

7. Fewer structures enhance better communication within the organization.	2.67	.48	Agree
Mean	2.99	.33	Agree

Legend: 1:00 – 1:49: Strongly Disagree; 1:50 – 2:49: Disagree; 2:50 – 3:49: Agree 3.50 – 4.00: Strongly Agree

The items above were presented to the respondents, making the first and seventh indicators in the negative statement part of the researchers’ strategy to check the consistency of the respondents. These were then reversely coded as part of the procedure in the study’s methodology.

From the findings, the respondents agreed with an overall mean rating of 2.99 (SD=.33). It can be perceived that the respondents have a positive perception of the organization. Moreover, the top two highest mean ratings were items 1 and 2. Perhaps indicator 1, which states that “the organization has few branches/departments (structure) in the hierarchy,” has a mean rating of 3.35 (SD=.48), and indicator 2 has a mean rating of 3.12 (SD=.91) “as a result of a few branches/departments (structure) in the organization, decisions do not take longer time” are the statements that had the highest ratings because the respondents are aware that in an organization, there should be more departments in a hierarchy. The reason is for the employees to stay focused on their field of work and not jump from one task of a different department to another. That will not only drain the employees but also create more confusion and problems with handling the quality of work.

This supports the idea that a clear and simple organizational structure can reduce confusion and improve the overall quality of work. For instance, Robbins and Judge (2018) argue that a well-designed organizational structure helps clarify roles and responsibilities, reduce conflicts, and improve overall work quality. Moreover, Colquitt et al. (2019) state that in the initial stages of research, there was an assumption that employees become more productive when engaged in a limited span of control. However, the implication is that the organization would need to hire additional managers to oversee smaller groups, leading to increased labor costs. Whatever the case, individual disparities in inefficient multitasking exist due to the variety and complexity of activities people conduct, the nature of tasks, and even interpersonal relationships (Courage & Pollard, 2017).

On the other hand, specialization and competence growth in particular functional areas are made possible by multiple departments. Departments can concentrate on their primary tasks and goals, resulting in increased expertise and understanding within those fields. Within each area, this specialty raises output and improves the quality of work (Neck et al. 2017).

Concerning the respondents who agreed that having fewer departments or branches can result in faster decision-making, as supported by the study of Almohtasib et al. (2020), decentralized organizations with fewer layers of hierarchy are often associated with faster decision-making processes. This is because decision authority is pushed down to lower levels, enabling quicker responses to challenges or opportunities.

Communication in the workplace is essential to building and sustaining effective working relationships in organizations. Effective communication in the work environment is crucial since every administrative task and activity involves direct or indirect communication to pass information and understanding from one person to another (Zambas, 2021). Compared to organizations with complex structures, those with fewer

branches or departments may have shorter decision-making processes. Communication avenues are typically easier and more direct in organizations with fewer branches or departments. Decision-making can be facilitated when there are fewer communication levels to go through. Along with that, faster coordination and implementation are made possible by the decision-making process's reduced complexity (Gaille, 2017).

The respondents also agreed with indicator 3, which states that “the few layers of the organizational structure in my organization enable a high level of integration, allowing certain decisions to be made at the operational level rather than entirely at higher levels due to decentralization” with a mean of 3.05 (SD = .74). This agrees with Shabbir, (2017) which posits fewer layers, facilitates rapid reaction, decentralized decision-making, and a high degree of organizational member integration.

Decentralization of decision-making is one excellent strategy that works well with modern businesses' operations.

They also agreed that “Certain decisions are not always made at a higher level but at the operational level, due to decentralization resulting from a few structures,” with a mean of 2.82 (SD = 0.74). According to Widodo (2019), authority management in an organization is categorized as either centralization or decentralization. Centralization involves the general manager, while decentralization entails delegating authority from top management to subordinates. In decentralized authority management, there is an expectation for swift decision-making to prevent disruptions in the company's operations. Additionally, decentralization allows decisions to be made by a single party to eliminate confusion. Rural Banks have largely adopted decentralized management processes, encompassing the protection of new products and services, determination of large-scale investments, budget allocation, setting selling prices, executing organizational strategy, and developing concepts and ideas. In decentralized organizations, decision security involves all employees, empowering managers at different levels to make important decisions based on their specific responsibilities. Consequently, decentralization emphasizes policies related to employment termination, determination of small-scale investment, objective development in decision security, strategies, diverse ideas, concept development, and addressing communication gaps between superiors and subordinates.

Employee engagement in decision-making was perceived positively, as indicated in indicator 5, “Engaging lower employees in the decision making facilitates employee empowerment and sense of belongingness,” with a mean score of 3.05 (SD= 0.59), suggesting that involving lower-level employees fosters empowerment and a sense of belongingness. This aligns with the findings of Almohtasib et al. (2020), highlighting that organizations employing a decentralized structure and focusing on teams tend to attain substantial success. This success is attributed to nurturing a sense of accountability and responsibility among all members throughout the enterprise rather than confining these aspects to a select few in senior management roles. The decentralized arrangement not only empowers employees but also provides them with increased opportunities for decision-making, resulting in enhanced involvement and engagement within the company (Almohtasib et al., 2020).

Meanwhile, indicator 6 shows that the respondents positively perceive “Reducing layers of the organizational structure and empowering low-level employees facilitate employees' devotion to the vision and objectives of our organization,” with a mean score of 2.92 (SD = 0.65). This is supported by a study by Reimer et al. (2017), which suggests that bringing together team members promotes self-identification, establishes a shared purpose, and ultimately boosts team initiative. Additionally, acknowledging the importance of teamwork, especially in interdependent teams, is crucial for overall effectiveness (Turner et al., 2019).

However, item 7, “Fewer structures enhance better communication within the organization,” received the

lowest mean of 2.67 (SD = 0.48), possibly because it can facilitate communication for various reasons, including minimizing bureaucratic levels and encouraging direct engagement between employees and management. Robbins et al. (2017) addressed in “Fundamentals of Management” how reduced organizational structures might enhance communication within a company. They emphasized that fewer levels of hierarchy allow for more direct and efficient communication routes, enabling information to flow more seamlessly across the business.

B. On Formalization

Table 4. *Perception of the Respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Formalization*

Formalization Indicators	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description
1. The company does not apply too many rules and regulations to its employees.	2.81	.46	Agree
2. Reducing rules and regulations encourages creativity.	2.50	.59	Agree
3. Reducing rules and regulations encourage initiatives from all levels of employees.	2.45	.67	Disagree
4. Less formalization facilitates communication within our organization.	2.32	.60	Disagree
5. Less formalization encourages creativity and learning in my company.	2.42	.63	Disagree
Mean	2.50	.75	Agree

Legend: 1:00 – 1:49: Strongly Disagree; 1:50 – 2:49: Disagree; 2:50 – 3.49: Agree 3.50 – 4.00: Strongly Agree

The perception of the respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Formalization depicted indicators of the formalization aspects. All the indicators were stated in the negative. All the statements asked whether informalization or reducing rules and regulations and less formalization would lead to better functions and structures.

