

Organizational Structure and Job Satisfaction: A Correlational Study of Teaching Faculty at Higher Education Level

Nazma Bibi¹, Musarrat Habib², Crystal J. Davis³



Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between various components of organizational structure and the job satisfaction of teachers at the higher education level. There are two forms of organizational structure: organic and mechanistic. The novelty of this study is that organizational structure was assessed on a six-point basis including "work specialization, departmentalization, chain of command, span of control, centralization, decentralization, and formalization". The study was descriptive and correlational. The population included all 22 public universities of Punjab, Pakistan. A sample of 505 faculty members was selected through a two-stage sampling technique, and the response rate was n=408. Two tools were used to collect data: The Organizational Structure Survey (OSS) developed by the researcher, and the experts checked the content validity of the Organizational Structure Survey (OSS). The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) of Spector (1994) was modified in the Pakistani context. Data were collected from seven public universities with a sample size of 505 university teachers in the Punjab region. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The results indicated that the organizational structure of the universities was organic. The study concluded a positive relationship between all the subscales of organizational structure and teachers' job satisfaction levels. Furthermore, the overall organizational structure was also significantly related to job satisfaction.

Keywords: *Organizational Structure, Job Satisfaction, Organic and Mechanistic, Content Validity*

1. Introduction

In recent years, the Pakistani government has started focusing on higher education. Higher Education Commission (HEC) Pakistan is responsible for a

¹ Assistant Professor, Govt. Degree College (W) Kot Khawaja Saeed, Lahore
Email: dr.nazma.bibi@gcwkotkhawajasaeed.edu.pk

² Assistant Professor, University of Lahore
Email: musarrat.habib@ed.uol.edu.pk

³ Professor, Cloud County Community College, USA
Email: Crystal.Davis@cloud.edu

comprehensive review of university performance following the (Higher Education Ordinance, 2002). At the same time, participants continued to report problems with the functioning of tertiary institutions, including government and private universities. The structure of the university organization can be one of the reasons for the low Job Satisfaction (JS) level among the faculty members. As a result, it may affect the performance of higher education institutions and universities. Organizations are formed into groups of people to achieve results that one cannot achieve independently. People in organizations have diverse experiences, inspirations, and values, and these differences lead the way in many ways (Bibi, Safder, Alvi, Jamshid, & Jamshid, 2020).

When an organization directs human behavior to achieve a goal, strategies should be designed to reduce this diversity among people and guide staff efforts to achieve goals (O'Neill, Beauvais & Scholl, 2001). The organization's objectives are calculated according to the organization's overall strategy (Kondalkar, 2007). Robbins and Judge (2013) indicated that Organizational Structure (OS) must follow organizational strategy.

Every organization is established to accomplish its goals. These goals are often achieved through the intensive efforts of several resources. Organizational Structure (OS) plays a vital role in achieving these goals (Kondalkar, 2007; Moorhead & Griffin, 2010). The OS directs all employees by exhibiting the connections that oversee the work process of the whole organization (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Moreover, Donaldson (2001) argued that the best organizational structure aligns with the overall strategy. So, there is no "most ideal way" to direct the organization of an effective organization. Instead, the manager should accept that either mechanical or environmental construction works best for the whole organization or units in its organization (Burns & Stalker, 1961). The mechanistic structure of the organization is that where there is a high level of technology, a transparent chain of command, and decision-making in the middle. The mechanistic structure of tertiary institutions create problems, for example, job dissatisfaction and low-level staff concerns in various types of jobs (Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006).

The OS is how the work is officially categorized and compiled (Sablinski, 2003). It is the anatomy of an organization which provides the foundation on which organizations operate. However, Hellriegel and Slocum (2011) posited the organizational structure as constructing an existing structure or renovation to suit the organization's environment and technical requirements. The two most dominant Organizational Structures (OS) are "mechanistic and organic". The organizational structure affects the employees' Job Satisfaction (now onwards: JS) in any organization (Altaf, Yousaf, Tahir & Bagram 2013).

OS also plays a significant role in enhancing organizational performance. This suggests that organizational structure inevitably affects its performance. If employees are satisfied, organizational performance will be high or good (Aniagyei, 2011).

