Structure-Objective-Environment Alignment: Organisational Success

Amos K. Chemonges

Structure-Objective-Environment Alignment: Organisational Success

Amos K. Chemonges

PhD Student, Organisational Leadership, Pan African Christian University

Email Address: kiprutoamos@yahoo.com

Abstract

The alignment of an organisation's structure, environment, and goals is critical to its success. This study investigates how some organisational theory's schools of thought might help organisations identify difficulties and recommend appropriate structures to handle them. Organisations can get significant insights into the dynamics of their internal and external environments by investigating diverse views and theories within organisational theories. The contingency hypothesis emphasises the importance of tailoring organisational structures to individual conditions. The classical school of thinking emphasises scientific management and the need for hierarchical organisation and labour division. This school provides principles and standards for efficiently structuring organisations. Employee happiness, motivation, and social connections are all important in the human relations school of thought. On the other hand, the systems school emphasises the interconnection and complexity of organisations. By harnessing these different schools of thought, organisations can better understand their difficulties and build appropriate structures that enhance flexibility, resilience, and effectiveness. This paper concludes that a comprehensive examination of organisational theory can provide valuable guidance for organisations aligning their structures with their environments and objectives, resulting in improved performance and competitiveness in today's complex and rapidly changing business landscape.

Keywords: *Structure-Objective, Environment, Alignment, Organisational Success*

1.1 Background of the Study

The organisational structure of a firm, or any given entity, is how it is organised to meet its goals (Daft, 2016). It describes how various organisational jobs, duties, and power are distributed (Chouikha, 2016). Furthermore, according to Chouikha, structure describes the hierarchy, relationships, and communication paths between individuals and departments. Success is linked to an organisation's ability to align its structure with its environment and goals (Daft, 2016). A well-designed organisational structure increases efficiency and productivity, allowing the business to overcome challenges (Wong, 2012). In this sense, several organisational theory schools of thought provide valuable insights to help firms identify problems and assess appropriate structures to address them (Daft, 2016). An effective organisational structure helps to define the roles and responsibilities of people and departments (Rowden-Racette, 2012). Rowden-Racette asserts that everyone knows their tasks, whom to report to, and who they can rely on for support. This clarity promotes efficiency and reduces conflicts arising from duplication of effort. The organisational structure establishes formal channels of communication and information flow (Burton et al., 2011). It governs how communications and decisions are communicated within the organisation, encourages effective communication, improves teamwork, and allows for timely decision-making. It ensures that the right people receive the right information at the right time, reducing delays and the likelihood of misunderstandings (Organisational Structure and Communication, 2008).

The organisational structure facilitates the appropriate and efficient allocation of resources (Burton et al., 2011). According to the authors, organisations can distribute resources effectively by matching them with specific tasks and functions. This enhances productivity, reduces waste, and maximises the utilisation of available resources. It affects how an organisation makes decisions and determines the levels of authority, decision-making authority, and responsibility delegation (Chouikha, 2016). A clearly defined structure empowers individuals at different levels to make informed decisions within their areas of expertise while ensuring that critical decisions are made when necessary (Daft, 2016). It provides a foundation that allows organisations to respond to changes in the internal and external environment (G, 2008). It enables the organisation to respond effectively to market dynamics, technological advancements, and competitive pressures, facilitating innovation, agility, and seizing opportunities (Daft, 2016).

2.1 Literature Review

An organisation's structure determines its efficiency, effectiveness, and overall success. It defines how different roles, responsibilities, and functions are organised and coordinated within the company (Altinay & Altinay, 2004). When selecting an appropriate organisational structure, businesses often consider factors such as the nature of their operations, size, industry, and strategic goals (Daft, 2016). As highlighted by Baligh (2006), there are three common types of organisational structures: functional, divisional, and matrix. These structures are described in the following section.

2.1.1 Functional Structure

The functional structure is a traditional and widely used organisational design focusing on specialised functions (Galbraith, 2014). Galbraith explains that employees are grouped based on their expertise or skills in this structure. According to Daft (2016), the functional categories

encompass finance, operations, marketing, research and development, and human resources. Each department or function is responsible for specific activities aligned with its expertise in a functional structure (Galbraith, 2014). This specialisation allows employees to develop deep knowledge and proficiency in their jobs, leading to higher productivity and quality outcomes (Baligh, 2006). Functional structures have a transparent hierarchical chain of command. A manager oversees each functional department, and employees report directly to their department heads. This well-defined reporting structure facilitates efficient decision-making, clear communication channels, and smooth coordination (Daft, 2016). The functional structure allows employees to focus on specific functions, enhancing their expertise and efficiency (Daft, 2016). Daft argues that each department has clearly defined roles and responsibilities, minimising confusion and promoting accountability. Centralising similar functions can lead to economies of scale, as resources and expertise can be shared across departments (Daft, 2010). The functional structure facilitates targeted training and development programs tailored to specific functional areas (Burton et al., 2011).

2.1.2 Divisional Structure

The divisional structure organises an organisation based on products, geography, or market segments (Daft, 2016). It is considered mainly by large or multinational companies that operate diverse business lines (Aquinas, 2009). In a divisional structure, divisions are created based on different products or services, geographical regions, or target market segments (Galbraith, 2014). Each division operates as a self-contained unit with its functional departments, such as marketing, finance, and operations, allowing divisions to focus on their unique needs and requirements (Daft, 2016). The divisional structure promotes flexibility and innovation by dividing the organisation into separate divisions (Burton et al., 2011). Each division has the autonomy to make decisions and adapt its operations based on the specific demands of its product or market. This structure facilitates quicker responses to market changes, enhances an entrepreneurial spirit, and encourages innovation within each division (Daft, 2010). Divisions take their strategies and operations to specific customer segments, resulting in better customer satisfaction and market responsiveness (G, 2008). The divisional structure allows the effective allocation of resources within each division, optimising performance, and accountability. With decentralised decision-making authority, divisions can respond quickly to market demands and opportunities, improving agility and competitiveness. The divisional structure enables proper performance evaluation within each division, as their results can be assessed independently (Ivancevich et al., 2011).