As presented, the respondents generally agreed with an overall mean rating of 2.50 (SD=.75). Just like the hierarchical structure, this could mean that the respondents positively perceive the organizational structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in terms of its formalization. However, they disagreed with three indicators. These are: 1) reducing rules and regulations encourages initiatives from all levels of employees with a mean score of 2.45 (SD= .67); 2) less formalization facilitates communication within our organization with a mean score of 2.32 (SD=.60), and 3) less formalization encourages creativity and learning in my company with a mean score of 2.42 (SD= .63). This could imply that in these three indicators, the respondents have a negative perception on the organizational structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in terms of its formalization.

Based on the study of Neck et al. (2017) and Colquitt et al. (2019), formalization relates to establishing standard organizational rules and procedures to regulate behaviors and decisions. As a fundamental element in organizational control and coordination, implementing strict rules and procedures enhances clarity regarding the organization’s objectives and operational methods. This, consequently, sets expectations for

employees to produce products and services of a standardized quality consistently. That is why the employees of the Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya disagreed with the idea that reducing rules and regulations encourages initiatives from all levels of employees.

The second indicator, which the respondents also disagreed with, is that less formalization facilitates communication within our organization. Communication barriers harm the organizational structure, create issues with implementing activities, and create a conflictual and pressured environment. This condition leads to the failure of organizations, resulting in a decline in organizational performance and productivity as stated by Korkmaz and Zorlu (2021).

Respondents disagree with the third indicator, which says that less formalization encourages creativity and learning in my company. In support of this claim, the study published by Manyike (2019) concluded that organizations with established rules and procedures can manage and direct employees' behavior and encourage team innovation. Conversely, less formalized organizations could lead to a lack of clarity regarding the best methods to tackle the assignment, which might worsen conflict within the team.

On the other hand, the respondents agreed that “the company does not apply too many rules and regulations to its employees” as well as “reducing rules and regulations encourages creativity” with a mean rating of 2.81 (SD= .46) and 2.50 (SD=.59) respectively. This finding is consistent with that reported in the study of Skorková (2020), who indicated that too many restrictions hinder initiative, creativity, and personal growth. The potential cause of this is limiting people’s autonomy and ability to make decisions by having too many restrictions, which may discourage initiative. People can become passive, reliant on others for direction, and not allowed to experiment and take risks. Furthermore, creativity typically emerges when people think outside the box and explore uncommon concepts. However, too many restrictions can cause people to limit their thinking to a narrow range, which limits the creation of innovative concepts.

A balance needs to be maintained as less formalization encourages creativity and learning in the company. Thus, entities’ creativity will rise as their organizational structures are improved.

C. On Internal and External Boundary

Table 5. Perception of the respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Internal and External Boundary

Statements	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description
1. My organization has blurred internal boundaries that allow easy relationships with various units and departments.	2.44	.52	Disagree
2. Blurred boundaries enable effective cooperation and coordination between different role-players in the organization; coordination and cooperation enhance my organization’s performance.	2.37	1.00	Disagree
3. The open boundary in my company enables free communication with the clients and other companies.	2.72	.78	Agree
4. Due to open access, the organization receives inputs from customers and other stakeholders extensively in customer service development.	3.27	.50	Agree

5. Feedback from our Customers contributes immensely to our good customer service.	3.45	.59	Agree
Mean	2.85	.62	Agree

Legend: 1:00 – 1:49: Strongly Disagree; 1:50 – 2:49: Disagree; 2:50 – 3:49: Agree 3.50 – 4.00: Strongly Agree

The perception of the respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Internal and External Boundary shows that, in general, the respondents agreed with their organizational structure in terms of internal and external boundaries with a mean rating of 3.35 (SD=.62). This indicates their positive perception on the organizational structure in terms of internal and external boundary.

But there were indicators that they particularly disagreed with. These were the aspects where: 1) their organization has blurred internal boundaries that allow easy relationships with various units and departments of the organization that have a mean rating of 2.44 (SD= .52); and 2) enable effective cooperation and coordination between different role-players in the organization, coordination, and cooperation enhance the performance of my organization with a mean rating of 2.37 (SD= 1.00).

Organizations often have multiple functional units and departments collaborating to achieve common goals. However, when internal boundaries become blurred, it might hinder effective collaboration and relationship-building among these units and departments. However, Shabbir (2017) concluded that organizations must encourage blurred internal boundaries since it will foster cooperation and coordination between every department, unit, and worker.

Most of the employees also disagreed with the second indicator, implying that blurred boundaries do not promote effective cooperation and coordination. An example is role overload, where employees struggle to juggle tasks such as work, family, and personal, which may result from blurred boundaries. Without defined limits, juggling various obligations can cause disagreements and make it harder to prioritize activities, which could reduce productivity. This supports the study of Tang & Vandenberghe (2021), which states that methods and circumstances through and under how responsibility overload relates to work performance remain poorly understood, giving it a particular standing in the role-stress literature.

On the other hand, the respondents agreed with the following indicators: “The open boundary in my company enables free communication with the clients and other companies,” “The organization receives inputs from customers and other stakeholders extensively in customer service development as a result of open access,” and “feedback from our Customers contributes immensely to our good customer services” with a mean rating of 2.72(SD=.78), 3.27(SD= .50), and 3.45(SD= .59) respectively.

A loose external boundary must be promoted for the business to adapt to the changing environment and offer value to clients. This involves the business influencing the external boundary with suppliers, customers, and other businesses, as Shabbir (2017) stated. In addition, Shah & Rai (2022) explained that knowing what clients think of a firm, how satisfied they are with its offers, or how devoted they are is vital information for any organization. Moreover, a company’s profitability is positively impacted by its capacity to satisfy its customers; satisfied consumers are the cornerstone of any flourishing enterprise as they encourage recurring business, brand loyalty, and positive word-of-mouth.