An organization's structure has a substantial impact on its behavior. Many people believe that the primary influencer of organizational behavior is OS decisions. The six subscales of OS include "delegation of authority, specialization, departmentalization, formalization, chain of command, and span of control" (Robbins, Coulter & Vohra, 2009, p. 193). Centralization is adversely related to JS (Bibi, 2020). Specialization also influences the JS of workers (Willem, Buelens, & De Jonghe, 2007). The other OS subscales, "formalization, chain of command, and span of control", are also related to the JS of employees (Adeyoyin, Agbeze-Unazi, Oyewunmi, Adegun, & Ayodele, 2015).

The government has prioritized higher education over the past few years, with significant foreign aid and academic negotiations taking place across the nation. Furthermore, there are complaints from stakeholders regarding the performance and results of higher education institutions; the organizational structure (OS) can be one factor that can improve teachers' level of satisfaction (Bibi, 2020). Thus, the results of advanced/higher education might be influenced. In addition, no such pointers were involved in the evaluation process for higher education institutions by the Higher Education Commission. The level of satisfaction with everyone's work and performance depends on the appropriate OS. The OS is a set of work-related behaviors deliberately established to achieve the organization's objectives.

Debates in the education sector have raged for the past decade about operating systems, organizational accomplishments, and staff satisfaction within the present organizational structure. However, opinions vary widely regarding the appropriate organizational structure to enhance job satisfaction. Consequently, the primary focus of this research was to give a complete comprehension of the Organizational Structure (OS) and its forms: the mechanical and organic organization and their sub-factors relationships with Job Satisfaction (JS) of teachers in higher education institutions.

1.1 Scope of the Study

Teachers in any educational organization are the fundamental source and a major aspect in the development of the organization. So, an educational organization must facilitate their teachers to reach the maximum level of their job satisfaction because organizations' success is also linked with the JS of its' employees.

In this study, the relationship between the subscales of OS of universities and the level of JS of their teachers was assessed. The scope of this quantitative correlational research study was limited to the subscales of OS and JS as specified in both survey instruments. Following the recommendation of previous research (Thomas, 2015) that suggested the need to study the subscales of OS against JS, this research study did not measure the effect of OS on JS, however, the implications of both variables are huge as McCartney (1978) posited that workers are satisfied with work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervisors, and co-workers when there is a positive organizational structure. The research showed that there is a significant relationship between the effects of OS on JS.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Over the past decade, the issue of OS and JS has attracted scholars' attention to organizational domain. Organizations have objectives to accomplish, and this is only achieved through the collective endeavours of employees. The organizational structure that underpins these goals and objectives is critical to achieving these goals. In organizational research, organizations are structured in a variety of ways. This highlights its difficulties with employees having their own goals and objectives, which they believe work satisfaction is paramount. Therefore, the selection and use of the most appropriate structure that may bring workplace satisfaction to the workplace is a concern in this study.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to identify and distinguish the Organizational Structure (OS) of universities in Punjab. In addition, the relationship between the subscales of OS of universities and the level of JS of their teachers was also assessed.

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses guided this quantitative correlational research study:

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between decentralization and the JS of university teachers.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between specialization and JS of university teachers.

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between formalization and the JS of university teachers.

Ho₄: There is no significant relationship between departmentalization and the JS of university teachers.

Ho₅: There is no significant relationship between the chain of command and the JS of university teachers.

Ho₆: There is no significant relationship between the span of control and JS of university teachers.

Ho₇: There is no significant relationship between organizational structure and the JS of university teachers.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the area of OS and JS. Many models have examined the relationship between OS and JS in the business and corporate sector, but this research is delimited to the field of education. This research is novel because subscales of OS in the previous studies were only three "specialization, and formalization" to assess the OS of organizations. This study includes six OS subscales, and the researcher developed the research instrument, although some items of Prezeosis's "Organization Diagnostic Questionnaire (ODQ)" were included after permission. The researcher introduced the six-component scale of OS, and gave the scale the name "Organizational Structure Survey (OSS).

