Macro Environment and Organisational Structure: A Review

Hannah Chika, Anyanwu[1]; Dr. Justin Mgbechi. O. Gabriel[2]

[1]Post Graduate Student, [2]Senior Lecturer,

[1,2]Management Department, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This piece of work theoretically or descriptively considered the impact of the external environment on the structure of organizations. The key variables being organizational structure (the dependent variable) and the external environment of the organization (as the independent variable). Dimensions of organizational structure adopted were: centralization, formalization, standardization, specialization and configuration while the measures of external environment applied were: level of uncertainty or changeability, intolerance or xenophobia and complexity. The theoretical foundation was hinged on social identity theory and contingency theory. Meaning, types and factors affecting organizational structure were considered alongside environmental factors. It was observed that the external environment has great impact on the organization and is largely responsible for the dynamic nature of the business world. It was therefore recommended that an adequate environmental scanning be carried out to ascertain the stability or otherwise of the environment to be able to know which structural type to adopt at every point in time.

KEYWORDS: Organizational Structure, Organizational Environment, Centralization, formalization, standardization, specialization, complexity, xenophobia, uncertainty

INTRODUCTION

An organization is said to be a system of people, activities and processes that interact and work together in the direction of achieving some distinct goals or objectives (Senior & Swailes, 2010). Similarly, organizations are composed of formal subsystems, such as management, strategy, goals, structure, operations, and technology; and informal subsystems, such as leadership, environments, politics, and culture (Senior & Swailes, 2010). Each of these components have substantial impact on the day to day activities, operations and work performances of the entire organization. Consequently, if one component does not match or is not suitable, performance, progress and survival of the entire organization might be trampled upon or hampered. Organizational structure, amongst all, has been singled out as the basic framework by which organizations line up set of actions, duties and responsibilities and specifies who does what, when and how (Teixeira, Koufteros & Peng, 2012). Organizational structure is a formal system of jobs, tasks and reporting relationships that controls, coordinates and motivates workers to cooperate and work in harmony to attain organizational goals and objective (Richard, 2012).

For organizational goals and objectives to be realized or achieved, various individual and collective activities and interactions are usually involved. The works of these individuals needs to be clearly spelt out, coordinated and managed. Organizational structure is a valuable means in accomplishing this specification of roles, responsibilities, division of work, power, managing and coordination, and channel of information between management levels as it lays down channels of reporting (who accounts to whom), designates official communication channels, and defines how distinct activities of people and materials are connected to each other (Johatch, 2014). These structures exist within an environmental domain or enclave. The nature of the business environment preempts the necessity or otherwise in terms of changes in the organizational structure or in terms of which structural design should be adopted. This implies that organizations are influenced by many factors arising from their dynamic surrounding (external environment) or from the organization itself (the internal environment).

Being knowledgeable about the corporate environment helps the organization to improve on its competitive position, improve in efficiency and effectiveness even in the global economy (Ireland, Hoskisson & Hitt, 2011). Yes, organizations can operate within numeral diverse structures, each retaining distinctive benefits and weaknesses, though depending on the objectives and strategy with which the organization wishes to attain their goal. However, even though any structure that is inappropriately managed will be overwhelmed with unpleasant situations, some organizational models are better well fitted for specific work environments and jobs than others. Hence the importance of examining the degree to which the environment can influence the structure of an organization. Structure, as a dimension of an organization, determines the extent and manner to which roles, power and responsibilities are grouped, delegated, defines relationship betwixt functions and positions, subdivides and delegates:

roles to persons, responsibilities and authority to execute defined tasks (Tran & Tian, 2013). It acts as perspective via which people can see their organization and its environment. These channels of describing, reporting and coordination of people could be diagrammed in the form of organizational chart.

Scholars in the field of organization theory have proposed numerous opinions concerning factors influencing the organizational structure. Some are of the view that certain factors, like: size, environment, or technology, determine organizational structure. They opine that these factors impose economic or other constraints on organizations and by so doing force them to choose a certain structure over others. This work will mainly consider how the external environment of an organization affects its structure and what it takes to overcome environmental encumbrances through structural adaptations. The purpose of this descriptive or theoretical work is to explore the impact of external environment of an organization on its structure. This is attempted by considering the dimensions of the dependent variable (organizational structure) and the measures of the independent variable (external environment). Dimensions of organizational structure considered here are: centralization/decentralization, configuration or level of hierarchy in the organization, size and formalization. While the measures of external environment of organization considered are: environmental changeability or uncertainty, xenophobia or level of intolerance, complexity.