D. On Technology

Table 6. Perception of the respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Technology

Statements	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description
1. Our structure matches with my company's technology.	3.13	.39	Agree
2. The responsiveness of our management to respond to changes in technology is a determining factor in the effectiveness of an organization.	3.72	.45	Strongly Agree
3. The appropriateness of our Technology contributes largely to our management effectiveness.	3.65	.48	Strongly Agree
4. Matching our technology with our structure contributes to our company's success, performance, and survival.	3.67	.52	Strongly Agree
5. Each type of technology has a specific organizational structure that will match it.	3.65	.48	Strongly Agree
6. Our organizations always scan the technological environment to determine what technology will mean to existing structures and products.	3.55	.50	Strongly Agree
7. The nature of our technology and the structure adopted by our company contribute to employee performance.	3.25	.66	Agree
Mean	3.51	.49	Strongly Agree

Legend: 1:00 – 1:49: Strongly Disagree; 1:50 – 2:49: Disagree; 2:50 – 3:49: Agree; 3:50 – 4:00: Strongly Agree

The perception of the respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Technology presents a positive perception, garnering the highest ratings among the four subparts of organizational structure with an overall mean rating of 3.51 (SD=.49). This could mean that organizational structure positively influences technology.

The highest ratings were on the aspects that: 1) responsiveness of our management to respond to changes in technology is a determining factor to the effectiveness of an organization with a mean of 3.72 (SD=.45), and 2) matching of our technology with our structure contributes to the success, performance, and survival of our company that has a mean rating of 3.67 (SD=.52). This could imply that for the first indicator, in the rapidly evolving landscape of technology, adaptability and responsiveness to change are crucial, particularly for organizations in fast-changing industries. Teece (2018) emphasizes that a management team's ability to adapt to technological shifts quickly signifies an agile organization ready to capitalize on opportunities and address challenges. This highlights that in the digital era, maintaining a competitive edge is fleeting, and slow reactions can result in falling behind. Therefore, the strong agreement of respondents on this point reinforces the notion that adaptability in the face of technological change is vital for organizational

effectiveness.

Respondents believe that aligning technology and organizational structure is crucial for a company's success. This is supported by literature, including Daft (2018), which reinforces that optimal performance is achieved when technology and organizational structure are aligned. Such alignment boosts efficiency, communication, and overall results.

Meanwhile, in terms of technology, they had agreed on the aspects that: 1) their structure matches with the technology of their company, 2) the nature of their technology and the structure adopted by their company contribute to a positive perception of the respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya in terms of Technology, with a mean rating of 3.13 (SD=.39) and 3.25 (SD=.66) respectively.

This could indicate that the statement's lower rating suggests that respondents need better alignment between their organization's structure and its technology. This perception might indicate a gap between the present structure and the organization's technological requirements. Such misalignments may arise from old systems or swift tech advancements outpacing organizational changes, restricting the full utilization of technological assets. According to Koi-Akrofi (2020), while IT investments can elevate performance, the benefits often depend on complementary adjustments in organizational structure. Achieving this alignment is an ongoing process. Even as many organizations recognize its importance, real-world challenges persist. For instance, while many accounting firms have adopted AI technologies, not all have adapted their structures to benefit from them (Chandi, 2017) fully.

The second statement may indicate that the respondents may not strongly believe that the current technology and organizational structure significantly contribute to employee performance. This suggests that there may be areas where technology is not optimally integrated with work processes, or the organizational structure may not be fully conducive to enhancing employee performance. While technology and structure do play a role in employee performance, they might not be the most prominent factors. Other factors like company culture, individual motivation, and leadership style could overshadow the direct impact of technology and structure.

Robbins and Judge (2018) have highlighted that the respondents' perceptions of their roles and fit in the organization directly affect their performance. The slightly lower agreement on the alignment of technology and structure influencing performance may be due to perceived mismatches or inefficiencies affecting employee morale and productivity. In accounting, a well-aligned technological infrastructure and organizational structure can streamline processes, reduce errors, and enhance employee performance, especially in financial reporting or auditing roles. However, technology alone cannot guarantee improved performance; an appropriate structure and skilled employees must complement it. Atanasoff & Venable (2017) have pointed out potential downsides to using technology, such as technostress, which can hamper employee productivity if not managed properly. Therefore, the company's structure must support and complement the technological tools.

The other indicators state that 1) Appropriateness of our Technology contributes largely to our management effectiveness, 2) Each type of technology has a specific organizational structure that will match it, and 3) Our organizations always scan the technological environment to determine what technology will mean to existing structure and products. This leads to one conclusion: adaptation to technological advancement should go well with the organization. Technological choices and implementations that align with the organization's strategic direction can boost efficiency, simplify operations, and make it possible to meet goals. Inadequate or mismatched technology can cause inefficiencies and inhibit operations.

In the study, Gupta (2018) further explained that many small and large businesses that succeeded in the pre-

digital age face both opportunities and threats from emerging digital technologies. These businesses risk falling behind the competition if they ignore digitalization. They must determine which devices provide the most significant potential to reach their target audience, what content is suitable for each platform, and, crucially, how to monetize content production across multiple platforms (Adducul & Palina, 2023). Companies must quickly adopt new procedures, agile approaches, ways of working, new organizational structures, and change management strategies to support their digital vision and prepare their employees for this shift. This is supported by the study of Shabbir (2017), who recommended that the company is urged to always adapt to technological advancements and incorporate the proper technologies when building its structure. This is because technology is both a dominant component in establishing the rules of competition and a determining factor in the effectiveness of an organization.

Table 7. Summary of the Perception of the Respondents on the Organizational Structure of a Multipurpose Cooperative

Variables	Mean	SD	Quality Description
A. Hierarchical Structure	2.99	0.33	Agree
B. Formalization	2.50	0.75	Agree
C. Internal and External Boundary	2.85	0.62	Agree
D. Technology	3.51	0.49	Strongly Agree
Mean	2.96	0.55	Agree

Legend: 1:00 – 1:49: Strongly Disagree; 1:50 – 2:49: Disagree; 2:50 – 3:49: Agree 3.50 – 4.00: Strongly Agree

Table 7 above summarizes the respondents’ perception of the organizational structure of a multipurpose cooperative. It implies that all variables have a positive perception. The variables assessed include Hierarchical Structure, Formalization, Internal and External Boundaries, and Technology. The respondents tended to agree or strongly agree with statements related to the organizational structure. The mean scores for each variable provide a quantitative measure of the respondents’ opinions.

Among the components, Technology emerges as the most positively perceived aspect, with the highest overall mean of 3.51 (SD = .49), signifying a strong vote of confidence in the cooperative’s technological infrastructure. This suggests that respondents believe the organization has successfully integrated technology into its operational framework.

Conversely, Formalization, while still receiving a positive perception, garnered the lowest overall mean of 2.50 (SD = .75). Despite this, the agreement in perception indicates that the respondents generally view the formalization aspects of the organizational structure in a favorable light. The slightly lower mean may suggest room for improvement in this specific area.

