



Relationship of Organizational Structure with Job Satisfaction and Task Performance of Teaching Faculty at Universities in Punjab

Dr. Nazma Bibi, Assistant Professor, Government Degree College (W), Kot Khawaja Saeed, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: nazma.bibi@ymail.com

Dr. Mahwish Safder, Assistant Professor, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Pakistan

Dr. Gulshan Fatima Alvi, Assistant Professor, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Pakistan

Nusrat Jamshid, Assistant Professor, Government Girls Degree College, Khwazakhela, Swat, Pakistan

Ishrat Jamshid, Secondary School Teacher, Government Girls High School, Panr, Swat, Pakistan

Abstract- The purpose of the research is to elucidate the organizational structure prevailing in universities of Punjab and to investigate its connection with teachers' job satisfaction and their task performance. At first, a survey was utilized to decide the organizational structure and whether it is organic or mechanistic. The population comprised of teachers of general (government and private) universities of Punjab. A quantitative approach was used in the current research. The sample for the research was selected through a two-stage random sampling technique. Faculty members of both sector universities were chosen to collect the data. From public universities, 456 teachers and 333 from private sector universities were taken. The total sample size was comprised of 789 teachers. As three variables were under investigation for the study so, three different instruments on a 5-points Likert scale were used. The content validity of these instruments was checked by the board of specialists. The reliability of the Organizational Structure Scale was 0.86; the Job Satisfaction Survey was 0.85, and the Task Performance Scale was 0.73. The return rate of the filled instruments was (89.48%). It was concluded that almost all of the universities have an organic structure. The results revealed that a noteworthy difference existed between all the subscales of organizational structure of public and private universities. Moreover, a strong positive link between organizational structure and job satisfaction of faculty members was found. Furthermore, a positive and weak correlation was observed in all the subscales of organizational structure and task performance of the teachers.

Keywords: Organizational structure, job satisfaction, task performance

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of organizational structure is a sign of deliberate idea. The organization is formed by segments, relations among segments, and structure as a sweeping statement forming a unit. A structure refers to the relationship amongst each element of an organization as a human body is the amalgam associations among body parts like blood and the skeleton (Ahmady, Mehrpour, & Nikooravesh, 2016). Likewise, an organizational structure is the main incentive of an organization in making a system for the best possible execution of administrative procedures (Wang, Wan, & Zhao, 2014). The organizational structure is characterized by alternate points of view. Organizational structure (OS) decides the extent of decisions, assignments, obligations, objectives, points of view, and awards for accomplishing outcomes. In the late eras, because of natural variations and emotional mechanical progress, the organizational structure has adjusted from mechanistic to organic (Shirazi, Rezazadeh, & Kordestani, 2019). Lunenburg (2012) presented two categories of organizational structure, *i.e.*, organic structure and mechanistic. He explained that organic organizations have fewer formal rules, a wide-ranging control zone, and a flat system of communication. This structure is adaptable in managing risks and urges workers to accomplish the objectives of the institution (Lunenburg, 2012). Whereas, mechanistic structures have many organizational stages, low absence of focus, vertical correspondence, high authority rules, and small control region (Clement & Puranam, 2018).

The two significant components for the best possible working of an institution are job satisfaction (JS) and job performance (JP). Many experts have conducted varied research to determine the relationship between OS and JS. It was indicated that OS and JS are connected (Meadows, 1980).

JS is considered as a fundamental variable, which can upgrade staff performances that unquestionably influence organizational capacity and performance. Robbins and Judge (2013) inferred that workers' satisfaction and dissatisfaction are controlled by the attributes and the idea of a job. In the educational setting, JS is of premier worry as it is associated with teachers' JP. Centralization had a negative link with the creativity and learning of workers. It was concluded through the study that a negative relationship exists between high formalization group learning (Bucic & Gudergan, 2004).

Human asset is a basic resource of each organization in this way, and organizations are answerable for making a domain where workers feel happy and are inspired for acceptable performance. JP refers to an arrangement of task declarations coming about because of job descriptions. People are evaluated based on the degree to which they accomplish these jobs (Locke, 2009). Universities are excellent examples of groups that must have an organic structure to increase their staffs' performance with the goal that they can do their vital role in society (El Talla, Al Shobaki, Abu-Naser, & Abu Amuna, 2018). Furthermore, JS and performance of the employees may also be influenced by the OS of universities.