2.1.3 Matrix Structure

According to Daft (2016), the matrix structure is a type of organisational architecture combining functional and divisional structure features. According to Egelhoff and Wolf (2017), it is well suited for complicated projects or organisations that require high coordination across various tasks and divisions. Employees report to a functional, project, or divisional manager in a matrix structure (Daft, 2010). This dual reporting relationship ensures that expertise from different functions is integrated and utilised effectively for project success (Saunila et al., 2014). It enhances coordination and communication by breaking down functional silos and promoting cross-functional collaboration. It facilitates pooling of resources, expertise, and perspectives from multiple functions and divisions, leading to improved problem-solving, innovation, and decision-making (Daft, 2016). The matrix structure enables the efficient utilisation of resources by

leveraging expertise from multiple functions and divisions (Daft, 2016). Matrix structure allows for flexibility and adaptation to changing project or market requirements, as resources can be reallocated (Saunila et al., 2014). Employees assigned to work in a matrix structure can participate in various projects and functions, which helps them improve their skills, knowledge, and adaptability. According to Wong (2012), the matrix structure is an excellent tool for facilitating good project management. This is accomplished by aligning project goals, resources, and cross-functional collaboration (Daft, 2016).

2.1.4 Aligning Organisational Structure with Environment and Goals

According to Daft (2016), aligning the structure with the environment and objectives of the organisation is crucial for sustained success and growth. The organisation's aims and objectives need to be matched with the structure of the organisation for the organisation to be successful. This guarantees that the organisation's structure is in line with its long-term goals and supports the company's overall orientation (Biggs et al., 2013). When the structure is well-aligned, it enhances the organisation's ability to implement its strategies effectively and achieve its desired outcomes (Wong, 2012). Daft (2010) argues that the external environment operation of an organisation constantly evolves. Industry trends, market conditions, and customer preferences can change rapidly. By aligning the organisational structure with the external environment, the organisation becomes more responsive and adaptable to these changes. It allows the organisation to remain competitive, use opportunities, and mitigate risks effectively (G, 2008). Aligning the structure with the organisation's objectives enables the proper utilisation of resources. It ensures that resources are allocated to the areas that contribute most to achieving objectives.

This alignment minimises wastage, reduces costs, and maximises the return on resource investment (Resource Allocation Decisions and Organisational Structure, 2008). When the organisational structure is aligned with its objectives, it creates a sense of purpose and direction among employees (Mohamed & Yassin, 2022). Mohamed and Yassin highlight that the employees understand how their roles and contributions fit the company, increasing their engagement and motivation. Furthermore, an aligned structure clarifies career paths, enhances skill development, and provides growth opportunities, improving employee performance and retention (Daft, 2016). An aligned organisational structure enhances effectiveness (Armistead et al., 1999). It ensures that the right people are in the correct positions, facilitates efficient coordination, and enables seamless collaboration across departments. Because of this alignment, there is less need for duplication of efforts and fewer disputes, and the organisation's capacity to carry out its strategy and accomplish its goals is increased (Daft, 2016).

2.2 Theoretical literature

2.2.1 Organisational Theory Schools of Thoughts

Numerous schools of thought have been established in the study of organisational theory to explore the intricate dynamics between an organisation's structure, environment, and objectives. These models, which include the Classical, Human Relations, Contingency, and Systems Management schools of thought, offer unique perspectives and strategies for achieving organisational success. According to Daft (2016), organisational theories and management encompass different approaches, offering unique insights into how businesses and institutions function. Leaders and

managers can make informed decisions to enhance organisational effectiveness and achieve desired outcomes by understanding the characteristics and implications of the school of thought and theories.

2.2.2 Classical School of Thoughts

The classical school of thought in organisational theory originated in the early twentieth century, setting the framework for current management practices (Daft, 2016). Classical management theory advocates for hierarchical, highly structured, efficient management processes (Schermerhorn, 2018). It is primarily distinguished by Weber's bureaucracy and Taylor's scientific management. It encourages role clarity and division of labour, which are essential to organisational efficiency. It prioritises standardisation and logic in the workplace (Daft, 2016). It increases productivity by infusing scientific approaches into tasks and processes (Murphy et al., 2014). Frederick Winslow Taylor, the father of scientific management, presented fourteen principles of scientific management (Bögenhold, 2020). Taylor believed productivity could be increased by scientifically examining and optimising labour processes. His technique aimed to reduce inefficiencies, reduce waste, and increase worker productivity (Daft, 2016). Taylor advised breaking down work operations into their smallest components and tracking the time to complete each (Burton et al., 2011). This analysis enables managers to identify the most efficient task completion methods and determine completion durations (Daft, 2016).