Furthermore, the mean score of 2.85 (SD = .62) suggests that respondents generally agree with the internal and external boundaries of the Multipurpose Cooperative. While the majority agrees with the effectiveness of boundary management, there might be some diversity in individual viewpoints or experiences regarding the depiction of roles and interactions both within and outside the organization. Overall, the “Agree” quality description signifies a positive perception of how the cooperative manages its internal and external boundaries, contributing to a favorable organizational structure.

Drawing from these results, it can be inferred that the Multipurpose Cooperative has implemented an effective organizational structure, aligning with positive perceptions across various dimensions. The positive relationship between organizational structure and the assessed variables is consistent with findings from the study by Shabbir (2017), reinforcing the idea that a well-designed structure contributes to positive organizational outcomes.

In conclusion, the positive perceptions expressed by the respondents in this study indicate that the Multipurpose Cooperative’s organizational structure is generally favorable. The detailed breakdown of variables in Table 7 enhances the understanding of specific areas of strength and potential areas for enhancement within the organizational structure.

Section 2. Perception of the Respondents in Employee Performance in a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya

This section presents the respondents’ perceptions of their workplace, especially how organizational hierarchies, decision-making processes, communication, and other factors influence their sense of achievement, respect, and overall performance. It aims to provide insights into how employees perceive the alignment between organizational structures and individual performance, supported by data-driven evaluations.

Table 8. Perception of the Respondents in Terms of Employee Performance in a Multipurpose Cooperative

Employee Performance Indicators	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description
1. There is a definite sense of hierarchy in this organization.	3.55	.35	Strongly Agree
2. As an employee of this organization, I must ask my immediate manager before doing almost anything.	3.40	.49	Agree
3. Only top managers make decisions regarding operations in our organization.	3.05	.78	Agree
4. As an employee of this organization, any decision I make must have my immediate manager's approval.	2.62	.66	Agree
5. This organization offers good service of high value at a minimum cost.	3.10	.67	Agree
6. Fewer structures enhance better communication within the organization.	3.50	.50	Strongly Agree
7. Open communication between all levels of staff is encouraged.	3.05	.74	Agree
8. Superiors provide excellent guidance in the workplace.	3.60	.63	Strongly Agree
9. My career development is encouraged at this organization.	3.57	.54	Strongly Agree
11. My ideas are sought and used.	3.60	.49	Strongly Agree
12. My salary is proportionate to the work I do.	3.45	.55	Agree
13. I am encouraged to understand the "bigger picture" at this organization.	3.60	.49	Strongly Agree
14. I feel a great sense of accomplishment from my job.	3.52	.50	Strongly Agree
15. I feel respected in my position.	3.52	.50	Strongly Agree
16. I am connected to my work community.	3.65	.48	Strongly Agree
Mean	3.60	.49	Strongly Agree

Legend: 1:00 – 1:49: Strongly Disagree; 1:50 – 2:49: Disagree; 2:50 – 3:49: Agree
3.50 – 4.00: Strongly Agree

These findings show that the respondents positively perceive Employee Performance in a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya, with an overall mean rating of 3.60 (SD= .49).

The perception of the respondents in terms of Employee Performance in a Multipurpose Cooperative shows that the respondents have a positive perception that employee performance is connected to how the organization is structured, with an overall mean rating of 3.60 (SD=.49).

In particular, the highest mean ratings were their perceptions of the connectedness of work to the community, the superiors providing excellent guidance in the workplace, encouragement to understand the “bigger picture” in their organization, and their ideas that are sought and used.

Employees perceived a significant connection between their work and the wider community, implying a strong sense of belonging to their work environment. Creating an organizational culture of belonging supported by leadership and strengthened interpersonal relationships is the best method to improve employees’ experiences (Bordeaux et al., 2021). This, in turn, can increase motivation, job satisfaction, productivity, and dedication, improving performance and overall well- being within an organization.

Another salient finding was the invaluable role of superior guidance in fostering employee dedication and development. According to Xu et al. (2021), leadership strategies that hinge on support and mentorship have been positively correlated with job satisfaction and superior performance.

Additionally, there was a pronounced agreement among employees regarding the importance of understanding the broader organizational context of their roles. Such an understanding boosts intrinsic motivation and satisfaction at work. Supporting this notion, Ganesh (2023) concluded that organizations prioritizing cultivating employee growth and engagement benefit from greater productivity, morale, and lower turnover rates, ensuring a clear understanding of company strategies that tend to witness a surge in commitment levels. Employees who understand the bigger picture tend to align more with company objectives and show greater motivation. Lastly, the feedback mechanism and involvement of employees in decision-making emerged as a pivotal aspect of job satisfaction. Organizations that promote open communication and integrate feedback encourage innovation and enhance employee satisfaction, as shown by Morrison (2015). This is further corroborated by Czerwonka (2023), stating that companies that actively integrate and act upon employee suggestions frequently experience increased productivity and overall job satisfaction.

With a clear hierarchical structure, employees can better comprehend their reporting lines and the sources of decision-making. Such a structure can indeed simplify decisions and reduce uncertainties. Nonetheless, an overly stringent hierarchical system might curtail innovation, particularly when frequent managerial approvals are required. This can make highly centralized systems lose their flexibility. A study by N Away et al. (2021) suggests that organizations with flatter structures are generally more agile, adapting faster to market changes.

Moreover, centralized decision-making may offer consistency, but it often acts as a barrier to innovation, especially in rapidly evolving environments. Contemporary business thought is increasingly leaning towards empowering employees across all levels, viewing it as crucial for fostering agility and innovative thinking. A centralized organization provides for faster decision-making at the top because a small group makes decisions of people and then conveys them to lower-level managers. The engagement of only a few people makes the decision-making process more efficient because they can discuss the nuances of each option in one meeting (Wale, 2022). Sharma (2023) further discussed the advantages of decentralized decision-making, including increased creativity and innovation when individuals or teams make decisions with varied viewpoints and experiences. Increased employee engagement and motivation as employees feel more

involved in decision-making.

Lastly, the heart of an organization’s competitive edge lies in its value proposition (Caldwell & Anderson, 2017). In their pursuit to offer maximum value at the least possible cost, some firms might inadvertently overlook the importance of maintaining quality. This perspective can stem from the difficulty of balancing quality with cost. Teisberg et al. (2019) value-based healthcare framework highlights the common challenge organizations face in providing high-quality services while managing costs effectively.

The findings show that the respondents prefer an unrestricted, rigid, or flexible organizational structure. They were more inclined to work in an organization where their ideas, whatever position they have, could be voiced and heard. They prefer less to the idea that only the top managers make decisions and that theirs must always be checked. They are more persuaded when they see their worth in the organization.