It is a general assessment that universities are creating less useful and productive students at higher education level and the performance of universities is also weak. Although, the government is spending an enormous budget on universities since this is the phase where students pass out and assume their productive job in society and contribute to the progress of a nation. Because universities are influenced by the excellence and adequacy of their HR and a significant piece of these assets is teaching staff, further consideration should be given to them so that they can accomplish their objectives and goals. This situation urged the researcher to plan this study.

Statement of the problem

The purpose of this document was to investigate whether a connection existed between the variables of OS, JS, and TP among teachers at public and private universities in Punjab. The recognition of the components that influence the JS and workers' performance in an organization in a positive or adverse is the duty of authorities in the administration of the establishment. Teachers of universities have no voice to say in making major decisions and communication in universities is vertical, so employees are not satisfied with their job. Ultimately their performance is affected and through the study scholars presumed that there is a divergence in the staffs' performance working in universities of Punjab, and there are numerous variables that influence their JS and performance. So, this study intended to classify the OS of the universities of Punjab, to help manage the organizations of these organizations.

Objectives

The objectives were to

1. Classify the organizational structure of universities
2. Explore the relationship of OS with JS of university teachers in universities of Punjab.
3. Investigate the relationship of subscales of OS with TP of university teachers in universities of Punjab.

Hypotheses

H₀₁. All the subscales of organizational structure of both sector universities have no significant differences.

H₀₂. Organizational structure and university teachers' job satisfaction have no significant relationship.

H₀₃. All the subscales of organizational structure and university teachers' task performance have no significant relationship.

Delimitations of the Study

The scope of the research was delimited to the general universities of Punjab working under the supervision of the HEC of Pakistan. Moreover, this study focused on two dependent variables *i.e.*, teachers' job satisfaction and their task performance (TP).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Structure refers to the links between different ingredients of a planned whole. The best example of structure is the human body that is an amalgam of different parts that are linked to each other to make the human body

(Johatch, 2014). Similarly, an organizational structure is the combination of different strategies which helps in separating job descriptions and directions to accomplish the task of an organization (Monavarian, Asgari, & Ashna, 2007). OS is a strategy through which organizational actions are planned and assigned to the workers to achieve the organizational goals. Each organization formulates its structure to plan the actions and monitor the activities of their workers (Rezayian, 2005). OS indicates to equally the correspondence lines and the allocated duties in an organization (Holtzhausen & Fourie, 2011). Moreover, Burns and Stalker (1961); and Katz and Kahn (2004) described six elements of OS. These include (i) work specialization, (ii) centralization or decentralization, (iii) series of command, (iv) formalization, (v) span of control and (vi) departmentalization.

The first element of OS is ‘specialization’. According to Kondalkar (2007), it is the process in which different responsibilities are distributed into different jobs. The next element ‘centralization’ refers to the decisions of an organization made at top-level management (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Contrarily to this, ‘decentralization’ refers to the distribution of powers to the lower management at various levels in an organization (Kondalkar, 2007). Moreover, ‘formalization’ refers to the number of tasks and behaviors of the workers controlled through organizational rules and regulations (Robbins, Coulter, & Vohra, 2009). The next element of OS is ‘chain of command’ that provides a hierarchy of powers from upper management to lower management and determines the reporting authority for each level of management in an organization. Whereas, ‘span of control’ is the number of juniors in an organization to whom a manager can skillfully handle to accomplish the organizational goals. The last element of OS is ‘departmentalization’. According to Robbins and Judge (2013), departmentalization provides a baseline for collecting the jobs together.

In the earliest eras, Burns and Stalker (1961) presented the notion of mechanistic and organic organizations. According to the authors, a mechanistic organization is comprised of strict levels of leadership, vertical correspondence, and a severe order of control. Both types of OS are inverse to one another in the OS conceivable outcomes. Mechanistic organizations have a firm order; high formalization; numerous principles and methods; vertical specialization; a downward way of correspondence; and hardly defined jobs. Notably, organic organizations are considered as fragile or possess a few chains of command. There are free guidelines and arrangements, low formalization, and strategies. Decentralization, and versatile, to varying circumstances and a stream of correspondence in every direction, these organizations are organic (Lunenberg, 2012). The following table presents the difference between mechanistic and organic structures which was created by Robbins and Judge (2013).