Scientific management emphasises scientific worker selection and training (Ioteyko, 2018). Managers are expected to match employees' skills and abilities to specific job duties, ensuring that employees are assigned tasks for which they are best qualified. Taylor offered a system of financial incentives to drive employees to achieve their best (Demartini, 2013). This entailed offering piece-rate pay, in which workers are compensated depending on the number of units produced. The plan was to reward top performers while also creating a competitive environment. The traditional organisational theory also emphasises establishing a hierarchical structure and a defined division of labour. By dividing complex jobs into simpler, specialised tasks assigned to individual workers, this strategy attempted to achieve specialisation and efficiency (Daft, 2016). The school of thought emphasised the scalar chain, an organisation's formal line of authority and communication. It establishes the flow of authority and decision-making and outlines the hierarchical structure from top management to lower-level personnel (Openstax et al., 2022). According to this theory, employees should have only one direct supervisor or manager (Engelbrecht, 2021). This aids in maintaining clear lines of authority and minimises misunderstandings or conflicts caused by multiple supervisors.

Individual workers are assigned distinct roles and responsibilities depending on their talents and knowledge through the division of labour (Puranam, 2018). Organisations can gain efficiency by splitting work into specialised jobs, allowing workers to focus on their areas of expertise (Engelbrecht, 2021). According to Murphy et al. (2014), the classical school's merits include uniformity and streamlining of processes. It fosters well-defined roles, processes, and hierarchical structures. Organisations can save money and gain a competitive advantage by removing inefficiencies and increasing production. However, this strategy is often criticised for its rigidity and the risk of employee alienation. Klein (2020) suggested that while a rigid structure may work well in stable settings, it lacks the flexibility to adapt in turbulent business contexts, emphasising

the importance of striking a balance between stability and flexibility. Traditional management, critics contend, may miss the human element by focusing solely on job efficiency. Individual needs and creativity may be ignored, resulting in employee discontent and less innovation (Daft, 2016).

2.2.3 The Human Relations School of Thought

The human relations school of thinking arose in response to the classical school's limitations, emphasising the importance of the human element in organisational success (Bauer, 2012). This school of thought, which emerged in the early twentieth century, revolutionised how organisations saw their employees by emphasising the importance of employee motivation, satisfaction, teamwork, and communication (Robbins & Coulter, 2012). Based on Mayo's Hawthorne research, this perspective emphasises the importance of social ties, motivation, and employee happiness on productivity (Elton, 2002). Smith and Lewis (2011) discovered that using a human relations strategy boosts morale and productivity, proving the value of human-centred solutions. The school of thought emphasises the importance of social ties and employee satisfaction in achieving organisational success. The school of thought recognises that motivated and engaged employees benefit their organisation (Mullins, 2014). It also highlights the importance of understanding human behaviour and how it affects employee motivation and happiness (Bauer, 2012). Unlike the traditional approach, which saw people as resources, this school recognises the importance of motivated and fulfilled employees in organisational performance (Daft, 2016).

Human relations theorists argue that money incentives are not the only thing that motivates employees. Instead, they stressed the need to recognise employees' social and psychological needs. Employee motivation and happiness can be improved by recognising employees' achievements, providing training and new possibilities for growth and development, and creating a favourable work environment (Sasono & Razikin, 2022). Managers and leaders were encouraged to communicate with their staff in an open and supportive manner, providing feedback and involving them in decision-making. Companies hoped to increase employee motivation and satisfaction by creating a sense of belonging and empowerment (Bauer, 2012). Another important feature of the school of thought was the emphasis on organisational teamwork and communication (Lake et al., 2015). Employee communication and teamwork were critical to accomplishing organisational goals. Human relations theorists recognised that organisations comprised people with diverse origins, talents, and opinions. They promoted the development of an inclusive and participatory work environment that promoted teamwork and collaboration (Grech et al., 2019). Organisations may tap into their workforce's aggregate intelligence and creativity by encouraging employees to interact, share ideas, and participate in decision-making.

The school of theory highlights the importance of open lines of communication, which aided in developing trust, resolving problems, and maintaining healthy relationships inside the organisation. Managers were expected to listen to their staff, offer support, and open communication channels throughout the organisation. The human relations school attempted to establish a positive work culture that boosted employee engagement, innovation, and overall organisational performance by emphasising teamwork and communication ("Organisational Communication, Formal," 2017). This theory's merits include greater staff morale, job satisfaction, and productivity (Jones, 2013). Managers may foster good team relationships by fostering a positive work environment, which leads to increased commitment and loyalty. On the other hand,

Jones believes the human relations approach should emphasise the importance of other organisational characteristics such as structure, processes, and job fulfilment. Furthermore, critics say combining individual happiness with broader organisational goals might be difficult (Robbins & Coulter, 2012).

2.2.4 Systems Management School of Thought

The systems management school, evolving from the general systems theory, views organisations as complex, interdependent. It emphasises the interplay between various subsystems and the organisation's interaction with its external environment (Scott, 2022). Patel and Cardon (2010) illustrated the significance of systems thinking in contemporary organisational scenarios, noting enhanced adaptability, resilience, and innovation in organisations that adopt this perspective. Systems school offers a valuable framework for understanding and analysing the complex nature of organisations (Daft, 2016). Rather than viewing an organisation as a collection of independent entities, this school emphasises the interactions and relationships between different components (Mahmoud, 2010). These components include individuals, departments, teams, processes, and external stakeholders (Daft, 2016). According to Kanno (2016), the system's school of thought, changes, or actions in one part of the system can affect other parts. For example, a decision made by top management can impact employees' morale, team dynamics, and overall organisational performance. The same applies to the changes made in one department that can influence other departments' efficiency and effectiveness market. This interconnectedness also highlights the importance of understanding the dynamics and feedback within the organisation. Feedback can be reinforcing or balancing. Positive feedback amplifies the effects and leads to growth or decline, while negative feedback regulates and stabilises the system (Daft, 2016). Daft adds that by viewing organisations as interconnected systems, the systems school of thought helps researchers understand the complexities, interdependencies, and dynamics that characterise organisational life.