Literature
Theoretical Foundation
The theories adopted in this work are theories of organization, contingency theory and Social Identity Theory (Tajfel 1978; Tajfel & Turner 1979). The organization theorists consider mostly two types of structures: Physical and social structures. Physical structure refers to the relations between physical components of organizations like buildings and geographical places in which the works and activities of the organization are carried out. On the other hand, social structure refers to the relationships between social elements like humans or people, positions and organizational units (like departments and sectors, etc). According to contingent theorists, organizational structure is mainly dependent on the prevailing internal and external environment in the organization. This theory maintains that the appropriateness of an organizational structure depends on environmental conditions, so, organizations who adopt structures which match or fit their internal characteristics to environmental requirements perform better (Achcaoucaou, Bernardo &Castan, 2009).

The Social Identity theory on the other hand, states that social identity and inter-group behavior are guided by positive social identity facilitated through positive inter-group distinctiveness or uniqueness. Positive intergroup distinctiveness is said to be motivated by the need of positive self-esteem (Abrams & Hogg, 1988) which may arise when the employees are given freedom to participate in deciding how they go about the execution of their duties and having a say in the management of the organization. This theory negates the principles of centralization of authority and formalization processes. Social identity theory indirectly supports the notion that there is a correlation between organizational structure and optimum job satisfaction (Olajide, 2015).

Organizational Structure
Structure refers to the relations between the components of an organized whole. Thus, structure concept can be used for everything. For example, a building is a structure of the relationship between foundation, skeleton, ceiling and wall. The body of human being is a structure consists of the relations between bones, organs, blood and tissues (Jo. hatch, 2014). Organizational structure is the framework of the relations on jobs, systems, operating process, people and groups making efforts to achieve the goals. Organizational structure can also be described as a set of methods dividing the task to determined duties and coordinates them (Monavarian, Asgari, &Ashna, 2007). Organizational structure is method by which organizational activities are divided, organized and coordinated. The organizations create the structures to coordinate the activities of work factors and control the members' actions (Rezayian, 2005).

More so, organizational structure refers to the models of internal relations of organization, power and relations and reporting, formal communication channels, responsibility and decision-making delegation is clarified. Amold and Feldman (1986): Helping the information flow is one of the facilities provided by structure for the organization (Monavarian, Asgari, &Ashena, 2007). The type of structure adopted by an organization is said to be contingent to the nature of organizational goals and the strategies or ploys adopted to achieve these goals. Structure impacts effectiveness and efficiency. It reduces redundant actions; promotes teamwork and spirit of esprit de corps; improves communication and either leads to success or failure.

From the above definition, it is deducible that organizational structure has the following key contents: (1) Organizational structure regulates official relations, communication and reporting channels in organization and explicitly showcases the amount of levels in the chain of command and it outlines the span of the control of managers in the organization. (2) Organizational structure defines the position of people working in group in any unit or division of the organization and it distributes the units in the entire organization alongside their various responsibilities. (3) Organizational structure embraces or comprises the design of the whole systems by which all units of the organization are effectively coordinated and controlled for attainment of set organizational goal.

Categories/Types of organizational structure
Organizational structure could be classified into two major categories: (1) the traditional structure which includes: functional structure, line and staff structure and line structure. (2) The modern structure which encompasses the project structure, and the matrix structure. These structures are briefly considered hereunder:

Functional Structure: Functional structure, also called bureaucratic organizational structure, is a structure (division, control and coordination of people and work) based on the specialization of its workforce in terms of their skills, or activities. Most small-to-medium-sized businesses adopt this form of structuring. This involves splitting the firm into departments or subunits such as marketing, sales,

and procurement for the sake of maximizing saving of specialization scale of the workforce. Decision making in this structure is usually centralized at the topmost echelon of the management. The underlying ideology of functional organization at the top level of management is that a subordinate anywhere in the organization will be controlled and commanded directly by number of managers operating in different departments.

Line and staff organizational structure: Line organization is the simplest and the oldest type of organization. Line organizational groups are involved in tasks that constitute the technical core of the firm or the subunit of a larger enterprise. They are directly involved in accomplishing the primary objective of the enterprise. In manufacturing, line groups engage in work related to production. In the service sector, the line group is responsible for its customers. Line groups have final decision-making authority regarding technical organizational purposes. Line authority flows down the chain of command. Again, line authority, for instance, gives a production supervisor the right to direct an employee to operate a particular machine, and it gives the vice financial controller the right to request a certain report from a department head. Therefore, line authority gives an individual a certain degree of power relating to the performance of an organizational task

The staff structure on the other hand, provide cogent advice and support to the line in the course of accomplishing the goals and objectives of the organization. It has been observed that there is always a conflict between line and staff structures due to disparities in their view points and modes of roles/responsibilities execution.