Table 1
Different Factors of Organic and Mechanistic OSs

Organic Structure	Mechanistic Structure
Decentralization	Centralization
Cross-functional teams	High specialization
Cross hierarchical teams	Rigid departmentalization
Free flow of information	A clear chain of command
Wide-span of control	Narrow span of control
Low formalization	High formalization

Organic and mechanistic structures are inverse to one another. Organic organizations have fewer principles, are decentralized, include a flat correspondence framework, and an adaptable hierarchy of leadership. On the other hand, the mechanistic structure comprises of centralization, inflexible levels of leadership, numerous guidelines and methods, and descending correspondence framework.

Most organizational administrators understand that change is a consistent occurrence that must be overseen appropriately for organizational sustainability (Thurshika & Andrew, 2016). In today’s era, organizations are adopting organic structure, and organic structure represents change, and employees JS and JP. The essential and central objective of each organization is employees’ JS and JP, existence, and development. Research proved that there is a significant connection between OS and JS (Kessler, 2007), also between OS and JP (Thurshika & Andrew, 2016).

In examining human behavior in an institute, JS is a very vital fundamental factor (Kondalkar, 2007). It is evident from research that workers who are gratified with their work are determined and dedicated toward

the success of their organization even in the worst conditions. Different people perceive JP from different perspectives. Locke (1976) specified that JS is an optimistic excited state working out as expected because of the assessment of a persons' job or job association. Lunenberg (2012) described that the psychological and physical pleasure of workers is also identified with JS. JS also shows the degree of significance that an organization gives to its HR. Moreover, Aamodt (2015) characterized JS as employees' attitude towards their specific job that might be positive or negative. The mentality of a worker is absorbed in job satisfaction.

Many elements affect job satisfaction of the workers of an organization but this research focused the following significant factors; "pay and promotion policy, rewards, supervision, fringe benefits, work content, operating procedures, relationship with co-workers and communication" (Coomber & Barriball, 2007; Dammen, 2001). As indicated by Kondalkar (2007) 'pay and promotion policy' for the employees had to be fair, clear and concerning the institutional standards and desires of staff. Robbins, Odendaal, and Roodt (2003) examined that 'supervision' influences JS and supervisor should provide particular guidance and assistance with job-related assignments. The benefits that the administrator provides are named as 'fringe benefits. According to Spector et al. (2007), these might be portrayed as the benefits in the shape of cash or non-financial benefits provided by an organization to their employees according to their nature of job and designation. Artz (2010) found a strong positive relationship between employees' JS and fringe benefits awarded to them. 'Rewards' enhance the result of the organization (Reio & Callahan, 2004). 'Operating rules and procedures' also determine JS (Shurbagi & Zahari, 2012). The research demonstrated that if 'co-workers' relationships are friendly then JS increases (Kondalkar, 2007). 'Work content' is another essential determinant of JS. The job tasks should be of this nature that people need to extend their abilities, minds, and skill. When this kind of job is finished effectively, workers feel pleased (Kondalkar, 2007). 'Communication' is viewed as a significant indicator to complete the goal line of the organization. Jorfi, Yacob, and Shah (2011) concluded that better communication among the management and their employees has a significant role in the JS level of the subordinates.

JP is defined as, "job performance is all of the behaviors employees engage in while at work" (Britt & Jex, 2008, p. 96). This definition declares that performance is all the conduct of employees who are occupied with the work. Performance is the task of quantity and quality accomplished by a worker in performing its obligations with the duty given to him (Mangkunegara, 2009). Borman and Motowildo (1993) perceived significant parts of behavior identified with the organizational achievement which are task performance (TP) and contextual performance. TP might be described as the "behavior that is directly related in producing products or service, or exercises that can provide indirect support for the organization's core specialized processes" (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997, p. 41). Task performance (TP) of employees is evaluated by job duties. "Task performance comprises the completion of activities or tasks that fulfills the written job requirements" (Williams & Anderson, 1991, p. 3). TP is considered as an effort during the employee's promotion. When people work hard and give good performance then they get a promotion during the job. Contextual performance is described as, "individual actions that are not connected with the job" (William & Anderson, 1991). Expected assignments and given obligations are finished in TP. Workers accomplish targets assigned to them written in the job description. Workers are required to meet with performance judgment. Then again, task performance incorporates extraordinary kinds of practices and these practices help in the execution of job associated assignments (Johari, Yahya, & Omar, 2009).