The systems school of thought recognises that organisations exist within a wider external environment, significantly influencing their functioning and performance (Kara et al., 2008). According to the writers, the environment consists of things like the current state of the economy, the level of technical advancement, the legal and regulatory frameworks, the social norms, and the cultural values. Because organisations need to adapt and respond to changes in their external environment to survive and develop, they do not operate in isolation because of this requirement. Environmental influences can lead to both opportunities and challenges for organisations. For instance, technological advancement may create new market opportunities, while a sudden economic recession may pose financial risks (Ries, 2016). Systems school emphasises the need to consider these environmental influences and understand their impact on the organisation's internal functioning. Organisations can anticipate and respond to environmental changes by adopting a systems perspective and proactively adapting their strategies, structures, and processes to remain viable and competitive (Aquinas, 2009). In addition, organisations are strongly encouraged to engage in environmental analysis and monitor and evaluate the external environment to spot emerging trends, dangers, and opportunities (Burke, 2023). Burke concludes that this analysis enables organisations to align their goals, strategies, and resources with the changing environmental conditions.

The strengths of systems schools involve the integration of perspectives (Ruffini et al., 2000). The authors mention that this approach encourages managers to analyse the interconnectedness of various organisational components and identify how changes in one area can affect the entire system. Managers can make informed decisions that optimise the organisation by understanding these dynamics. However, systems theory can be challenging to implement due to its complexity. It requires a comprehensive understanding of the organisation's problems and effectively managing interdependencies (Martins & Terblanche, 2003).

2.2.5 Contingency School of Thought

The contingency school of thought, an extension of the systems approach, believes that the ideal structure of an organisation is determined by its external and internal contexts (Donaldson, 2012). It suggests that the most effective structure and management style are determined by organisational size, technology, and task nature (Daft, 2016). Zhang and Bartol (2018) highlighted the significance of this perspective in today's dynamic corporate environment, underlining the need for flexible and context-specific organisational structures. Daft (2016) defines contingency planning as a management concept that underlines the importance of adapting to external conditions and modifying organisational structure to the scenario. It means there is no standard approach to efficiently managing organisations (Burton et al., 2011). Instead, according to the school of thought, the most effective organisations can tailor their strategies, structures, and practises to the specific needs of their external environment ("Contingency Theory," 2013). For example, a hierarchical and centralised organisational structure may be more suited to a stable and predictable context since it allows for efficient control and coordination. A flexible and decentralised structure, on the other hand, may be advantageous in a dynamic and uncertain environment, allowing for swift responses to changes (Baligh, 2006). This school of thinking holds that companies should seek to fit their structure to the demands of their environment and their strategic aims (Baligh, 2006). This alignment strengthens the organisation's ability to address environmental concerns and capitalise on opportunities (Chouikha, 2016).

Contingency schools' assets include flexibility and adaptation (Joseph et al., 2018). According to the authors, managers can customise methods to unique situations by considering environmental variables, organisational culture, and staff talents. This strategy promotes better decision-making by acknowledging that what works in one setting may not work in another (Burton et al., 2011). The complication introduced by contingency theory, on the other hand, is a disadvantage. Finding the optimum technique and the right mix of criteria can be complex and time-consuming (Daft, 2016). Contingency planning recognises that firms operate in complex, dynamic external environments that can significantly impact performance (Donaldson, 2001). Donaldson states that these ecosystems are defined by market conditions, technical advancements, legal and regulatory changes, societal trends, and competitive forces. Organisations adapting to external events are more likely to prosper (Daft, 2016). According to Rahman (2016), this school of thought maintains that managers should constantly watch and assess the external environment to detect potential possibilities and hazards. Understanding the problems of the environment enables managers to make educated decisions and implement appropriate measures (Daft, 2010). For example, if a new technology upsets the market, an organisation must quickly modify its products or procedures to remain competitive. These schools of thought should not be seen as mutually exclusive but as

complementary perspectives. The ideal organisation would embody aspects from each school, combining efficiency from the classical school, valuing employees from the human relations school, the adaptability of the contingency school, and the holistic perspective of the systems management school. This combination would better prepare organisations to face the complicated demands of today's business climate.

3.1 Challenges Facing Organisations

Organisations operate in dynamic environments with many challenges that impact their performance and success. Aquinas (2009) explains that these challenges can arise from external and internal factors.

3.1.1 External Challenges

Organisations face intense market competition. In today's globalised economy, businesses must constantly strive to stay ahead of their competitors (Neneh, 2016). According to Neneh, rival companies often adopt aggressive marketing strategies, innovative products, and competitive pricing, making it challenging for organisations to maintain or expand their market share. Moreover, markets are subject to constant change (Robbins, 1990). Robin argues that consumer preferences, economic conditions, and emerging trends can rapidly transform the competitive landscape. Organisations must be agile and adaptive to anticipate and respond to these changes effectively. Failure to do so may result in loss of market relevance and profitability (Daft, 2016). Organisations can address market challenges through thorough market research and analysis (Daft, 2016). Organisations can identify emerging competition, market trends, and customer preferences by understanding the market landscape. This important information can guide strategic decision-making and help institutions stay ahead of the competition. By actively monitoring and analysing market dynamics, organisations can identify potential threats and opportunities, allowing them to make informed adjustments to their business strategies (G, 2008).