Section 3. Relationship between Organizational Structure and Employee Performance in a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya

A comprehensive statistical analysis assesses the impact of various organizational dimensions on employee output. The analysis considers different aspects of organizational structure, including hierarchical structure, formalization, internal and external boundaries, and technology.

Table 9. Relationship between Organizational Structure and Employee Performance in a Multipurpose Cooperative in Nueva Vizcaya

Mean Ratings		Employee Performance Mean Rating		
		Correlation Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
	Hierarchical Structure	.721	.058	Do not reject Ho
Spearman’s rho	Formalization	.761	.050	Do not reject Ho
	Internal and External Boundaries	.302	.058	Do not reject Ho
	Technology	1.000	.000	Reject Ho

The level of Significance is set at <0.05.

Statistical analysis using the Spearman rho test reflects that the p-values computed for the hierarchical structure, formalization, and internal and external boundaries were greater than .05, which entails not rejecting the null hypothesis, indicating no significant relationship. This implies that organizational structures in these aspects do not affect employees’ performance.

These findings align with the results of Nosike et al. (2021), which reveal a weak positive correlation between the number of hierarchical layers and employees’ performance. The study observed that the nature and quantity of hierarchical layers exhibit a low association with employee performance. Consequently, the influence of the nature of hierarchical layers on employees’ performance is minimal. This outcome contrasts with the study conducted by Shabbir (2017), which states that the nature of hierarchical layers significantly

positively affects a firm's performance.

This is further supported by the Indeed Editorial Team (2021), which states that hierarchical structures can help employees understand different levels of management and reporting mechanisms, facilitating progress updates and issue reporting. However, a flat structure with few management layers can lead to role ambiguity, negatively affecting worker performance.

In the research by Nosike et al. (2021), there was an extremely weak negative correlation between formalization and employees' performance, suggesting an insignificant relationship. Another study supports this idea, indicating that the nature of formalization does not positively relate to the performance of academic staff. This finding aligns with a previous study conducted by Fischer et al. (2017), indicating that in situations of low uncertainty, organizational formalization may not be essential for creating structures that enhance performance but could potentially impose constraints on discretionary behavior. Despite skepticism among employees in the research domain regarding bureaucratic decision-making procedures, this finding contradicts Shabbir's (2017) assertion that the nature of formalization in an organization has a significant positive effect on firm performance.

The results differ from Nosike et al. (2021) findings regarding the relationship between internal and external boundaries and employees' performance, revealing a weak positive correlation. Compared to hierarchical layers and formalization, external and internal boundaries substantially influence employees' performance.

Nevertheless, although the study/result states that there is no significant relationship between the hierarchical structure, formalization, and internal and external boundary, studies still indicate a positive perception and a significant relationship between them. For instance, the study of Shabbir (2017), where the survey questionnaires were adopted, implies that companies that do not have a structure suitable for their staff will certainly encounter poor employee performance, concluding that organizational structure significantly improves employee performance. Moreover, all hypotheses indicate a significant relationship between organizational structure variables and employee performance. This supports the idea that organizations with fewer levels of hierarchy, blurred internal and external boundaries, had less formalization, and used technology that fit their organizational structure would have better employee performance.

Additionally, the result of the study shows that organizational structure relative to technology shows a p-value that is less than .05, which entails rejecting the null hypothesis and thus denotes a significant relationship. This means that organizational structure relative to technology affects employee performance.

When it comes to the relationship between organizational structure and technology, the organizational structure directly impacts how technology is incorporated and employed inside a company. A well-designed organizational structure may help with technological integration, allowing employees to interact, cooperate, and exchange information more efficiently (de Vreede et al., 2016). According to an article from eLearningCompany, Inc. (2023), collaborative technology may improve processes, facilitate information exchange, and increase creativity. Such technologies, specifically designed to foster collaboration across teams, departments, or entire companies, empower employees to interact, communicate, and collaborate. Tools like Slack, Asana, Messenger, Gmail, Zoom, Viber, and other collaboration tools may collaborate, interact, and allocate or assign tasks to employees.

Moreover, according to a study by Kampini (2018), the structure of an organization has a major impact on how well employees perform their job responsibilities. Low productivity, limited work delegation, no incentives, and centralized decision-making can all result from poorly organized systems. On the other hand, a well-organized structure paired with technology can contribute to enhanced staff performance. Kane et al. (2019) emphasized that companies that align their organizational structure with rapid technological changes

or advancements tend to have more adaptive, innovative employees who perform better.

As we move further into the digital era, the connection between how organizations are structured with respect to technology and how well their employees perform becomes increasingly evident. Companies that successfully incorporate technology into their framework enhance their competitive edge in the market and elevate their internal employee performance measurements.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Determining the Organizational Structure and Employees' Performance: The Case of Multipurpose Cooperatives in Nueva Vizcaya has led the researchers to the following conclusions:

1. In terms of organizational structure, the employees of a Multipurpose Cooperative have a positive perception of the organizational structure's four sub-variables (hierarchical structure, formalization, internal and external boundary, and technology). The reason for this could be because the management is proactive when it comes to the fast-changing industry. They adapted to the technological shift that helps the cooperative to have more opportunities and solve their problems which will result in them dominating the market.
2. The employees of a Multipurpose Cooperative hold a positive perception of employee performance. The positive perception is reflected in various dimensions of their work environment. It indicates a healthy organizational culture that values communication, guidance, and holistic engagement, fostering an environment where employees feel valued and motivated. The cooperative's emphasis on aligning individual contributions with the broader organizational goals is evident in the positive responses to indicators related to career development, accomplishment, and respect in their positions.
3. Hierarchical structure, formalization, and internal and external boundaries do not have a significant relationship with the performance of employees except for technology. This might be because traditional hierarchical structures and formalization no longer have as much of an impact on how well employees perform in today's rapidly changing and technologically oriented workplace. Internal and external boundaries are less influential due to the increasing interconnectedness and virtual nature of contemporary workplaces, acting as a powerful catalyst that empowers employees to transcend these traditional constraints and directly influence their performance. This emphasizes the necessity for businesses to adapt and make technology investments to maximize employee performance in the modern workplace.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are advised:

To the Employees: The study's findings emphasize a strong correlation between employee performance and technology. The researchers recommend that employees engage in training programs, seminars, and development opportunities to enhance their proficiency in utilizing the organization's technological resources. This adds to their skills and provides the cooperative with a competitive advantage. A technologically proficient workforce ensures the organization's adaptability to industry changes, fosters innovation, improves efficiency, and contributes to operational excellence. By fostering a continuous learning and adaptation culture, the cooperative positions itself for sustainable growth and success in a dynamic technological landscape.