Line structures: the main features of this structure are that: orders and instructions flow from top to the bottom in line organizational structures whereas appeals and suggestions flow from bottom to top. The principle of unity of command is the most noticeable feature of this type of structure as orders are received from the bosses to the subordinates who are accountable to their immediate superior. The number of subordinates under a superior are limited. Coordinating and control of people and their activities in this structure are simply easy.

Divisional or Multidivisional Structure
The type of structure is second type is common amongst large organizations with numerous business units. This type of structuring involves dividing leadership team based on the products, projects, or subsidiaries they operate. A good example of this structure is Johnson & Johnson. With numerous kinds of products and lines of businesses, the company structures itself in such a way that each business unit operates as its own company with its own president.

Flat Structure: As the name implies, this kind of structure compresses the hierarchy and chain of command in the organization giving more autonomy to the employees than the managers. Most organizations adopt this structural pattern for speedy implementations of decisions.

Matrix Structure: The matrix structure involves employee participation in virtually every unit or department of the organization. This structure designates employees across different superiors, divisions, or departments. For instance,

an employee working for a matrix company, may have responsibilities in both sales and customer service. Matrix structure combines responsibilities that may cut across different units of the organization. It is also the most complicating and the least used. Each department is being supervised by two supervisors at the same time in matrix structure also.

Hybrid Structure: Hybrid structure, is a flexible form of structure or a combination or a mixture of market- and mission-oriented practices, beliefs, and rationale (Battilana & Dorado, 2010) of more than one structures whereby one part is dedicated to one type of structure (may be profit maximization) and another part to another type of structure (may be non-profit maximization).

The reason of formation of hybrid structures is mixture of advantages of two structures by managers or due to changes in the organization. As disadvantage, Smith, Gonin, &Besharov (2013), expressed that hybrid structures always generate a lot of problems in terms of performance, organizing the workforce, roles and responsibilities, in terms of belongings of the workforce in the hierarchies and even in terms of encouraging learning in the organization. Again, it is said that in hybrid structures, it is usually difficult to determining whether outcomes represent failure or success (Jay, 2013). Hybrid structures are said to commonly have participatory ownership nature (Mamao, 2011) and are viewed as partially accountable to both its members and a wider environment. By moving from one section of structure to another structure, the relations basis is changed and hybrid forms can be uncertain. But advantageously, hybrid structure enables the organization to adopt the best and flexible structure for use at every point in time depending on the issue at hand.

Network structure: The networks are formed when the organizations are saddled with rapid changes in technology, short life cycles of product alongside detached and specialized markets. In network structure, essential assets are dispersed amongst some network partners as there is no unified organization in a network to generate the products or services and the network is either the producer or supplier. In this type of structure, the partners are associated via customer supplier relations and a type of free market system is formed. This indicates that the goods are traded amid network partners as in a free market, they are traded (Johatch, 2014).

The project structure: this represents a cluster of activities to be performed or executed within a fixed period of time and a specific cost. This structure is like an adhoc or temporary type, usually gotten rid of as soon as the project or purpose for its establishment is completed. Project structure has conglomerates of specialists whose services jointly ensure the attainment of the set goals.

Factors affecting structuring of an organization
Before an organization could successfully take any structure, there are certain important design factors that must be taken cognizance of. These factors are usually considered as key factors affecting the organization. Some scholars have classified these factors as contextual and structural in nature (Parsian& Arabi, 2012).

Organizational structure can be affected by goals, strategy, environment, technology, organization size. These variables are key and content-based and indicate the entire organization and its position between the organization and environment. Content variables can be important as they show organization and the environment in which there are structural variables. Content variables affect structural variables and by their combination, different types of structural designers are created (Rabinz, Translated by Parsian and Arabi, 2012). Structural variables on the other hand, indicate internal features of an organization and present a basis by which the organizations can be measured and their structure features can be compared with each other.

Thus, the factors affecting the structuring of an organization include but not limited to: size, span of control (centralization or decentralization), fit, differentiation and integration, technology, size, staffing, unity of command, and line versus staff. These are briefly explained below:

Size: size of the organization is a very important issue to be considered when designing the structure of the organization. Size represents the magnitude, extent or quantity of persons or management levels to be controlled and coordinated for goal attainment in the organization. It is easier to control fewer persons than it is to control larger number of persons and their activities in the organization.