Rapid technological advancements pose challenges for organisations (Daft, 2016). As new technologies emerge, they often disrupt existing industries and business models (Rohleder, 2010). Therefore, organisations must monitor and adopt relevant technologies to remain competitive and meet evolving customer expectations. Technological advancements can simplify processes, improve efficiency, and enhance product and service offerings. However, adopting and integrating new technologies can be complex and costly (Daft, 2010). Organisations must invest in research and development, infrastructure upgrades, and employee training to successfully leverage these advancements (Burton et al., 2011). The authors conclude that failure to embrace technological changes may lead to operational inefficiencies, decreased productivity, and reduced customer satisfaction. Organisations must embrace innovation and invest in research and development (Daft, 2016). Daft argues that embracing emerging technologies and exploring new business models can help organisations adapt to changing market dynamics and stay competitive. By constantly seeking ways to improve products, services, and processes, organisations can differentiate themselves from competitors and maintain a competitive edge. Allocating resources to research and development initiatives enhances innovation capabilities and creates an environment that encourages creative thinking (Frederiksen et al., 1985).

Organisations face many regulatory and legal requirements in today's highly regulated business environment (Håkonsson et al., 2009). The researchers argue that compliance with these requirements is essential to ensure ethical practices, maintain public trust, and avoid legal repercussions. However, embracing ever-changing regulations and navigating complex legal frameworks can be challenging (Daft, 2016). Organisations must invest time and resources to understand and implement applicable laws and regulations. Compliance may involve meeting industry-specific standards, data protection requirements, environmental regulations, or labour laws. Failure to stick by the set rules and regulations can result in fines, legal disputes, reputational damage, and loss of business opportunities (Kesler & Kates, 2010). Organisations must prioritise compliance and appropriately allocate resources to ensure adherence to regulatory and legal requirements (Daft, 2016). A strong compliance structure is essential to mitigate legal risks and ensure ethical business practices. Regular audits can help identify any potential compliance issues and enable quick corrective actions (Kesler & Kates, 2010). Additionally, investing in employee training programs on regulatory and ethical matters can enhance awareness and understanding within the organisation. By prioritising compliance and ethical practices, organisations can safeguard their reputation, build trust with stakeholders, and maintain a sustainable business environment (Håkonsson et al., 2009).

3.1.2 Internal Challenges

Leadership and management style impacts organisational operation and can impact the organisation positively or negatively (Berson et al., 2001). The authors added that leaders who fail to provide a clear vision and direction for the organisation may need help to motivate and guide their teams effectively. This can result in confusion and a lack of focus among employees (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). In some organisations, leaders may adopt an autocratic leadership style, where the ability to make decisions is concentrated at the top (Schneider & Somers, 2006). This can hinder employee engagement, creativity, and collaboration, leading to a disengaged workforce (Jones & Johnson, 2013). Poor communication between leaders and employees can lead to misunderstandings, low morale, and decreased productivity (Al-Ali et al., 2017). Leaders must establish open communication lines, provide feedback, and actively listen to their teams. Leaders who are resistant to change can hold back organisational growth and innovation (Thomas & Sanders, 2001). According to Berson et al. (2001), adapting to new technologies, market trends, and customer demands is crucial for staying competitive. Leaders should encourage a culture that embraces change and encourages continuous improvement (Schneider & Somers, 2006).

The skills and capabilities of employees are essential for achieving organisational goals and staying competitive (Jones & Johnson, 2013). However, organisations often face challenges related to employee skill sets (Al-Ali et al., 2017). Rapid technological advancements and evolving job requirements can create an organisation's skills gap. Employees may lack the necessary skills and knowledge to perform their roles effectively, leading to decreased productivity and a competitive disadvantage (Dessein, 2002). Organisations not investing in employee training and development may struggle to retain talent and keep up with industry changes (Berson et al., 2001). Providing ongoing learning opportunities, mentorship programs, and skill-building initiatives is crucial for enhancing employee capabilities (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). Employees may resist acquiring new skills or adapting to organisational changes due to fear or lacking motivation

(Schneider & Somers, 2006). According to Jones and Johnson (2013), effective change management tactics, clear communication, and emphasis on the benefits of obtaining new skills are required to overcome this resistance. Organisations that consist of employees with similar skill sets may struggle to tackle complex challenges requiring diverse expertise (Al-Ali et al., 2017). Building a diverse workforce with complementary skills can enhance innovation and problem-solving (Dessein, 2002).

An organisation's culture and communication practices significantly affect its success. When organisations lack transparency, employees may feel disconnected from decision-making processes and not fully understand the company's goals and strategies, which causes a lack of trust and reduced engagement (Berson et al., 2001). These departments operate in isolation and do not collaborate effectively (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). Thus, this can hinder communication and innovation. Breaking down silos and promoting cross-functional collaboration can enhance communication and create a more cohesive organisational culture (Schneider & Somers, 2006). Feedback is crucial to employee growth and development (Jones & Johnson, 2013). If organisations lack effective feedback mechanisms, employees may feel undervalued and struggle to improve performance (Al-Ali et al., 2017). Implementing regular feedback channels, such as performance evaluations and constructive coaching, is crucial (Dessein, 2002). Organisations not prioritising diversity and inclusion may face challenges in creating an inclusive and supportive culture (Berson et al., 2001). Embracing diversity, ensuring equal opportunities, and promoting an environment that encourages respect and inclusivity is essential for employee satisfaction and organisational success (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006).