To the Cooperative: Given a preference for traditional methods, organizations should encourage creativity in presenting products, especially online, as most people now use the internet. Leveraging creativity is

essential to capture the attention of new clients. It is also recommended that organizations should seek technology that simplifies communication between various tools or platforms used in the business. This compatibility reduces data silos, enhances efficiency, and supports better decision-making based on comprehensive information. It is suggested that the Cooperative should offer continuous support by conducting training, seminars, and other activities to facilitate a smooth transition, showcasing a commitment to successful implementation, and fostering employee performance.

To the Future Researchers: Since the study is confined to a single multipurpose cooperative, it may not fully represent the entire cooperative sector. It is advisable to conduct further research to enhance the understanding of the relationship between organizational structure and employee performance. And since the study primarily focuses on organizational structure and technology's impact on employee performance, overlooking other potential influencing factors such as leadership styles, organizational culture, and external market dynamics, it is suggested to do comprehensive analysis incorporating these factors could provide a holistic understanding of employee performance determinants.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, J., Mahmood, H. K., Muzaffar, A., Ramzan, M. A., & Rizvi, S. S. U. H. (2014, January). Impact of technology on performance of employees (A Case Study on Allied Bank Ltd, Pakistan). *ResearchGate; World Applied Sciences Journal*. https://researchgate.net/publication/288459922_Impact_of_technology_on_performance_of_employees_a_case_study_on_Allied_Bank_Ltd_Pakistan
2. Adducul, S. & Palina, J. (2023). The Disappearing Shelf Space Versus the Flourishing Virtual Newsstands in the Philippine Publishing Industry: The Case of ABS-CBN Publishing, Inc. *International Journal of Research and Publication Reviews*, 4(9), 504-526. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.923.52334>
3. Adekola, T. A., Bello, A. O., & Eze, S. C. (2017). The effects of organizational structure on the performance of *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 5(6), 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejbir.vol5.no6.p46-62.2017>
4. Aggarwal, C. (2023, February). What are the types of organizational structures? *Shiksha Online; Shiksha Online*. <https://shiksha.com/online-courses/articles/what-are-the-types-of-organizational-structures>.
5. Ahmad, F., Danish, R. Q., & Ramzan, S. (2015, January). Effect of formalization on organizational commitment; interactional role of self-monitoring in the service sector. *American Journal Of Economics, Finance and Management*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277666442_Effect_of_Formalization_on_Organizational_Commitment_Interactional_Role_of_Self-Monitoring_in_the_Service_Sector
6. Akob, M., Arianty, R., & Putra, A. H. P. K. (2020). The mediating role of distribution kahn's engagement: an empirical evidence of salesforce in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(2), 249–260. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no2.249>
7. Almohtasib, T., Bergström, N., & Nguyen, V. (2020). Decentralized environment's impact on employee performance: A study on how a decentralized environment in the operating & service department impacts employee performance within an organization. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1437221/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
8. Atanasoff, L., & Venable, M. (2017, December). Technostress: Implications for adults in the https://researchgate.net/publication/321690765_Technostress_Implications_for_Adults_in_the_Workforce
9. Bartnick, S. (2023, January 27). How to craft the right organizational structure for your business. *Entrepreneur*. <https://entrepreneur.com/starting-a-business/how-to-craft-the-right-organizational-structure-for-your/441359>

10. Bataineh, K. A. (2019). Impact of work-life balance, happiness at work, on employee performance. *International Business Research*, 12(2), 99–112. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v12n2p99>
11. Beer, P., & Mulder, R. (2020). The effects of technological developments on work and their implications for continuous vocational education and training: A systematic *Frontiers*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00918/full>
12. Bello, S., & Musa, S. A. (2023). A review of organisational change on employee performance in public sector organisation in Nigeria. *Journals.researchsynergypress.com*, 2(1), (92–102). <https://journals.researchsynergypress.com/index.php/orcadev/article/view/1342/801>
13. Bordeaux, C., Grace, B., & Sabherwal, N. (2021, November 23). Why does belonging matter in the workplace? *Deloitte United States*. <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/blog/human-capital-blog/2021/what-is-belonging-in-the-workplace.html>
14. Bozorov, F., Dedahanov, A., Rhee, J., & Seog, S. D. (2017). Organization structure and employee innovative behavior: The mediating role of https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320224307_Organizational_structure_and_employees%27_innovative_behavior_The_mediating_role_of_empowerment
15. Bragg, S. (2022, April 29). Hierarchical organizational structure. *AccountingTools*. <https://accountingtools.com/articles/hierarchical-organizational-structure>
16. Bustamam, N. M., Choh, N. F. C., Shaari, J., & Muda, R. (2020, March). Factors affecting the performance of employee in workplace. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340274168_FACTORS_AFFECTING_THE_PERFORMANCE_OF_EMPLOYEE_IN_WORKPLACE
17. Caldwell, C., & Anderson, V. (2017). Competitive advantage: Strategies, management, and performance. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Cam-Caldwell/publication/321682230_Competitive_advantage_Strategies_management_and_performance/links/5a8416fe45851504fb3b09a2/Competitive-advantage-Strategies-management-and-performance.pdf
18. Caminos, K. (2004). A study of the effect of organizational structure on employee satisfaction in youth-serving organizations in the San Francisco Bay *Master's Theses*. <https://repository.usfca.edu/thes/1104/>
19. Carroll, L. S. (2017). A comprehensive definition of technology from an ethological perspective. *Social Sciences*, 6(4), 126. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci6040126>
20. Castillo, E., & Castillo, M. (2017). Cooperatives in the socio-economic development of the https://base.socioeco.org/docs/2._en-dr_eulogio_t_castillo_paper_for_vietnam.pdf
21. Chandi, N. (2017, July 20). Council post: How AI is reshaping the accounting industry. *Forbes*. <https://forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2017/07/20/how-ai-is-reshaping-the-accounting-industry/?sh=3b61fb5037f3>
22. Colquitt, J., Lepine, J., & Wesson, M. (2019). Organizational behavior improving performance and commitment in the workplace sixth edition. <https://lib-unpak.ac.id/index.php?p=fstream-pdf&fid=2029&bid=14441>
23. Courage, M. L., & Pollard, M. A. (2017). Working memory capacity predicts effective multitasking. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 76, 450–462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.008>
24. Czerwonka, E. (2023, November 20). What is employee satisfaction? Measure and Improve – *Buddy Punch*. <https://buddypunch.com/blog/identifying-and-fostering-employee-satisfaction/>
25. Daft, R. (2018). Organization theory and design. *Cengage Learning*. <http://www.mim.ac.mw/books/Organization%20Theory%20and%20Design.pdf>
26. de Vreede, G.-J., Antunes, P., Vassileva, J., Gerosa, M. A., & Wu, K. (2016). Collaboration technology in teams and organizations: Introduction to the special issue. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 18(1), 1–6. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-016-9632-3>
27. Desta, B. K. (2019). Organizational factors affecting employee performance: The case of selected public service organizations in dire dawa administration, Ethiopia. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 9(10), <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/PPAR/article/view/49903>.