2. Literature Review

The structure of an organization can vary in its type and meaning. Andrew (2012) explained that "organizational structure consists of employment positions, their interaction with each other and accountability through process and sub-system expectations" (p. 3). An organizational structure is a system used to find the best way to delegate responsibilities, powers, and responsibilities to employees and their departments (Elsaid, Okasha, & Abdelghaly, 2013). It also controls and directs the flow of information in the organization. The organizational structure (OS) summarizes how their work is divided to perform different functions, and then its interaction again integration is found between those functions (Andrew, 2012). It provides a fundamental basis for organizational activities (Mohammed & Saleh, 2013). OS also shows value-based decisions made by an organization (Quinn, 1988), which means what job functions are officially divided, collected and assembled and can connect social and emotional systems (Rezayian, 2007).

OS empowers the organization to form a framework for the effective use of organizational processes (Wang, Wan, & Zhao, 2014). The structure of the organization is divided into diverse ways. Two important structures are mechanical and organic (Hellriegel & Slocum, 2011). Lunenburg (2012) stated that organic structures have a lower hierarchy, fewer legal rules, a wider regulatory environment, and a more direct communication system. An organic structure supports workers to attain the objectives of the organization. However, a mechanistic structure comprises multiple stages of organization, lack of focus, high legal rules, limited control space, and vertical correspondence (Clement & Puranam, 2017). Burns and Stalker (1961) presented two dimensions of OS that are; organic and mechanistic. Several scholars and investigators have examined

and presented diverse components of OS. Prominent among them are Pugh Hickson, Hinings, and Turner (1968), who described the five factors of organizational structure: “standardization, formalization, centralization or decentralization and configuration" (p. 65).

In this study, OS consists of seven subscales, i.e. “centralization, decentralization (delegation of authority), departmentalization, formalization, chain of command, and span of control" (Robbins, Coulter, & Vohra, 2009, p. 193). The first feature of the OS is “specialization”. It is a procedure in which distinct duties are assigned to different roles (Kondalkar, 2007). Centralization refers to organizational decisions made at the senior management level (Robbins & Judge, 2013). In contrast, “delegation or power allocation” refers to the allocation of power to subordinates at different levels of the organization (Kondalkar, 2007). The term "centralization” represents the concentration of power in the hands of a management structure. The dispersal of power among the administrative system's lower layers is referred to as decentralization. In addition, it refers to the number of jobs and the conduct of employees governed by the organization’s rules and procedures (Robbins, Coulter, & Vohra, 2009). The “chain of command”, which gives a sequential level of control from senior management to sub-management and sets the reporting authority at each company level, is the next component of the OS. While the span of control means the number of juniors that a senior can well handle to attain the organization’s objectives. The last feature of the OS is “span of control”. According to (Robbins & Judge, 2013), setting up a department forms the basis for grouping jobs together. The following table can interpret both structures in clear way;

Table 1

Organic vs Mechanistic Structure

Organic Structure	Mechanistic Structure
Delegation/ decentralization	Central decision-making
Free flow of information	Downward communication
Fewer rules and guidelines	More rules and guidelines
A wide span of control	Narrow span of control
Flexible functions (less specialization)	Units are divided (More specialization)
Cross hierarchical teams	Inflexible departmentalization

Source: developed by researcher

Table 1 shows that both (organic and mechanistic) structures are opposite to each other. Organic structures are significant concerning staff training and organizations, innovation, and development (Øgaard, Marnburg, & Larsen, 2008). In organic structure, (a) there is high interaction and participation, (b) the

decision-making process is not in one place, (c) communication is not organized, and (d) flexible functions. Whereas the mechanistic structure includes (a) units being divided into specific levels, (b) downward communication, (c) the decision-making process is central (d) more rules (Ahmady, Mehrpour, & Nikooravesh, 2016). Moreover, Duncan (1971) has suggested five key aspects of organic structure: sharing in decisions, formalization, management class, non-compliance authority, and staff segregation. Both frameworks provide consistent planning designs that can be used to balance the pressure from connected variables. These two "perfect" patterns seem to have specific strengths and flaws. The mechanical pattern is more suitable when associations are concerned about effectiveness (Litterer, 1973). Conversely, an organic form can be chosen when there is a high inconsistency and the organization is unsure how to convert the input into results.