Bhatti and Qureshi (2007) studied the "impact of employee participation JS, employee commitment, and employee productivity" in Pakistan. Analysis of data demonstrated that the involvement of staff in organizational activities influences employees' JS, employee commitment, and productivity of the employees. In Pakistan Altaf, Yousaf, Tahir, & Bagram (2013) expressed that a few kinds of research have been done on participative administration and JS, outcomes of these investigations demonstrated that decentralization encourages workers; staff recognizes their qualities which inevitably raises JS.

Regarding the study "satisfaction as an outcome of communication and organizational structures," Ahmad et al. (2010) OS comprises of the level of specialization, formalization, and centralization. The data were taken from 322 center level directors of five major urban cities of Pakistan. The study portrayed a negative correlation between OS and JS. Moreover, this relationship was found significant as the p value was less than .05. Moreover, Feizi and Farid (2013) analyzed "the effect of organization structure on worker's job satisfaction". The outcomes have demonstrated that 32% fluctuation in JS is communicated by three elements

of OS; (i) formalization, (ii) intricacy, and (iii) centralization. Furthermore, in the instructive setting, Eynali, Golshahi, Yazdi, and Rahimi (2014) studied the connection between OS and JS of the education sector. The results found a negative and insignificant connection between OS and its other features; formalization, multifaceted nature and centralization, and employees' JS. Moreover, significant research in the zone of JS was done by Adeyemi and Bolarinwa (2010). The outcomes found a significant correlation between democratic administration style and instructors' JS. In Pars Abad Islamic Azad University, the effect of OS and organizational commitment of workers was evaluated by Shafaei, Rahnama, Alaei, and Jasour (2012). The results have shown that OS and job characteristics have a strong influence on workers' JS and their organizational commitment.

Shirazi et al. (2019) concluded from their research that organic structures enhance performance measurements. Al Shobaki, Abu-Naser, El Talla, and Abu Amuna (2018) identified the performance of the managerial staff. They concluded from this study that employees should participate in making decisions as it enhances their performance. Alipoor, Ahmadi, Pouya, Ahmad, and Mowlaie (2017) showed that OS (basic viewpoints) has a critical negative impact on workers' JP. Moreover, in the presence of mechanistic OS workers' job performance reduces.

Massa and Zhang (2010) examined OS and JP in the commercial sector. They found that if an institution had a vertical structure, then employees' performance decreases. Zehra and Bukhari (2015) concluded that TP of workers and bureaucratic and creative cultures are decidedly connected while supportive culture did not affect the TP of employees.

III. METHODOLOGY

This research was descriptive as an existing phenomenon was investigated without any manipulation of treatment. A Survey technique was used to gather the data. The population involved all teaching faculty working in general public and private universities of Punjab, Pakistan. There was total of 22 general universities including 13 public and 9 private sector universities. A two-stage random sampling technique was used. Initially, 50% of government (public) and private universities were selected from 22 universities. In this way, seven public and five private universities were chosen. The total teaching faculty of public universities is 4559 and private university is 3331. In the second stage, 10% of teachers of universities were selected randomly which consisted of a total 789 teachers (public= 456 and private=333 teachers). Frankle and Wallen (2012) also suggested that a sample can be large in survey studies. If the population exceeds five thousand, a sample can be taken of four hundred and more keeping in view limited time and resources (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2011). The author personally visited the universities situated within Lahore for data collection while other modes of correspondence like email and post were used to collect the data from the rest of the universities. Response rate on instruments was 89.48% (n=706) including 92.19% (n=307) from private sector teachers and 87.5% (n=399) response from faculty members of public sector universities.