Span of control (centralization or decentralization):This represents the number of people or subordinates reporting to a supervisor. The more subordinates an individual has, the more time and energy it will take and the more difficult it will be to control manage them effectively. Large spans of control indicates a flatter organization with fewer levels in the hierarchy. While organizations that give greater attention to individual subordinates has a narrower span of control and correspondingly a taller organization, one with more levels of hierarchy. Decisions about span of control are dependent on the leadership style and the degree of empowerment leaders wish to develop in the organizations. Leaders with proper or higher orientation to hierarchy might select narrower spans of control, less delegation, and a more centralized structure but leaders with lower orientation to hierarchy might accept and boost a wider span of control and feel comfortable delegating more responsibility to others.

Fit: Fit implies a match between the desired structure and the organization's environment and set goals alongside strategies required to achieve them. Structures that do not match or is misaligned with the business environments or sequences of internal arrangements will definitely be much less effective.

Differentiation and integration: Differentiation involves a kind of division of labor whereby work is divided into its component pieces or bits and allocated to specialists in various parts of the organization. This arises specifically when an organization has expanded and becomes more multifaceted and individuals become more specialized and conversant in what they do for the organization. Integration on the other hand implies the need to coordinate and amalgamate, mix o combine the divided activities into a whole outcome (product or service). Generally, the more

work is divided, the more the managers require to create avenues for its integration, and the more challenging it becomes for the organization. This must be considered in terms of structural design.

Technology: The nature of an organization's technology often affects its structure. Technologies that have highly mutually dependent parts demand organizational structures that vary from those that involve autonomous, unconnected parts. The series of tasks and the equipment and talent available for accomplishing them can have a substantial impact on the organization's structure. With the recent times information age, the speedily expanding nature of computer based and satellite-based information systems is generating new organizational practices.

Staffing: Human are the key component of every organization and constitutes its basic structure. Intelligent managers thoughtfully consider the fit of the individual talents of the people and the tasks they are to execute. The mere fact that a piece of paper has a job description associated with it does not mean that any individual put in that position will be able or willing to fulfill that description. When the talents of available individuals do not match the job demands of specific fragments of the organizational structure, some managers are more willing to make alterations in the structure than they are in the personnel.

Unity of command: The unity of authority to individuals in organizations is a design principle that should be considered in light of the goals of the organization and the abilities of its members. Unity of command represents

Dimensions of organizational structure
There are four aspects of organizational structure that have regularly been studied in literature. These are: Centralization, formalization, hierarchical levels, and departmentalization.

Centralization/Decentralization: Centralization is the amount to which important decision-making authority is focused at higher levels of an organizational hierarchy by the Chief executive officers. This is contrary to what happens in decentralized organizations which have decisions and problem solving carried out at lower levels by the workers who are closer to the issue at stake. Centralized organizations apportion decision making obligation to higher-level managers and place superior demands on the judgment capabilities of the Chief Executive Officers and other high-level executives. Decentralization on the other hand implies the opposite, more decision-making autonomy rests on the lower category.

Centralization has its advantages: some workers are more comfortable in an organization where the manager assertively gives instructions and makes decisions quicker. Centralization may also lead to more efficient operations, particularly if the company is working in an unchanging or unambiguous environment.

Configuration (number of hierarchical levels): Configuration depicts the total number of levels in the hierarchy of the organization. There is usually both negative and positive inclinations about the number of hierarchies in an organization. The notion is that the more the level of

hierarchy, the longer decision-making chain and the time it takes for decisions to be processed and arrived at. Chain of hierarchies equally constraints the employees from being free to air their views in issues concerning their work.

Formalization: This signifies the degree to which rules, procedures, instructions and policies are codified or written down for accessibility and follow up by the persons in the organization. Formalized organizations keep records of individual and collective job descriptions, a written record of employee performances, formal record for orientation of newly employed persons in the organization, etc. However, excessive formalization restricts the initiative power of the employees as they cannot do anything on their own outside the rules and procedures laid down. Formalization might be said to be resistant to changes in work ideologies and abhors swift decision making in terms of emergencies at work.

Standardization: Standardization refers to the degree to which workers work according to laid down standard procedures and rules in an organization. It makes sure employees accomplish their duties and tasks in the required manner, and thus, guarantees that a worker's actions and behaviors are routine and predictable (Jones, 2013) and that similar work activities are performed in a uniform manner atall locations (Al-Qatawneh, 2014). Standardization, just like formalization is a control mechanism which seeks to make sure that worker behavior aids the attainment of organizational objective. When standardization is extensive in an organization; employees are accountable for their actions, and have no authority to break rules (Al-Qatawneh, 2014).