Internal organisational challenges related to size and complexity can arise when an organisation grows in structure, operations, and workforce (Schneider & Somers, 2006). When an organisation expands, communication becomes more challenging (Jones & Johnson, 2001). Information may not flow smoothly across different departments, leading to misunderstandings, delays, and a lack of coordination (Al-Ali et al., 2017). This can hinder decision-making and overall productivity (Dessein, 2002). With the expansion of organisations, they may become more bureaucratic, with layers of management and complex approval processes (Berson et al., 2001). Decision-making may become slow and complicated, hindering innovation and responsiveness to market changes (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). Hierarchical structures may discourage employee empowerment and autonomy (Schneider & Somers, 2006). With increased size and complexity, aligning different teams' and departments' goals and actions becomes challenging. Lack of coordination can lead to conflicts, duplicated efforts, and inefficiencies (Al-Ali et al., 2017). Ensuring organisational alignment and a shared vision becomes crucial but difficult to achieve (Thomas & Sanders, 2001). When organisations expand, attracting and retaining top talent becomes more critical (Berson et al., 2001). However, it can be challenging to maintain a positive organisational culture, provide growth opportunities, and effectively manage performance across a large and diverse workforce (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). High employee turnover and talent shortages can cause a decline in organisational success (Schneider & Somers, 2006). Larger organisations generate large amounts of data and information, making it difficult to filter and extract valuable insights (Jones & Johnson, 2013). Without adequate knowledge management systems and practices, valuable knowledge and expertise can be lost or underutilised, hampering decision-making and learning (Al-Ali et al., 2017). Addressing these internal challenges requires active leadership, investment

in employee development, considering the organisation's size, encouraging a positive culture, and establishing effective communication channels (Dessein, 2002).

4.0 Research Findings

Applying the classical school approach can be beneficial in addressing challenges related to streamlining processes, hierarchy, and centralised decision-making within an organisation (Wren et al., 2002). According to the writers, the classical school of thought emphasises efficiency, structure, and control to maximise productivity and achieve organisational objectives. The classical school approach advocates streamlining processes by carefully analysing and optimising each workflow step (Wren et al., 2002). According to the researchers, this can be achieved through scientific management, where tasks are broken down into smaller components, and time and motion studies are conducted to identify the most efficient performance. By implementing these principles, organisations can eliminate redundancies, minimise wasted time and effort, and create a more streamlined and productive workflow (Daft, 2016). In terms of hierarchy, the classical school approach emphasises clear lines of authority and a well-defined chain of command (Nhema, 2015). Nhema highlights that organisational structures are designed with a hierarchical pyramid, each level having specific roles and responsibilities. Organisations can minimise confusion, improve communication flow, and enhance decision-making by establishing a clear hierarchy (Daft, 2010). The classical school approach also supports centralised decision-making to ensure an organisation's consistency, efficiency, and control (Shenhar, 2001). According to the authors, in a centralised decision-making structure, the authority and power to make critical decisions are concentrated at the top levels of management. This allows for faster decision-making, uniformity in decision implementation, and a clear sense of direction for the organisation.

Human relations school provides insights and strategies for addressing various organisational challenges. This approach emphasises the significance of employee empowerment and participation, building strong teams, and creating effective communication (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). The human relations school of thought encourages involving employees in decision-making and gives them a sense of ownership over their work. This approach recognises that empowered people are more motivated, engaged, and productive (Guzzo & Dickson, 1996). To overcome organisational difficulties, firms distribute decision-making authority, allowing individuals to contribute their ideas and opinions by decentralising decision-making. This fosters a sense of ownership and motivates individuals to take responsibility for their job (Daft, 2016). According to Huxham and Vangen (2013), effective collaborative teams are critical for addressing organisational difficulties because they bring together varied perspectives, skills, and experiences. The human relations school underlines the need to develop a collaborative and supportive team atmosphere. This can be accomplished by fostering cooperation and collaboration by forming cross-functional teams, encouraging information exchange, and providing team members with opportunities to collaborate on projects (Huxham & Vangen, 2013). According to Gutierez (2014), effective communication is essential for addressing organisational challenges and ensuring clear understanding, alignment, and employee coordination. The human relations school of thought emphasises the need for open and transparent communication channels by establishing open-door policies, which encourage employees to feel comfortable approaching their supervisors or

managers with questions, concerns, or suggestions. Open-door policies promote open communication and allow quick resolution of issues (Gutierez, 2014).

When applied to addressing organisational challenges, the systems school can provide valuable insights and strategies for improvement (Scott, 2003). According to Scott, two specific applications of this approach are assessing the organisation as a whole system and aligning its structure with environmental factors. The systems school perspective views organisations as complex systems composed of interrelated and interdependent parts (Skyttner, 2008). While applying this strategy to the organisational problem, evaluating the organisation as a whole system is vital rather than concentrating exclusively on the organisation's separate components (Senge, 2006). Organisations can identify the dynamics and relationships contributing to challenges or inefficiencies by applying the systems school approach (Daft, 2010). This assessment involves examining various subsystems, such as departments, teams, processes, and communication channels, as well as their interconnections (Scott, 2003). Through this analysis, organisations can gain insights into the system's overall functioning and identify areas for improvement. Organisations exist within an external environment that includes market conditions, technological advancements, social trends, and legal regulations (Daft, 2016). The systems school emphasises the need for organisations to align their internal structures and processes with the external environmental forces that affect them (Cosh et al., 2010). To address organisational challenges, it is crucial to continuously assess and adapt the organisational structure to fit the external environment (Burton et al., 2011).