Instrumentation

There were three variables under investigation in this research. So, the following three types of instruments were used to assemble the data for the study. All three tools were based on five points Likert scale with different options.

Organizational Structure Scale (OSS)

To find the prevailing OS of the universities, the Organizational Structure Scale (OSS) which comprised of 28 items, was adapted. Among these items, few of them were borrowed from the Prezeois scale of the Organization Diagnostic Questionnaire (ODQ). OSS was adapted by the researcher. A panel of experts checked the content validity of OSS. The experts proposed hardly any changes in these instruments. These adjustments were made in the questionnaire. Moreover, the reliability of the OSS was ensured through pilot testing. The reliability of the OSS was 0.86.

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

To address the second variable of the study *i.e.*, Job Satisfaction of teaching faculty, Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) formulated by Spector's (1994) was adopted after completing ethical considerations. The scale assesses job satisfaction over its nine aspects. The reliability of the JSS was 0.85.

Task Performance Scale (TPS)

To find out the task performance of teaching faculty of universities, William and Anderson's (1991) scale was adopted. TPS consisted of 7 items. The reliability of TPS was ensured and was calculated as 0.73. The task performance of the teachers was evaluated by two types of rating; Self-rating and Supervisory rating. Both the ratings were analyzed to find out the task performance of the teachers.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

To test hypotheses, collected data were analyzed by applying statistics. Mean and Standard deviation was used to determine the OS of the universities of Punjab.

Table 2
Factor wise Analysis of Organizational Structure

Factor	N	M	SD
Centralization	706	3.19	0.69
Formalization	706	3.34	0.61
Specialization	706	3.30	0.63
Chain of Command	706	3.51	0.59
Span of Control	706	3.27	0.96
Departmentalization	706	3.53	0.68

Table 2 demonstrated the factor wise analysis of organizational structure prevailing in the universities. There were six factors of organizational structure. Scale means *i.e.*, 3 was taken as the cut point. The mean score above scale mean was considered as organic while the mean score below scale means was considered as mechanistic organizational structure. Among all six factors of organizational structure 'centralization' has the least mean score of 3.19 with a standard deviation of 0.69. But it was also considered as organic because mean score 3.19 in above the scale mean. Moreover, all other factors reflected that universities have an organic organizational structure. H_{01} . The organizational structure of both sector universities has no significant difference.

Table 3
Comparison between the OS of Universities

Organizational Structure	Mean		S.D		Mean Difference	df	t-value	Sig.
	Public	Private	Public	Private				
Centralization	3.24	3.12	.74	.60	.122	704	2.33	.020
Formalization	3.41	3.24	.62	.57	.165	704	3.60	.001
Specialization	3.57	3.45	.66	.59	.094	704	1.94	.052
Chain of Command	3.24	3.12	.55	.61	.120	704	2.73	.006
Span of Control	3.44	3.21	1.1	.72	.227	704	3.11	.002
Departmentalization	3.31	3.22	.66	.69	.086	704	1.67	.094

Table 3 described the comparison between the subscales of OS of public and private sector universities. An independent sample t-test was applied to analyze the data. A significant difference was found between all the subscales of OS of private universities and public universities except departmentalization where in government universities ((M= 3.31, S.D. = .66) and private universities (M= 3.22, S.D. = .69; $t(704) = 1.67$, $p =$

.094 > $\alpha = .05$). Based on the conclusion null hypothesis H_{01} is rejected and decided on the basis of all factors / subscales of the OS that private universities' OS is less organic as compared with public universities.

H_{02} . Organizational structure and university teachers' job satisfaction have no significant relationship.

Table 4
Relationship between OS of Universities and their Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Organizational Structure	Job Satisfaction	
	Correlation Coefficient	.559
Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
N	706	

Table 4 demonstrated the relationship between the OS of universities and their teachers' job satisfaction. Results showed a positive moderate correlation (.559) between the OS of universities and their teachers' job satisfaction. Moreover, this relationship was found significant ($\alpha = 0.05 < p = .001$). Based on these findings null hypothesis H_{02} was rejected and decided that OS and JS are linked with each other.

H_{03} . All the subscales of organizational structure and university teachers' task performance have no significant relationship.