28. Doz, Y. L. (2018, February 13). Spanning the boundaries that limit organisational innovativeness. *INSEAD Knowledge*. <https://knowledge.insead.edu/strategy/spanning-boundaries-limit-organisational-innovativeness>
29. EduBirdie. (2021, September 29). The relationship between organizational structure and job performance. *Edubirdie*. <https://edubirdie.com/examples/the-relationship-between-organizational-structure-and-job-performance/>
30. eLearning Company, (2023, May 15). Leveraging collaborative technologies to boost knowledge sharing and innovation. *The ELearning Blog*. <https://elearning.company/blog/leveraging-collaborative-technologies-to-boost-knowledge-sharing-and-innovation/>
31. Eze, S. C., Bello, A. O., & Adekola, T. A. (2017). The effects of organizational structure on the performance of *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 5(6), 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejbir.vol5.no6.p46-62.2017>
32. FICCO (First Community Cooperative). (2020, February 14). How cooperatives benefit a community. *FICCO*. <https://ficco.org/2020/02/14/how-cooperatives-benefit-a-community/>
33. Fischer, R., Ferreira, M. C., Meurs, N. V., Gok, K., Jiang, D.-Y., Fontaine, J. R. J., Harb, C., Ciecuch, , Achoui, M., Mendoza, M. S. D., Hassan, A., Achmadi, D., Mogaji, A. A., & Abubakar, A. (2017, December). Does organizational formalization facilitate voice and helping organizational citizenship behaviors? It depends on (national) uncertainty norms. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321977430_Does_organizational_formalization_facilitate_voice_and_helping_organizational_citizenship_behaviors_It_depends_on_national_uncertainty_norms
34. Francis, A. (2018, April 21). Impact of information technology on organizations. *MBA Knowledge* <https://www.mbaknol.com/information-systems-management/impact-of-information-technology-on-organizations/>
35. Gaille, L. (2017, September 16). 13 Flat organizational structure advantages and disadvantages. *org*. <https://vittana.org/13-flat-organizational-structure-advantages-and-disadvantages>
36. Ganesh, K. (2023, May 31). Why employee engagement and retention is the secret to improving culture? <https://www.culturemonkey.io/employee-engagement/workplace-employee-engagement-and-retention/>
37. Gupta, S. (2018). Organizational barriers to digital transformation. *Shikha Gupta Kth Royal Institute of Technology School of Industrial Engineering and Management*. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1218220/FULLTEXT01.pdf?fbclid=IwAR1nZWkvFNSg85vM1Q5n6R1q00XBhrkhO5uigyhXn7WMLUJpBKALfW8q_sw
38. Haerani, S., Sumardi, S., Hakim, W., Hartini, H., & Putra, A. H. P. K. (2020). Structural model of developing human resources performance: Empirical study of Indonesia states owned enterprises. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(3), 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no3.211>
39. Harappa. (2021, December 23). Max Weber’s theory of bureaucratic management. *Harappa. education*. <https://harappa.education/harappa-diaries/max-weber-theory-of-bureaucracy-2/#:~:text=The%20Max%20Weber%20Theory%20of%20Bureaucracy%20proposes%20that%20all%20business,what%20is%20expected%20of%20them.>
40. Indeed Editorial Team. (2021, February 23). Hierarchical structure: Definition and examples. *Indeed Career Guide*. <https://indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/hierarchical-structure-definition-and-examples>
41. Iqbal, A., Lodhi, R. N., Mussawar, S., Nayab, H. H., Saeed, R., & Yaseen, S. (2013). Factors affecting the performance of employees at work place in the banking sector of *Research Gate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260303088_Factors_Affecting_the_Performance_of_Employees_at_Work_Place_in_the_Banking_Sector_of_Pakistan
42. Janicijevic, (2013). The mutual impact of organizational culture and structure. *Economic Annals*, 58 (198), 35–60. <https://doi.org/10.2298/eka1398035j>
43. Kampini, T. (2018). Impact of organization structure on employee performance. *GRIN*. [grin.com. https://www.grin.com/document/434752](https://www.grin.com/document/434752)

44. Kane, G., Palmer, D., Phillips, A., Kiron, D., & Buckley, N. (2019). Accelerating digital innovation inside and outside the box. <https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/lu/Documents/deloitte-digital/lu-accelerating-digital-innovation.pdf>
45. Koi-Akrofi, G. Y. (2020, June). Complementary assets and value creation beyond information technology https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342819796_Complementary_Assets_and_Value_Creation_Beyond_Information_Technology_Investments
46. Korkmaz, F., & Zorlu, K. (2021, April). Organizational communication as an effective communication strategy in organizations and the role of the *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351128825_Organizational_Communication_as_an_Effective_Communication_Strategy_in_Organizations_and_the_Role_of_the_Leader
47. Lee, C. (2020). A study on the relationship between organizational structure and organizational effectiveness: The case of the Korea Water Resources Corporation (K-water). *KDI Central Archives*. <https://archives.kdischool.ac.kr/bitstream/11125/41880/1/A%20Study%20on%20the%20relationship%20between%20organizational%20structure%20and%20organizational%20effectiveness.PDF>
48. Manyike, R. (2019, June). Formalization structure and team creativity in high tech firms. https://researchgate.net/publication/334456207_Formalization_Structure_and_Team_Creativity_in_High_Tech_Firms?fbclid=IwAR1fU_YzRTszxkckhbpKLJxPL0y2b3IqOZjP3MoO0_TK1K-q6dq0RtFSEB4
49. Morrison, E. W. (2015, April 2). *The academy of management annals*. Routledge. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233164076_Employee_Voice_Behavior_Integration_and_Directions
50. N Away, F. A., Simamora, B., Nadeak, S. I., Nugraha, M. S., Prasetia, I., & Hendriarto, P. (2021). Decentralization, centralization and quality of organizational performance of human resources. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353779536_DECENTRALIZATION_CENTRALIZATION_AND_QUALITY_OF_ORGANIZATIONAL_PERFORMANCE_OF_HUMAN_RESOURCES
51. Nadheya, R., & Yuvara, Dr. S. (2018). Role of technology on employee behaviour and their performance. *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology (IJMET)*, 9 (7), 244–251. https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/IJMET/VOLUME_9_ISSUE_7/IJMET_09_07_028.pdf
52. Nduati, M. M., & Wanyoike, R. (2022). Employee performance management practices and organizational effectiveness. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 3(10), 361–378. https://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajhrba_v3_i10_361_378.pdf
53. Neck, C. P., Houghton, J. D., & Murray, E. L. (2017). Organizational behavior: A critical-thinking approach. London: SAGE Publications, Inc. [http://www.amas.hk/pdf/shijianshenxue/1/3649%EF%BC%89Organizational%20Behavior%20A%20Critical-Thinking%20Approach%20\(Christopher%20P.%20Neck,%20Jeffery%20D.%20Houghton%20etc.\)%20\(z-lib.org\).pdf](http://www.amas.hk/pdf/shijianshenxue/1/3649%EF%BC%89Organizational%20Behavior%20A%20Critical-Thinking%20Approach%20(Christopher%20P.%20Neck,%20Jeffery%20D.%20Houghton%20etc.)%20(z-lib.org).pdf)
54. Nguyen, H. M., Mai, L. T., & Huynh, T. L. (2019). The role of transformational leadership toward work performance through intrinsic motivation: A study in the pharmaceutical field in Vietnam. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 6(4), 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2019.vol6.no4.201>
55. Nguyen, P. T., Yandi, A., & Mahaputra, M. R. (2020, June). Factors that influence employee performance: Motivation, leadership, environment, culture organization, work achievement, competence and compensation (A study of human resource management literature studies). *Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management*. <https://scribd.com/document/548964654/389-Article-Text-735-3-10-20200922-1>
56. Nnadi, O., Sunday, C., Udeze, C., & Ugwu, N. (2019). Organizational structure and employee's performance in selected micro-finance banks in Enugu State, Nigeria. *IDOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 38–52. <https://www.idosr.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/IDOSR-JHSS-41-38-52-2019.-JU.pdf>