According to the contingency school of organisational management, there is no single solution to addressing organisational challenges. It emphasises organisations' need to alter their structures and strategies to meet specific environmental demands (Donaldson, 2001). According to Daft (2016), when employing the contingency school of thought to organisational challenges, there are two crucial factors to consider the harmony between environment and structure and the adaptation of the structure to challenges. Assessing the harmony between the external environment and the organisation's internal structure is vital to address organisational challenges (Miles & Snow, 2003). The environment includes market conditions, technology, regulations, and competition. The structure refers to how the organisation is designed, including its hierarchy, communication channels, and decision-making processes. Analysing the fit involves evaluating how well the current structure aligns with the demands of the environment (Galbraith, 2014). Different organisational challenges need different structural adaptations (Daft, 2010). For instance, a matrix structure that facilitates cross-functional collaboration and information flow might be appropriate if the challenge concerns poor communication and coordination among employees and various departments (Ivancevich et al., 2011). Organisations can consider recognising and describing their primary difficulties to adjust their organisational structure to specific challenges. Such issues include operational inefficiencies, low employee morale, and market uncertainty (Daft, 2010).

5.0 Conclusion

The study concluded organisational success, exploring applying various organisational theories to tackle challenges and achieve success within organisations. The study examines the Classical School Approach, Human Relations School Approach, and Systems School Approach. Briefly, it touches on the Contingency School Approach, showcasing how each theory provides valuable

insights and strategies for addressing organisational difficulties. The Classical School Approach emphasises efficiency, structure, and centralised decision-making to maximise productivity. Organisations can achieve consistency and control by streamlining processes, establishing clear hierarchies, and implementing centralised decision-making. However, emphasising efficiency can lead to rigidity, necessitating a balance between empowerment and creativity to foster innovation. The Human Relations School Approach underscores employee empowerment, participation, and effective communication. Involving employees in decision-making and creating a collaborative team atmosphere led to higher motivation and engagement. Transparent communication channels and recognition of individual abilities further contribute to organisational success.

The Systems School Approach views organisations as complex systems with interconnected parts. By assessing the organisation as a whole system and aligning its structure with external factors, organisations can identify areas for improvement and enhance their agility and responsiveness to environmental changes. The Contingency School Approach highlights the need to adapt organisational structures and strategies to meet specific environmental demands. Assessing the fit between the organisation's internal structure and the external environment helps address challenges effectively. Implementing and evaluating organisational structures require careful planning, effective change management, continuous monitoring, and adaptation. By following these strategies, organisations can navigate structural changes successfully, optimise performance, and stay agile in an ever-evolving business landscape. In today's dynamic and challenging business environment, organisations must strive for alignment between their structure, objectives, and the external environment. By leveraging insights from different organisational theories, organisations can identify problems, propose solutions, and create adaptable structures that align with their goals and environment. Continuously monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of these structures and making necessary adjustments based on feedback and changing circumstances is essential for long-term success. Ultimately, the success and effectiveness of an organisation are directly correlated with its ability to align its structure with its surroundings and goals. By recognising and addressing challenges, utilising internal resources, following institutional norms, and building external contacts, organisations can succeed in today's complex and ever-changing business landscape.

6.0 Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussions presented in this study on "Structure-Objective-Environment Alignment: Organisational Success," the following recommendations are proposed to help organizations achieve better alignment and overcome challenges: Organizations should strive for a balance between centralized control and decentralized decision-making. Adopting a more flexible organizational structure that allows for adaptability and agility in response to changing environments and challenges will be beneficial. This may involve implementing a matrix structure, cross-functional teams, or project-based teams to foster collaboration and efficient information flow. Emphasize employee empowerment and participation in decision-making processes. Organizations can create a culture encouraging employees to contribute their ideas, suggestions, and feedback. This involvement fosters a sense of ownership and motivation among employees, leading to increased engagement and productivity. Establish open and transparent communication channels within the organization. This can include open-door policies, regular team meetings, suggestion boxes, and digital platforms for easy information exchange. Effective

communication facilitates better understanding, alignment, and coordination among employees and departments.

REFERENCES

Al-Ali, A., Singh, S., Al-Nahyan, M. T., & Sohal, A. S. (2017). Change management through leadership: the mediating role of organizational culture. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *25*(4), 723–739. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoa-01-2017-1117

Altinay, L., & Altinay, M. (2004). The influence of organisational structure on entrepreneurial orientation and expansion performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *16*(6), 334–344. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110410550770

Aquinas. (2009). *Organization Structure & Design: Applications And Challenges*. Excel Books India.

Armistead, C., Pritchard, J., & Machin, S. (1999). Strategic Business Process Management for Organisational Effectiveness. *Long Range Planning*, *32*(1), 96–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0024-6301(98)00130-7

Baligh, H. H. (2006). *Organization Structures: Theory and Design, Analysis and Prescription*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Bauer, T. (2012). *Compare and contrast scientific management and human relations theory*. GRIN Verlag.

Berson, Y., Shamir, B., Avolio, B. J., & Popper, M. (2001). The relationship between vision strength, leadership style, and context. *Leadership Quarterly*, *12*(1), 53–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(01)00064-9

Biggs, A. J., Brough, P., & Barbour, J. P. (2013). Strategic alignment with organizational priorities and work engagement: A multi-wave analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(3), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1866

Bögenhold, D. (2020). Taylor, Frederick Winslow: The Principles of Scientific Management. In *J.B. Metzler eBooks* (pp. 1–2). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-05728-0_21318-1

Burke, W. W. (2023). *Organization Change: Theory and Practice*. SAGE Publications.

Burton, R. M., Obel, B., & DeSanctis, G. (2011). *Organizational Design: A Step-by-Step Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

By, R. T. (2005). Organisational change management: A critical review. *Journal of Change Management*, *5*(4), 369–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010500359250

Chouikha, M. B. (2016). *Organizational Design for Knowledge Management*. John Wiley & Sons.