Employees who work for organizations with goals can only perform well when their satisfaction is sufficiently met. If an organization wants to work efficiently, it must keep the JS of employees in view. JS is an "employee's judgment of how well his job has satisfied his various needs" (Smith, 1955, p.322). According to Blum and Nylor (1998), job satisfaction is a general state of affairs created by certain aspects of work, singular attributes, and relationships outside of work. Job satisfaction is a general state of affairs about one's work, which is also considered a personal evaluation of the conditions in the workplace, supervision, or outcomes which arise as a result of having a job. Moreover, Spector (1997) defined JS as "the degree to which people like their jobs" (p. 7). JS is "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience" (Locke 1976, p.1300).

JS is not a single concept; it is a multidimensional concept. As stated by Spector (1997), determinants of JS are "pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures co-workers, nature of work and communication" (p. 8). These factors were studied in this study using a job satisfaction survey (JSS) by Spector (1985). This research has focused on Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory which is also known as Factor Herzberg's theory. It posits two opposing boundaries - job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with continuity. A worker needs to meet inspiring factors such as salary and benefits, appreciation, and performance to be satisfied with their job. However, in the absence of "hygienic" items such as working situations, company policies and frameworks, job security, communication with co-workers, and management quality, an employee will not be satisfied with their performance. A manager should focus on the things that enhance workers' satisfaction within the organization.

Job satisfaction (JS) is influenced by many factors, and one among them is OS. The primary and internal goal of each organization is the JS of staff. Studies have proven a strong correlation between OS and JS (Kessler, 2007; Tran & Tian, 2013). On the issue of OS and JS, Kessler (2007) utilized a scale to assess the OS created by Khandwalla (1976/1977). The results demonstrated a positive connection between OS and JS, indicating that employees working in a more organic organization provided a higher level of JS than employees working in more organized mechanistic organizations.

Kakabadse and Worall (1978) studied the relationship between OS and JS as an experience of staff employed in nine social services departments. They found that the best predictions for OS were the magnitude of centralism and formalization closely related but negatively to JS. Lambert, Paoline III, and Hogan (2006) and Campbell, Fowles, and Weber (2005) concluded from their study that centralization is negatively related to JS, and formalization has a significant direct link with JS. From their research, I. Ali and J. Ali (2004) found that employees' say in decision making has a significant positive effect on JS. The OS has shown remarkable consistency in the results of doing a particular job, doing things legally, and making it one in the satisfaction of the work. Employees have a high level of job satisfaction when they are given a chance to somehow make decisions (I. Ali & J. Ali, 2004). Another study, Impact of Organizational Structure on Nurses' Job Satisfaction: A Questionnaire Survey, showed that centralization negatively affects job satisfaction.

Furthermore, the study also showed that less formalization and more specialization enhance the JS of employees (Willem, Buelens, & De Jonghe, 2007, p. 1011). In 2007, Kessler led a study regarding OS and JS. He concluded that employees working in more organic organizations are more satisfied than workers employed in mechanistic settings. In the industrial sector, another research found that OS is linked positively with the JS of employees (Øgaard et al., 2008). Katsikea, Theodosiou, Perdikis, and Kehagias (2011), viewed that centralization negatively affects job autonomy which affects the JS of employees. Another factor of OS's "span of control" is significantly associated with JS (Kwan, Isa, & Hin, 2015). Adeyoyin, Agbeze-Unazi, Oyewunmi, Adegun, & Ayodele (2015) also reported that specialization and departmentalization have a significant effect on the job satisfaction of university library staff.

Thomas (2015) concluded that a relationship exists between OS and JS from his study. He also posited that an organization should adopt OS according to the significant purpose of the organization. Adeyoyin et al. (2015) decided from their research that specialization and job satisfaction affect employees' job satisfaction. Job autonomy is a term for decentralization, and it has no significant

association with the JS of employees (Keena, Lambert, Haynes, May, & Buckner, 2018). Moreover, Woyengo, Nzulwa, and Odhiambo (2019) examined the effect of organizational structure (OS) on job satisfaction (JS). The study found out that organizational structure had a significant influence on employee job satisfaction and commitment in the civil service in Kenya" (p. 619). Bibi (2020) and Bibi et al. (2020) concluded from their research that organic OS has a positive and significant relationship with JS. Moreover, it was also found that organic OS enhances the JS of university teaching staff.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The descriptive research design was used to study the relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction of university teachers. The correlational method was used to investigate the relationship between different OS subscales and university teachers' job satisfaction. This study aimed to find a link between the subscales of OS and the JS level of the teachers working in universities.