57. Nosike, C., Okoye, N., & Afodigbueokwu, H. (2021). Effect of organizational structure on employee performance of commercial banks in Nigeria. *Journal Research Journal of Management Practice*, 1 (7), 2782–7674. <https://www.ijaar.org/articles/rjmp/v1n7/rjmp-v1n7-Jul21-p1719.pdf>
58. Nwonu, C. O., Agbaeze, E. K., & Obi-Anike, H. O. (2017, May). Effect of organizational structure on performance of selected manufacturing companies in Enugu State Nigeria. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317546699_Effect_of_Organisational_Structure_on_Performance_of_Selected_Manufacturing_Companies_in_Enugu_State_Nigeria
59. Nzyoka, C. M., & Orwa, B. H. (2016). The relationship between total compensation and employee performance in the insurance industry, case of Mayfair Insurance Company Limited. *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 5(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.pbs.20160501.14>
60. Republic Act 9520 | CDA. (2009, February 17). Republic of the Philippines Cooperative Development <https://cda.gov.ph/issuances/republic-act-9520/#:~:text=%E2%80%9320A%20cooperative%20is%20an%20autonomous>
61. Republic of the Philippines Cooperative Development Authority. (2021). Registered cooperatives under A. 9520. <https://cda.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2021-List-of-Cooperatives.pdf>
62. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2018). Essentials of organizational behavior. *Pearson*. http://homepages.se.edu/cvonbergen/files/2018/03/Essentials-of-Organizational-Behavior_14th-ed_Chapters-1-and-2.pdf
63. Robbins, S., Coulter, M., & Decenzo, D. (2017). Fundamentals of management eleventh *Pearson*. <https://www.pearsonhighered.com/assets/preface/0/1/3/5/0135175151.pdf>
64. Samphina (2022, August 23). Effects of organizational structures on employees' performance. *Samphina Academy*. <https://samphina.com.ng/effects-organizational-structures-performance-workers/>
65. Satyendra. (2020, June 6). Organization structure. *IspatGuru*. <https://www.ispatguru.com/organization-structure/>
66. Shabbir, M. S. (2017). Organizational structure and employee's performance: A study of brewing firms in *American Research Journal of Business and Management*. https://www.google.com.ph/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.arjonline.org%2Fpapers%2Farjbm%2Fv3-i1%2F6.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1BVBOHUxhVwATd_VJp6ME-&opi=89978449
67. Shah, Z., & Rai, S. (2022, July). A research paper on the effects of customer feedback on https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361916247_A_Research_Paper_on_the_Effects_of_Customer_Feedback
68. Sharma, D. (2023, August 16). What is decentralized decision making? 6 Ways it benefits managers and teams. <https://www.risely.me/decentralized-decision-making-for-your-team/#:~:text=Advantages%20of%20decentralized%20decision%20making%20include%3A%20Increased%20creativity>
69. Skorková, Z. (2020, January). The effect of formalization in the enterprise. https://researchgate.net/publication/346552522_The_effect_of_formalization_in_the_enterprise
70. Tang, W.-G., & Vandenberghe, C. (2021, May 21). Role overload and work performance: The role of psychological strain and leader-member exchange. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.691207/full?fbclid=IwAR25iYanNy48o015YhAUkbnNHPJkCJsePpwhwQ_bp_f8hg4DOPmkIvMyqw
71. Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning*, 51(1), 40–49. *Scencedirect*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007>
72. Teisberg, E., Wallace, S., & O'Hara, S. (2019). Defining and implementing value-based health *Academic Medicine*, 95(5), 682–685. <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000003122>
73. University of Minnesota. (2017). Chapter 14: Organizational structure and change. *Ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub*. https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/orgbehavior/part/chapter-14-organizational-structure-and-change/?fbclid=IwAR2vPIevJGcgOYk0RQRXO3oPliA4vWhBHcsUHckUdgyd0_gWUI929Yi1JE
74. Váchal, J., & Talí?, M. (2020). The development of organizational and management structures in small-scale and mid-scale entrepreneurship in the Czech Republic. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 73, <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20207302006>

82. Wale, H. (2022, October 27). Centralization. *Corporate Finance Institute*. <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/management/centralization/>
83. Xu, S., Liu, P., Yang, Z., Cui, Z., & Yang, F. (2021, October 14). How does mentoring affect the creative performance of mentors: The role of personal learning and career stage. <https://frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.741139/full>
84. Zambas, J. (2021, August 4). The importance of effective communication in the workplace. *Careeraddict.com*. <https://www.careeraddict.com/the-importance-of-effective-communication-in-the-workplace>
85. Zhenjing, G., Chupradit, S., Ku, K. Y., Nassani, A. A., & Haffar, M. (2022). Impact of employees' workplace environment on employees' performance: A multi-mediation model. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10(890400). Ncbi. <https://ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9136218>