Table 5
Relationship between OS of Universities and their Teachers' Task Performance (TP)

Variables	Variables	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Centralization	TP	.123	.001
Formalization	TP	.120	.001
Specialization	TP	.117	.002
Chain of command	TP	.186	.001
Span of Control	TP	.116	.002
Departmentalization	TP	.146	.001

Table 5 showed the relationship between the all the subscales of OS of universities and their teachers' task performance. Analysis of data depicted a positive and weak correlation between all the factors of OS of universities and their teachers' task performance. Based on these findings null hypothesis ' H_{03} all the subscales of OS and university teachers' task performance have no significant relationship' was rejected. This shows that all subscales of OS and TP were weakly connected. This may be due to the reason that only one aspect of job performance was assessed i.e., Task performance.

V. DISCUSSION

This chapter reveals the outcomes of the data collected from this descriptive correlational research. This quantitative descriptive study intended to decide the prevailing organizational structure of both private and public sector universities and to investigate the relationship of OS with job satisfaction and relationship of all the subscales of OS with task performance of teachers within universities in Punjab. The OS of all general universities was assessed through mean and standard deviation. Findings showed that the OS of all general universities was organic. Moreover, the centralization component of the organic structure has low value as compared to other components of OS. It demonstrated that general universities have less centralization as compared to other components of organic structure and these findings are aligned with the results of Khandwalla, (1976). Khandwalla (1976) used seven items scale to find out OS and concluded that it was found more organic than mechanistic structure. To find out the difference between the organizational structure of both public and private universities, inferential statistics (Independent sample t-test) was applied. A noteworthy difference was found between all the subscales of OS of public and private universities except departmentalization. This shows that jobs are assembled in the same way in both public and private sector universities. Experts of required subjects may be taken/ hired from concerned departments and due to this reason cross hierarchical groups prevailed in universities. Therefore, the null hypothesis H_{01} was rejected. The result of research supports the research of Ambrose and Schminke (2003). They concluded that

public organizations are organic in structure unlike private organizations and have a significant difference between their organizational structures.

The second hypothesis was related to the relationship between the prevailing OS and JS of teaching faculty. For this purpose, Pearson r was applied and found a strong positive correlation between OS and JP of teaching faculty of the universities. On the base of the finding, the null hypothesis H_{02} was rejected. The result of the study also supported the outcomes that a strong positive link found between OS and JS of teachers (Dammen, 2001). These results support the findings of Kessler (2007) who found a positive connection between OS and JS. Moreover, the results of the current study support the results of Eynali et al. (2014).

The third hypothesis was related to the relationship between all the subscales of OS of universities and the TP of their teaching faculty. A positive and weak connection was found between all the subscales of organizational structure of universities and the task performance of their teaching faculty. Hence, the null hypothesis H_{03} was also rejected. Other aspects of job performance e.g. contextual performance also play an important part in job performance that's why weak correlation was found. This might be the reason of weak correlation of all the subscales of OS and TP. Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) investigated the relationship between OS and TP of employees. The study found that centralization and formalized standards disallowed workers in performing their duties. In this manner, employees didn't accomplish a difficult task to improve their jobs. It might be reasoned that workers avoided difficult tasks in organizations with high centralization and formalization. Zehra and Bukhari (2015) examined organizational culture and TP in the private financial sector. A weak and positive association has shown between all factors of OS and TP of workers. Organizational clash and managerial politics might be the cause of a weak relationship between OS and TP of university teachers. Alipoor et al. (2017) and Thurshika and Andrew (2016) also demonstrated that mechanistic OS and TP are adversely connected. The past studies stated above approved the results of current research. Then, this objective was also accomplished.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The study concluded that organic structure is present in both public and private sector universities of Punjab. Moreover, all the components of OS; control of authority, formalization, a span of control, specialization, the hierarchy of leadership, and departmentalization demonstrated huge outcomes. Furthermore, the results of the study also depicted that teacher of public universities participated in the research were much pleased with their jobs unlike the teachers of private sector universities. The purpose of the quantitative descriptive research was to investigate the connection between OS and JS in both public and private sector universities. The findings of the current study supported a relationship between OS and TP. The relationship demonstrated OS to be associated with JS. Different components that are identified with the organizational structure might be studied in further researches focusing on the relationship between OS and other job-related practices.