Specialization: specialization, refers to the number of occupational specialties involved in an organization and the span of training needed of each. The greater the number of person specialists and the longer the period of training required to achieve it, the more complex the organization (Lunenburg, 2012). Specialization can be measured in three dimensions: horizontal separation, vertical separation and geographic separation (Sarboland, 2012). Some authors have argued that mechanistic organizations are not sub-divided into numerous departments that perform various tasks but rather are concentrated into a few departments within the organization (Robert& Olive, 2013).

Environment of Organizations
Environment is one of the contextual dimensions of an organization. These external and internal conditions that constitute the organization's environment influence to a large extent the basis on which the structure is built. Environment therefore is all elements outside the boundary of the organization which in one way or the other have potentials that affects its structures, interactions and processes (Gabriel, 2018:54). The environment is sub-grouped as general of external, task and internal environment. Diverse studies have established that the environment of an organization has a lot to tell about her structure. Scholars have been of the view that the environment of an organization has great impact on the design and operations of oeganisations(Otokiti&Awodun, 2003; Aborade, 2005; Adi, 2006 and Ajala, 2005). This is because, diverse environmental conditions, indeed, demand for different organizational structure for a high level of performance and goal attainment. The level of structure

therefore might be dependent on the nature or measure of environment involved.

Measures of organizational Environment
Three major environmental factors have been singled out as very important for consideration in terms of the organizational structuring: (1) Level of changeability (2) Level of complexity and (3) Level of xenophobia or intolerance. (4) Degree of Competition. This implies that the four measures of organizational environment considered in this piece of work are level changeability, complexity, xenophobia or intolerance and competition.

Level of Changeability or uncertainty: The environment of business is said to be uncertain, i.e when decision makers don't have sufficient information about the environmental factors and have a difficult time predicting environmental factors. Unending changes, uncertainty and variations in the environment of organizations has been considered as one of the major constraints decision makers face in adopting a specific structure for the organization. Environmental changeability means the extent to which variations abound in the environment of the organization and which in one way or the other affects the activities or operations of the organization.

It has been observed that the higher the level of changes in the environment, the more prevailing structure of organization should be adaptive, with roles, responsibilities and function open to continuous redefining and coordination plus communication levels re-examined and re-adjusted much more laterally. Structures are easier to be made when the environment is stable. Dimensions such as competition, turbulence, and information feedback have been identified (Sun&Price, 2016), as involved in producing environmental uncertainty.

Organizations systematized to transact in stable/dependable and unchanging markets may not be much effective in a complex, promptly changing environment. The more unwavering the environment is, the more centralized chain of command the organization's structure may be, with usable formalized procedures, rules and processes. Thus, organizations that function in a high level of environmental uncertainty may chose decentralization of decision-making in its structure, thereby being dependent on formal rules and procedures. Yet, compresses their chain of command by granting more autonomy to the workers,

Complexity: Environmental complexity involves the varied mixture of complications and range of environmental activities which significantly influences the operations of the organization. The larger the level of complexity, the more abundance of relevant environmental information is likely to be experienced by the organizational decision makers. As the complexity and uncertainty rises, the number of positions and departments in the organization concomitantly rises too.

In lower income economies, environmental complexity is formed by three factors: heterogeneity, formal competition, and informal competition. Heterogeneity refers to the differences of inputs and outputs required by an industry. Formal competition denotes the concentration of formal organizations within the same industry. Informal competition discusses competition from mostly small firms

that are not formally registered, do not pay taxes, and employ undocumented employees (Iriyama, Kishore & Talukdar, 2016; Web, Bruton &Tihanyi2013). Heterogeneity creates complexity because in a more heterogeneous industry where organizations require many different inputs and produce a broad variety of outputs, obtaining resources is more complicated compared to industries with few inputs and outputs and such heterogeneous industry is usually characterized by many interactions and inter-organizational connections (Chen, Zeng & Lin, 2017). This increases a challenge for an organization to make the right strategic decisions because it is more problematic and costly to scan and monitor the environment. The more heterogeneous an industry becomes, the higher its rate of unpredictability and managers need to develop broader search strategies (Terjesen&Patel, 2017).

Complex structures and stable environments generate lower level of uncertainty. Great number of external components of the organization remain contradictory and changes take place slowly or do not even occur in structure formation.

Xenophobia or intolerance: Xenophobia or environmental intolerance depicts the level of threat, indifference or hostility the decision makers in an organization encounter from external competition in the course of attaining the set goals of the organization. Xenophobia here means the 'fear of a stranger or foreigner' (Bordeau, 2010: 4) from other homelands, over competition on resources they have previously been enjoying solely. Intolerable environments call for highly centralized structure with tighter controls and central decision making from top to bottom echelon of the organization.