3.2 Population, Sample and Sampling

The survey approach was used to collect data. The population included all teaching faculty working at public universities in Punjab, Pakistan. There were 13 general public universities in Punjab. A two-stage random sampling procedure was deployed. Initially, 50 percent of public universities were chosen from a pool of 13 universities. Seven public universities were selected in this manner. At public universities, there are a total of 5050 teaching staff members. In the second phase, 505 university teachers were randomly selected from the first phase. In research studies, Frankle and Wallen (2012) recommended that the sample size might be more significant. In terms of time and resources, if the population surpasses 5,000, a final sample of 400 or more may be obtained (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2011). The researcher personally visited universities in Lahore, while other means of correspondence, such as online, were used to collect data from other universities. The response rate of the instruments was 81% (n = 408).

3.3 Instrumentation

This study used survey research and correlational design. With a sample size of 505 university teachers, data were obtained from seven public universities in the Punjab region. The researcher adapted, closing the "Likert Type Scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)." The first tool included 28 items of the organizational structure survey (OSS). Some items from the Prezeois scale were used in OSS for this study. The content validity of OSS was checked by

expert opinion. The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) of Spector (1994) contains 36 items. The reliability of both scales was 0.81.

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Descriptive (Mean and Standard Deviation) and inferential statistics (Pearson r) were used for data analysis to answer the research questions. All null hypotheses were validated at a significance level of 0.01 ($\alpha = 0.01$). The structure of the university organization was identified and divided by descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics for organizational structure factors (n= 622)

Factor	N	M	SD
Decentralization	408	3.23	0.50
Formalization	408	3.37	0.59
Specialization	408	3.34	0.58
Chain of Command	408	3.57	0.55
Span of Control	408	3.41	0.63
Departmentalization	408	3.33	0.61

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for OS. The OS is divided into six elements. When calculating these variables' mean and standard deviations, all factors showed a mean higher than 3.0. The lowest mean was of centralization (M = 3.23, SD = 0.50). The factors indicated that the OS was organic in the selected universities. A mean rating of 3.0 and above was taken as a cutoff score. Medium values above 3.0 represent the organic structure, and values below 3.0 represent the mechanistic structure. Among the six components of OS, centralization has the least mean score of 3.23 with SD= 0.50. Yet, it is known as organic because its mean score is greater than 3 (mean= 3.23). In addition, all other factors have shown that universities have an organic OS.

H₀₁:

Table 3

Pearson r correlation of Decentralization and JS (n= 408)

Variables	Variables	N	r	p
Decentralization	Job Satisfaction (JS)	408	0.333	.001

Table 3 indicates the link between decentralization and JS. The association between decentralization and job satisfaction (JS) displayed an r value of .333, significant at $p < .001$. Decentralization is moderately related to job satisfaction. It means that employees' voice is given importance in selected universities, and their JS is related to decentralization.

H₀₂:

Table 4

Correlation of specialization and JS

Variables	Variables	N	r	p
Formalization	JS	408	0.585	.001

Table 4 showed the link between specialization and JS. The r value of 0.585 is significant at .001. Thus, the data indicated that a moderate link exists between the specialization factor of OS and JS. It showed that there is less specialization in organic organizations and flexible functions are to employees. In this way, they are satisfied with their job.

H₀₃:

Table 5

Correlation of formalization and JS

Variables	Variables	N	r	p
Formalization	JS	408	0.622	.001

The relationship between formalization and JS is displayed in table 5. The results showed a significant correlation $r = 0.622$, significant at .001. Therefore, it is concluded that a significant and strong correlation exists between formalization and overall JS in sample universities. It displayed that fewer rules or guidelines during job tasks enhance the job satisfaction of university teachers. It also means that they have flexibility in the rules and policies of the institution.

H₀₄:

Table 6

Correlation of departmentalization and JS

Variables	Variables	N	r	p
departmentalization	JS	408	0.633	.001

In table 6, the correlation between departmentalization and JS is shown. It indicated a significant correlation $r = 0.633$, significant at .001. Hence, it is concluded that a significant and strong correlation exists between both variables. It displayed that in the presence of cross hierarchical teams, teachers of universities are more gratified.