Employees working in organic OS perform well as compared to employees working under mechanistic OS. Accordingly, it is prescribed that general universities encourage organic structures to improve teachers' TP. The administration of universities should be allowed the chance to take an interest in upgrading the organic organizational structure. Study results can be utilized as a base of information for additional investigations about OS, JS, and TP following changed criteria and research strategies. Future studies might be conducted by including other aspects of job performance and then relationship between OS and job performance might be found.

This investigation utilized a pure quantitative plan. Future investigations might be led utilizing diverse research structures, particularly qualitative perspectives. Moreover, this type of study may be conducted on different situations like population, and locality, etc.

Acknowledgments

The authors of the study acknowledge the work of all researchers coded in the study. Moreover, acknowledgment is extended to all participants of the study because it was impossible to complete this research without their invaluable feedback.

REFERENCES

1. Aamodt, M. (2015). *Industrial/organizational psychology: An applied approach*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
2. Adeyemi, T., & Bolarinwa, R. A. (2010). Principals' leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, 1(2), 1-12.
3. Ahmad, Z., Ali, L., Ahmad, N., Ahmad, Z., Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M. (2010). Satisfaction as an outcome of communication and organizational structures: An outcome-based approach. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(5), 249-257.
4. Ahmady, G. A., Mehrpour, M., & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). Organizational structure. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 455-462.
5. Al Shobaki, M. J., Abu-Naser, S. S., El Talla, S. A., & Abu Amuna, Y. M. (2018). Performance Reality of Administrative Staff in Palestinian Universities, *International Journal of Academic Information Systems Research*, 2(4), 1-17.
6. Alipoor, H., Ahmadi, K., Pouya, S. Ahmad, K., & Mowlaie, S. (2017). The effect of organizational structure on employees' job performance in private hospitals of Ahvaz. *Journal of Ecophysiology and Occupational Health*, 17 (3 & 4), 119-123.
7. Altaf, M., Yousaf, U., Tahir, M., & Bagram, M. M. (2013). Job satisfaction and employee's participation in government sector. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 3(2), 384-393.
8. Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2003). Organization structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, perceived organizational support, and supervisory trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 295-305.
9. Artz, B. (2010). Fringe benefits and job satisfaction. *International journal of manpower*, 31(6), 626-644.
10. Bhatti, K. K., & Qureshi, T. M. (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of business Research papers*, 3(2), 54-68.
11. Borman, W.C. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance. In Schmitt, N. and Borman, W.C., (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations* (71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
12. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
13. Britt, T. W., & Jex, S. M. (2008). *Organization Psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
14. Bucic, T., & Gudergan, S. P. (2004). The impact of organizational settings on creativity and learning in alliances. *Management*, 7(3), 257-273.
15. Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Clement, J., & Puranam, P. (2018). Searching for structure: Formal organization design as a guide to network evolution. *Management Science*, 64(8), 3469-3480.
17. Coomber, B., & Barriball, K. L. (2007). Impact of job satisfaction components on intent to leave and turnover for hospital-based nurses: A review of the research literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44, 297-314.
18. Dammen, K. J. (2001). *The Effects of Organizational Structure on Employee Trust and Job Satisfaction*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. The Graduate School. University of Wisconsin-Stout.
19. El Talla, S.A., Al Shobaki, M. J., Abu-Naser, S. S., & Abu Amuna, Y. M. (2018). The nature of the organizational structure in the Palestinian governmental universities - Al-Aqsa University as a model. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(5).15-31.
20. Eynali, M., Golshahi, K., Yazdi, M. T., & Rahimi, M. M. (2014). The relationship between organizational structure of department of education and the personnel's job burnout. *International Research Journal of Management Science*, 2(2), 49-54.
21. Feizi, M., & Farid, S. (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*, 2, 76-80.
22. Frankle, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8thed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

23. Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E. & Airasian, P. W. (2011). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. New York, NY: Pearson.
24. Holtzhausen, L., & Fourie, L. (2011). Employees' perceptions of institutional values and employer employee relationships at the North-West University. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 11(4), 243-254. doi: 10.1002/pa.417.
25. Johari, J., Yahya, K. K., & Omar, A. (2009). *Construct Validation of the Job Performance Measurement: A Case of the Malaysian Public Service Agencies*. Paper presented at the Performance Measurement Association Conference, University of Otago, New Zealand.
26. Johatch, M. (2014). *Organization theory*. Translated by Dr. Danayifard. H, Tehran: Mehban publications.
27. Jorfi, H., Yaccob, H. F. B., & Shah, I. M. (2011). Human resource management-emotional intelligence: Communication effectiveness mediates the relationship between stress management and job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Managing Information Technology*, 3(4), 1-7.
28. Katz, A. U., & Kahn, J. K. (2004). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A conceptual synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 45-62.
29. 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. Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/2243>.
30. Khandwalla, P. N. (1976/1977). Some top management styles, their context and performance. *Organization for Administrative Sciences*, 7, 21-51.
31. Kondalkar, V. J. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour*. New Delhi, India: New Age International (P) Limited Publishers.
32. Locke, E. A. (2009). *Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behavior*. (2nd ed.). West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
33. Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette, *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1343). Chicago: Rand McNally.
34. Lunenberg, 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.
35. Mangkunegara, A.A.A.P. (2009). *Human Resources Resource Management Company*. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya.
36. Massa, M., & Zhang, L. (2010). The role of organizational structure: Between hierarchy and specialization. Submitted to the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Financial Studies*.1-39.
37. Meadows, I. S. (1980). Organic structure and innovation in small work groups. *Human Relations*, 33(6),369-382.
38. Monavarian, A., Asgari, N. & Ashna, M. (2007). Structural & content aspects of the knowledge-oriented organizations. *1st National conference on management of knowledge 13-14 razi international center*, Tehran, Iran p.10- 20.
39. Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
40. Reio, T. G., & Callahan, J. L. (2004). Affect, curiosity, and socialization-related learning: A path analysis of antecedents to job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(1), 3-22.
41. Rezayian, A. (2005). *The basics of organization and management*. Tehran. SAMT publications.
42. Robbin, S. P., Coulter, M., & Vohra, N. (2009). *Management*. (10thed.). New Delhi, DL: Pearson Education, Inc.
43. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. (15th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education Inc.
44. Robbins, S., Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. (2003). *Organizational behavior*. Cape Town, ZA: Prentice-Hall International.
45. Shafae, J., Rahnama, A., Alaei, A., & Jasour, J. (2012). Evaluation of the impact of organizational structure and job characteristics on job satisfaction and organizational commitment case study: Islamic Azad University, Parsabad branch. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(3), 2329-2335.
46. Shirazi, S. A., Rezazadeh, J., & Kordestani, G. (2019). The Role of Organizational Structure in Designing Performance Measurement Systems. *Environmental Energy and Economic Research*, 3(1), 61-74.
47. Shurbagi, A., & Zahari, I. (2012). The relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction in national oil corporation of Libya. *International Journal of Humanities and Applied sciences*, 1(3), 88-93.

48. Spector, P. E., Allen, T. D., Poelmans, S. A., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., O'Driscoll, M. P., Sanchez, J. I., Abarca, N., Alexandrova, M., Beham, B., Brough, P., Ferreiro, P., Fraile, G., Lu, C., Lu, L., Moreno-Velazquez, I., Pagon, M., Pitariu, H., Salamatov, V., Shima, S. Simoni, A.S., Siu, O. L. & Widerszal-Bazyl, M. (2007). Cross-national differences in relationships of work demands, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions with work-family conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(4), 805-835.
49. Thurshika, S., & Andrew, A. (2016). The influence of organization structure for change on employee performance. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning*, 2(5), 258-269.
50. Wang, G., Wan, J. and Zhao, L. (2014). Strategy map for Chinese science parks with KPIs of BSC. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, 5(2), 82-105.
51. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
52. Zehra, H. T., & Bukhari, I. (2015). Relationship between organizational culture and in-role job performance among private sector bank employees. *Pakistan Business Review*, 17(3), 541-561.