If the business environment becomes less tolerant, the structure of the organization will certainly be altered, if such alteration is prerequisite to the attainment of the organizational goal. The 2019 Xenophobia outbreak in South Africa with Nigerian investors and the 2020 Xenophobia experience of Nigerian investors in Ghana are typical examples of how environmental intolerance can affect the structure of an organization. Structure could be a bit static if the environment is friendly.

Environmental Factors affecting the structure of the organization
Environmental factors affecting the structure of organization are grouped into two: eternal environmental factors and internal environmental factors.

External factors: encompasses those factors inherent in the supporting environment and outside the organization, which are not directly within the control of the organization but which in one way or the other influences the structure, activities and development of the organization. These factors include: technological changes, demography, political factors, economic and socio-economic factors, competitors. Many organizations are faced with competitive environment now in a global market, not just in the domestic market. Variations in technology and enlarged ability to obtain and process information necessary for implementation of goals and effective responses to competitors are becoming timelier and more effective than it was in the scientific era. Speed outlining the organization's choice of where and how they operate are all central to the organization.

Technology: technological changes affect so many parts of modern organization including the structure (Nwaeke, 2012). Technological changes can render existing products, methods of production and machineries obsolete in a twinkle of an eye. It can equally create new opportunities. The impact transcends through new products, processes and materials. Technological factors emanate from outcome of changes in the technologies the managers used in designing, producing, or distributing goods and services, responsibilities and roles. Given the variety of changes inherent in technology in modern organizations, it is highly imperative that managers carefully understudy different technological elements prior to designing the structure of the organization. This will help managers to identify and decide on potential substitutes for their organization's technology, identify newly evolving technologies and the timing of other major changes (Nwaeke, 2012).

Technology of an organization is defined in two ways base on the prevailing organizational level of analysis. Technology could either be operational or material based. Operations technology means the equipping and sequencing of activities in an organization's workflow while material technology involves the characteristics of the physical and informational materials used. The nature of technological variables affects the design of the organizational structure.

Political/legal environment: This encompasses government regulations of business and relationships of business and the government (Nwaeke, 2012). Frequent changes in political leadership lead to changes in legal framework and regulatory laws constraints operations of business organizations and thus create opportunities and threats, equally leaving the managers with dicey decision-making capability.

Economic Environment: This deals with the overall health of the global economy in which the business organization operates. This affects organizational operations, activities and structure. For instance, the advent of Covid 19 pandemic has a lot of untold impact on the structures of diverse organizations. Restructuring has suddenly been the order of the day as so many organizations have employees working mainly online from home.

Impact of the external environment on the organizational structure
Indeed, the environment of an organization has a great impact on the structure of the organization and in fact determines the nature of structure to be adopted for efficiency and goal attainment. These impacts are expressed in a brief comparison of the measures of the external environment and the dimensions of organizational structure below:

Xenophobia or intolerance Vs Centralization: Juxtaposing thexenophobia or intolerance as an environmental factor with centralization as an aspect of organizational structure, there is no gain saying in the view that only a tolerable environment could be permissible for an organization to plan its activities, apportion responsibilities, roles and duties and map out measures of coordinating same.

In the year 2019 for example, there was a drastic intolerance attitude exhibited by the South Africans over the Nigerians

resident in the South African domain. So many business edifices and enterprises owned by the Nigerians were destroyed and lives were equally totally ruined. In such a hostile country as at then, where citizens of South Africa displayed hostilities and hatred against migrants (their businesses inclusive), based on the assumption that they may increase competition for resources, employment opportunities, etc, for organizations that had established centralized structures, deciding on the exact thing to do to avert the hostility that degenerated into violent attacks would be very easy as authority is vested only at the top. If a decentralized structure was involved, it would take much time to arrive at a decision and this might expose the organization and people in it to dangers of physical attacks to life and properties (Ballyn, 2011).

Xenophobia or environmental intolerance has been in existence as far back as 1960 (Romola 2015) and have a unified goal, hatred for foreigners. For investors who by virtue of globalization would want to structure their organizations in foreign land, xenophobia is a major encumbrance to be trashed out. Thus, structuring an organization for success would require managers considering how tolerable the environment is before mapping out the prerequisite structure.

The importance of having a strong senior manager to unify the employees as one (centralization), and the fact that they are viewed as one organization from the outside, the security enjoyed for being one organization instead of an independent unit, and an easier access to their customers, information and action taking, makes the operations easier in terms of emergencies like the xenophobia. The negative aspect is that the workers cannot take any decision without consulting the topmost managers in charge.