H₀₅:

Table 7

Correlation of chain of command and JS

Variables	Variables	N	r	p
chain of command	JS	408	0.371	.001

From the correlation analysis indicated in table 7, it has shown that there is a significant relation $r = 0.371$ ($p = .001 < \alpha = .01$) between the chain of command and job satisfaction (JS). It revealed that in selected universities,

information flows freely within the organization, which has a relationship with teachers' job satisfaction.

Ho₆:

Table 8

Correlation of Span of control and JS

Variables	Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Span of control	JS	408	0.544	.001

Table 8 shows the correlation analysis between the span of control and JS of university teachers. Data analysis showed a significant correlation (.544) between the span of control and JS of university teaching staff. Furthermore, this link was significant at $p = .001 < \alpha = .01$. Based on these outcomes, a manager or head can efficiently manage more employees at a time in selected universities. It meant that there is a wide span of control and significantly related to the JS of teachers.

Ho₇:

Table 9

Correlation of overall OS and JS

Variables	Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Organizational structure	JS	408	0.647	.001

Table 9 indicates the correlation analysis of OS and JS. The results showed a significant $p = .001 < \alpha = .01$ and a strong positive correlation (r value 0.647) between university teachers' overall OS and overall JS. The organic OS has a strong association with the JS of teachers.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This section displays the findings of this correlational and descriptive study in comparison with previous research studies. The study's goal was to investigate the types of organizational structure at public universities. In addition, the correlation of different components of organizational structure with JS was also investigated. At first, the organizational structure of universities was determined through the mean score. The mean score above 3 showed organic OS, and less than 3 showed mechanistic OS. Therefore, the mean score of all the components of OS indicated the organic OS in the sample universities.

After identifying the OS of universities, the next step was to examine the relationship between subscales of OS and job satisfaction. The first hypothesis was *"There is no significant relationship between decentralization and JS of university teachers."* Correlation analysis was performed to analyze the first hypothesis. The outcomes showed that decentralization is moderately related to job satisfaction. This means that employees have a voice to say in decision

making, and decentralization is prevailing in public universities. In other words, it can be concluded that centralization and JS have an inverse relationship. The results are in connection with the studies of Lambert et al. (2006), Campbell et al. (2005), I. Ali and J. Ali (2004), and Willem et al. (2007). They concluded that centralization is inversely related to job satisfaction. Willem et al. (2007) stated that decentralization gives freedom to employees and a sense of belonging to the organisation. Therefore, their JS increases. The results contradict Keena et al.'s (2018) study, as decentralization was assessed by a single item that could not fully explain decentralization.

The second hypothesis was *"There is no significant relationship between specialization and JS of university teachers."* The correlation analysis revealed that specialization is moderately related to JS. The same outcomes were noted by Adeyoyin et al. (2015). They concluded that specialization affects the job satisfaction of employees. The following hypothesis was *"There is no significant relationship between formalization and JS of university teachers."* The outcomes confirmed the previous studies of Campbell et al. (2005) and Lambert et al. (2006). They found that formalization has a significant effect on JS. Significant liberty can be permitted when instructions and limits are clear.

The fourth hypothesis was *"There is no significant relationship between departmentalization and JS of university teachers."* The analyzed data showed that departmentalization and JS are significantly related. The results are consistent with Adeyoyin et al. (2015). The following hypothesis was *"There is no significant relationship between the chain of command and JS of university teachers"* The data analysis displayed that information flows freely in selected universities and has a significant link with JS. The outcomes are in line with Kessler (2007). He concluded that in organic settings, employees are gratified as compared with the mechanistic environment. The sixth hypothesis was *"There is no significant relationship between span of control and JS of university teachers"* It was indicated from the analysis that the span of control was significantly associated with JS. This study confirms the results of the past/ earlier study of Kwan et al. (2015). They have shown that the span of control is positively associated with the JS of employees.