Changeability or uncertainty vs formalization:
Just like life itself is dynamic and filled with uncertainties and changes, organizational environments evolve or change continuously. The level of uncertainty in the entire globe is not lacking in organizational environment, hence, the structure indeed should be affected by the environment, be it internal or external. In a world of uncertainty, formalization of rules, regulations and codifying all procedures on paper for strict compliance might not be too realistic.

As markets change and industries become increasingly dynamic, organizations need to adjust their existing rules, routines and invest in aptitudes to scan their changing environment (Karna et al., 2016; Peteraf et al., 2013). Skimming through environmental capabilities are widely viewed as a crucial step for aligning organizational strategies with the external environment, which is expected to boost organization's performance and efficiency in dynamic environments.

In highly unstable environments, it is hard t to achieve an in-depth understanding of the environment and such an environment has a negative impact on the performance of the organization. This renders effective environmental scanning a precarious asset of executive judgment, strategy development, and organizational performance. Some have argued that due to a variety of economic, political, cultural, and demographic characteristics that stimulate environmental uncertainty, the competitive environment is

more unpredictable in lower income countries and as such, local firms in lower income countries are strongly more affected by the existence of a large informal sector, which often stifles the development of these firms by creating additional uncertainties (George, Corbishley, Khayesi, 2016; Iriyama, Kishore, & Talukdar, 2016).

While the importance of internal learning mechanisms, managerial experience, and organizational routines, specialization, etc are well acknowledged as drivers of organizational development (Schilke, 2014b), it isnoteworthy that in a resource-scarce environment characterized by constant changes, unpredictability, and uncertainty, these may not be the main drivers to develop new competencies or capabilities.

Ever-changing organizational climate or perceived organizational environmental uncertainty creates a decision-making problem which affects formalization of rules, duties, procedures and regulations in the organization. Building the concept of innovative climate based on the understanding of the business environment, (Welter &Smallbone, 2011) makes it very necessary for organizations that are just start-ups to scan the firm's environment for its growth and survival before adopting the right structure.

Conclusion
Over the years, the advent of globalization and economic crisis have compelled organizations to have a rethink on their strategies, structures and the way the organizations function/operate. It is noticeable that some organizations, who for instance, were focused on marketing are now switching their focus from markets to products or competitors, rather than looking at the big picture in the structure. These switches are sometimes occasioned by the eventualities arising from the environment of the organization especially the external perspective. Indeed, dysfunctional or obsolete structures are bound to be changed to match with the environment if the organization is to effectively and efficiently function alongside the dynamic nature of the business world. This implies that changes in the business environment is a key factor that could actually alter or influence the structure of an organization positively or negatively.

Again, so long as organizations are continually in search and use of strategies that could enhance the attainment of organizational goals, profitability and efficiency, the structures, roles and functions must change and be realigned with the new strategy/objectives trending in the global market and environment. This does not imply that existing responsibilities will be overlooked, staffing design can be inappropriate or that people and functions will work against each other. It is a simple indication of a traditional hierarchy flattening out, maybe broadening into a matrix structure in parts of the organization to suite the environmental exigencies.

Going by the contingency theory, the nature of the structure to be adopted in any organization is contingent to the prevailing environment and circumstances on hand. For instance, lengthy administrative procedures have encouraged the growth of informal organizations. While the absence of legislation as well as ambiguity of institutions has also favored the production of the informal sector (Webb et

al., 2013). As such, the informal divisions of organization is highly unpredictable (Restrepo-Echavarría, 2014) because scholars have argued that informal organizations can pose competitive threats to formal firms and are an important source of environmental complexity (Restrepo-Echavarría, 2014). So, the environment has great impact on the nature of the organizational structure.

Recommendations
It is thus recommended that organizations either overlook the rigidity of organizational structure and adopt flexible structures that could warrant quick changes for easy flow of business or remain overwhelmed by their competitors. The environment is the key factor in determining the level of available resources and the ease with which an organization can carry out its activities, thus, adequate environmental scanning must be embarked upon prior to structuring an organization to attain the goals for which the organization is created. For example, poor macroeconomic policies lead to high interest rates, fluctuating currencies, and a host of conditions that make it difficult for some organizations to perform well. Environmental scanning will elate adequate decision making.

References
[1] Aborade, R. (2005). A practical approach to advanced financial accounting. 2nd ed., Master Stroke Consulting

[2] Adi, A.B.C. (2006). The moral economy and the possibility of accumulation in Africa: How the IFIs can help West African Review, 3(2): 34-49

[3] Al-Qatawneh, M. I. (2014). The impact of organisational structure on organizational commitment: A comparison between public and private sector firms in Jordan. European Journal of Business and Management, 6(12), 30-37

[4] Ballyn, S. (2011). Lives in migration: Rupture and continuity. Barcelona: University of Barcelona.

[5] Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: The case of commercial microfinance organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 53, 1419-1440.

[6] Chen H, Zeng S, Lin H, et al. (2017). Munificence, dynamism, and complexity: How industry context drives corporate sustainability. Business Strategy and the Environment 26, 125–141.

[7] Daniels, J. D., Radebaugh, L. H., & Sullivan, D. P. (2011). International business environments and operations.13th edition. Harlow: Pearson education limited.

[8] Gabriel, J.M.O. (20018). Business Management: An Indigenous Standpoint, University of Port Harcourt Press, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

[9] George, G., Corbishley, C., Khayesi, J. N. O, et al. (2016) Bringing Africa in: Promising directions for management research. Academy of Management Journal 59(2), 377–393.

[10] Iriyama, A. Kishore, R.& Talukdar, D. (2016). Playing dirty or building capability? Corruption and HR training as competitive actions to threats from informal and foreign firm rivals. Strategic Management Journal 37, 2152–2173

[11] Johatch, M. (2014). Organization theory. Translated by Dr. Danayifard. H, Tehran. Mehban publications.

[12] Lunenburg, F. C. (2012). Mechanistic-Organic organizations-Anaxiomatic theory: Authority based on bureaucracy or professional norms. International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity, 14(1) 1-7

[13] Monavarian, A; Asgari, N; Ashena, M. (2007). Structural and content dimensions of knowledge-based organizations. The first national conference of k knowledge management. Bahman.

[14] Mamao, G. M. (2011). Growth strategy for hybrid organizations: Balancing economic, environmental, and social impacts (Unpublished master's thesis). MIT, Cambridge.

[15] Nwaeke, L. I. (2012). Business concept and perspectives. Published in Nigeria by Eristian publishers. Copyright@2012. ISBN:978-94108-2-0

[16] Olajide, O.T. (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

[17] Otokiti, S.O. and Awodun, M.O. (2003). The master strategist: Management with style in a turbulent business environment, Lagos, Pumark Nigeria Limited

[18] Restrepo-Echavarría, P. (2014). Macroeconomic volatility: The role of the informal economy. European Economic Review 70, 454 469.

[19] Rober, W. & Olive, M. (2013). The effect of formal organizational structures on inter-organizational networks. A study on OEMs in the forest technology industry of Northern Swede. Master thesis of Umeå School of Business and Economics.

[20] Romola, A. (2015). Preventing xenophobia in Africa: What must the African union do? AHMR, 1(3), 254–259.

[21] Sarboland, K. (2012). Effect of different levels of organizational structure on the productivity of human resource management: A case study: electricity distribution company in Ardabil province. Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 2(6), 5550-5554.

[22] Santra, T., &Giri, V. (2008). Effect of organizational structure on organizational effectiveness through face-to-face communication. The Icfai Journal of Organizational Behavior, 7 (2), 28-38.

[23] Schilke, O. (2014b). Second-order dynamic capabilities: How do they matter? Academy of Management Perspectives 28(4): 368–380.

[24] Senior, B., &Swailes, S. (2010). Organizational change. 4th edition. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

[25] Smith, W. K., Gonin, M., &Besharov, M. L. (2013). Managing social-business tensions: A review and research agenda for social enterprise. Business Ethics Quarterly, 23, 407-442.

[26] Sun, W. & Price, J. M. (2016). The impact of environmental uncertainty on increasing customer satisfaction through corporate social responsibility. *European Journal of Marketing,* 50(7/8), 1209-1238. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2015-0077

[27] Tajfel H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations.* New York: Academic

[28] Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup* conflict. In   W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.).*The social psychology of intergroup   relations*: 33-47. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

[29] Teixeira, R., Koufteros, X. A. and Peng, X. D. (2012). Organizational structure, integration, and manufacturing performance: A conceptual model and propositions. *Journal of Operations and Supply Chain Management*, 5(1), 69-81

[30] Terjesen, S. & Patel, P. C. (2017). In search of process innovations: The role of search depth, search breadth, and the industry environment. *Journal of Management* 43(5): 1421–1446.

[31] Tran, Q. &Tian, Y. (2013). Organisational structure: influencing factors and impact   on a   firm. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 3, 229-   236

[32] Webb, J. W., Bruton, G. D., Tihanyi L, et al. (2013). Research on entrepreneurship in the informal economy: Framing a research agenda. *Journal of Business Venturing* 28(5), 598–614.

[33] Welter, F., & Smallbone, D. (2011). Institutional perspectives on entrepreneurial behavior in challenging environments. *Journal of Small Business Management* 49(1): 107-125