The last hypothesis was *"There is no significant relationship between organizational structure and JS of university teachers."* The findings showed that employees' overall OS and overall JS have a significant link. The outcomes confirmed the previous studies of Bibi (2020), Bibi et al. (2020), Kessler (2007), and Woyengo et al. (2019). They concluded that OS is positively linked with the JS of employees. Furthermore, they also found that organic OS increases the JS of employees. Flexibility in guidelines and policies of organizations might be the

cause of organic OS. All public universities have demonstrated the organic structure of organizations. All the subscales of OS, including “formalization, specialization, chain of command, a span of control, and departmentalization”, displayed significant findings. The study's main goal was to determine the association between OS subscales and the JS of teachers in public universities. The results of the study support that all the subscales of OS and JS are correlated. The correlation coefficient showed different aspects of OS to be significantly correlated to JS.

6. Recommendations

According to the study's conclusions, universities should encourage more organic structures to improve the job performance of their teachers. This research was limited to the Punjab province. Further research should include participation from other provinces to see the trends in Pakistani universities. A quantitative research design was used for this study; for future studies, qualitative aspects are recommended to explore, especially on different samples. Different other variables identified with the organizational structure can be investigated in the future to see the relationship of OS with JS and other work-related behaviors

References

- Adeyoyin, S. O., Agbeze-Unazi, F., Oyewunmi, O. O., Adegun, A. I., & Ayodele, R. O. (2015). Effects of job specialisation and departmentalisation on job satisfaction among the staff of a Nigerian University Library. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 1295.
- Ahmady, G. A., Mehrpour, M., & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). Organisational structure. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 455-462.
- Ali, I., & Ali, J. H. (2005). The effects of the interaction of technology, structure, and organizational climate on job satisfaction. *Sunway Academic Journal* 2, 23–32.
- Altaf, M., Yousaf, U., Tahir, M., & Bagram, M. M. (2013). Job satisfaction and employee participation in the government sector. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 3(2), 384-393.
- Andrew, D. C. (2012). *Is there an organisational structure for our reengineering business operation?" Enterprise re-engineering.*
<http://www.efenselink.mil/c3ibpr/prcd 5280.html>.

- Aniagyei, W. (2011). *The Effect of Organisational Structure on Project Performance: The Case of Aga Ltd.* Institute of Distance Learning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- Bibi, N. (2020). *Relationship of organic and mechanistic organisational structure with job satisfaction and job performance of teaching faculty at higher education institutions.* (Unpublished Ph. D Thesis), Institute of Education & Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
- Bibi, N., Safder, M., Alvi, G. F., Jamshid, N., & Jamshid, I. (2020). Relationship of organizational structure with job satisfaction and task performance of teaching faculty at universities in Punjab. *Elementary Education Online*, 19(3), 3659-3669.
- Blum, M. L. & Naylor, J. C. (1968). *Industrial Psychology: Its theoretical and social foundations.* Harper and Row.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell S. L., Fowles, E. R., & Weber B. J. (2004). Organizational structure and job satisfaction in public health nursing. *Public Health Nursing*, 21(6), 564-571. doi: 10.1111/j.0737-1209.2004.21609.x.
- Clement, J. & Puranam, P. (2017). Searching for structure: Formal organization design as a guide to network evolution. *Management Science*, 64(8), 3879- 3895. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2807>
- Duncan, R. B. (1971). *The effects of perceived environmental uncertainty on organizational decision unit structure: A cybernetic model.* (Unpublished Ph. D Thesis), Yale University.
- Donaldson, L. (2001). *The Contingency Theory of organizations.* Sage.
- Elsaid, N. M., Okasha, A. E., & Abdelghaly, A. A. (2013). Defining and solving the organizational structure problems to improve the performance of the Ministry of State for environmental affairs – Egypt. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication*, 3(10), 1-10.
- Frankle, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.

- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E. & Airasian, P. W. (2011). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*. South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Higher Education Ordinance (455 HEC ordinance), *The Gazette of Pakistan, Extra, L III* (2002). Retrieved from https://hec.gov.pk/english/aboutus/Documents/455_HECOrdinance.pdf
- Kakabadse, A., & Worrall, R. (1978). Job satisfaction and organizational structure: Nine social service departments. *British Journal of Social Work*, 8(1), 51–70.
- Katsikea, E., Theodosiou, M., Perdikis, N., Kehagias, J., (2011). The effects of organizational structure and job characteristics on export sales managers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of World Business*, 46(2), 221-233.
- Keena, L. D., Lambert, E. G., Haynes, S. H., May, D., & Buckner, Z. (2018). Examining the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction among southern prison staff. *Corrections, Online first*. 1–21. doi:10.1080/23774657.2017.1421053
- Kessler, S. R. (2007). *The effects of organizational structure on faculty job performance, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior*. Graduate Theses and Dissertations, University of South Florida. <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/2243>
- Khandwalla, P. N. (1976/1977). Some top management styles, their context, and performance. *Organization for Administrative Sciences*, 7(4), 21-51.
- Kondalkar, V. J. (2007). *Organizational Behavior*. New Age International Pvt Limited Publishers.
- Kwan, C. S., Isa, F. M., & Hin, C. W. (2015). The relationship between leadership, span of control and the mediating effect of attitude toward switching agency and job satisfaction: A case of unit trust agents in Johor Bahru. *Taylor's Business Review*, 5(2), 119-135.

- Lambert, E. G., Paoline III, E. A., & Hogan, N. L. (2006). The impact of centralization and formalization on correctional staff job satisfaction and organizational commitment: An exploratory study. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 19(1), 23-44.
- Litterer, J. A. (1973). *Analysis of organisations*. (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In MD. Dunnette, *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1343). Rand McNally.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2012). Mechanistic-Organic Organizations-An Axiomatic Theory: Authority based on bureaucracy or professional norms. *International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity*, 14(1), 1-7.
- Mccartney, W. W. (1978). *The Effect of Organization structure on job satisfaction among employees of retail firms in the Southeastern United States*. (Unpublished Ph. D Thesis), LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses. 3289.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/3289
- Mohammed, F., & Saleh, F. (2013). Surveying the impact of organization structure on employee's job satisfaction of Agricultural Bank in Ardebil Province. *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research*, 3(3),34-45.
- Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (2010). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations*. (9th ed.). China Translation & Printing Services Limited.
- Øgaard, T., Marnburg, E., & Larsen, S. (2008). Perceptions of organizational structure in the hospitality industry: Consequences for commitment, job satisfaction, and perceived performance. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 661–671. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2007.07.006
- O'Neill, J. W., Beauvais, L. L., & Scholl, R. W. (2001). The use of organizational culture and structure to guide strategic behavior: An information processing perspective. *The Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 2(2), 131-150.

- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature*. Sage Publications.
- Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C. R., & Turner, C. C. (1968). Dimensions of organization structure, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 13(1), 65-105.
- Quinn, E. (1988). *Beyond rational management*. Jossey Bass.
- Rezaeian, A. (2007). Organize and coordinate in management. *Management Knowledge*, (5), 120-127.
- Robbins, S. P., Coutler, M., & Vohra, N. (2009). *Management*. (10th ed.). New Delhi, DL: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. (15th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education Inc.
- Sablynski, C. J. (2003). *Foundation of Organizational Structure*. www.csus.edu/indiv/s/s/sablynskic/ch14/html.
- Smith, P. C. (1955). The prediction of individual differences in susceptibility to industrial monotony. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 39(5), 322-329.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713.
- Spector, P. E. (1994). *Job satisfaction survey*. Tampa, Florida: Department of Psychology, University of South Florida.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Thomas, O. O. (2015). Effects of organizational structure on job satisfaction in the Nigerian financial sector: Empirical insight from selected banks in Lagos State. *NG-Journal of Social Development*, 5(1), 96-108.
- Tran, Q. & Tian, Y. (2013). Organizational structure: Influencing factors and impact on a firm. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*. 3(2), 229-236.

- Wang, G., Wan, J. & Zhao, L. (2014). Strategy map for Chinese science parks with KPIs of BSC. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, 5(2), 82-105.
- Willem, A., Buelens, M., & De Jonghe, I. (2007). Impact of organizational structure on nurses' job satisfaction: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44(6), 1011–1020. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.03.013
- Woyengo, P M. N., Nzulwa, J. & Odhiambo, R. (2019). Influence of organizational structure on employee job satisfaction and commitment in the civil service in Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 6(3), 616 – 620.

Citation of this Article:

Bibi, N., Habib, M., & Davis, C. J. (2022). Organizational Structure and Job Satisfaction: A Correlational Study of Teaching Faculty at Higher Education Level. *International Journal of Innovation in Teaching and Learning (IJITL)*, 8(1), 1-19.