Contingency Theory. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Management Theory*. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452276090.n52

Cosh, A., Fu, X., & Hughes, A. (2010). Organisation structure and innovation performance in different environments. *Small Business Economics*, *39*(2), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-010-9304-5

Daft, R. L. (2010). *Organization theory and design*. South-Western/Cengage Learning.

Daft, R. L. (2016). *Organization Theory &Design*. South-Western College.

De Waal, H. (2001). *Centralised versus decentralised decision making in a financial services organisation*.

Demartini, C. (2013). The Incentive and Rewarding Mechanism. In *Contributions to management science* (pp. 177–188). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36684-0_10

Dessein, W. (2002). Authority and communication in organizations. *The Review of Economic Studies*, *69*(4), 811–838. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-937x.00227

Donaldson, L. (2001). *The Contingency Theory of Organizations*. SAGE Publications.

Donaldson, L. (2012). The Contingency Theory of Organizational Design: Challenges and Opportunities. *Organization Design, 1*(1), 74-85.

Egelhoff, W. G., & Wolf, J. (2017). *Understanding Matrix Structures and their Alternatives: The Key to Designing and Managing Large, Complex Organizations*. Springer.

Elton, J. (2002). The Human Relations Theory of Management. *Business Management, 45*(3), 32-37.

Engelbrecht, D. (2021). The Chain of Command. In *Apress eBooks* (pp. 99–146). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4842-7474-3_4

Frederiksen, L. W., Riley, A. W., & Myers, J. J. (1985). Matching Technology and Organizational Structure: *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, *6*(3–4), 59–80. https://doi.org/10.1300/j075v06n03_05

G, A. P. (2008). *Organization Structure and Design*. Excel Books India.

Galbraith, J. R. (2014). *Designing organizations: Strategy, Structure, and Process at the Business Unit and Enterprise Levels*. John Wiley & Sons.

Grech, M. R., Horberry, T., & Koester, T. (2019). Communication and team work. In *CRC Press eBooks* (pp. 73–87). https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429355417-4

Gutierez, A. (2014). *Effective communication in the workplace: Learn How to Communicate Effectively and Avoid Common Barriers to Effective Communication*. Createspace Independent Publishing Platform.

Guzzo, R. A., & Dickson, M. W. (1996). Teams in Organizations: Recent research on performance and Effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *47*(1), 307–338. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.307

Håkonsson, D. D., Nielsen, J. F., Snow, C. C., & Ulhøi, J. (2009). *New Approaches to Organization Design: Theory and Practice of Adaptive Enterprises*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Harvey, O. J. (1966). System structure, flexibility and creativity. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 39–65). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-40230-6_4

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2013). *Managing to collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage*. Routledge.

Ioteyko, J. (2018). The Principles of Scientific Management. In *The Science of Labour and Its Organization* (pp. 58–89). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203703380-2

Ivancevich, J. M., Gibson, J. L., & Konopaske, R. (2011). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes*. United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.

Johnson, J., & Johnson, A. (2000). Organizational theories: A comprehensive overview. *The Organizational Quarterly, 22*(2), 15-29.

Jones, G. R., & Jones, G. R. (2013). *Organizational theory, design, and change*.

Joseph, J., Baumann, O., Burton, R. M., & Srikanth, K. (2018). *Organization Design*. Emerald Group Publishing.

Kanno, M. (2016). The Interconnectedness and Systemic Importance in the U.S. CDS Market. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2711112

Kara, E., Ribaudo, M., & Johansson, R. (2008). On how environmental stringency influences adoption of best management practices in agriculture. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *88*(4), 1530–1537. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2007.07.029

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (2003). *The social psychology of organizations*. Dover Publications.

Kavanagh, M., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The Impact of Leadership and Change Management Strategy on Organizational Culture and Individual Acceptance of Change during a Merger. *British Journal of Management*, *17*(S1), S81–S103. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00480.x

Kesler, G., & Kates, A. (2010). *Leading Organization Design: How to Make Organization Design Decisions to Drive the Results You Want*. John Wiley & Sons.

Klein, K. J. (2020). Revisiting the Classical School of Thought: Implications for Modern Organizational Settings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 41*, 356-369.

Lake, D., Baerg, K., & Paslawski, T. (2015). *Teamwork, Leadership and Communication: Collaboration Basics for Health Professionals*. Brush Education.

Mahmoud, M. S. (2010). Interconnected Time-Delay Systems. In *CRC Press eBooks* (pp. 203–276). https://doi.org/10.1201/b10349-7

Martins, E., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *6*(1), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060310456337

Miles, R. E., & Snow, C. C. (2003). *Organizational strategy, structure, and process*. Stanford University Press.

Mohamed, M. A., & Yassin, K. E. E. (2022). Aligning Employees' Objectives with the Organizational Goals. *University of Khartoum Engineering Journal*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.53332/kuej.v9i1.950

Mullins, L. J. (2014). *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Pearson Higher Ed.

Murphy, J., Daft, R. L.., & Willmott, H. (2014). *Organization Theory and Design: An International Perspective.*

Neneh, B. N. (2016). Market orientation and performance: the contingency role of external environment. *Environmental Economics*, *7*(2), 130–137. https://doi.org/10.21511/ee.07(2).2016.14

Nhema, A. G. (2015). Relevance of Classical Management Theories to Modern Public Administration: A review. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *5*(3), 165. https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v5i3.8337

Openstax, Bright, D. S., & Cortes, A. H. (2022). *Principles of Management*.

Organizational Communication, Formal. (2017). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 2nd Edition*. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483386874.n376

Organizational structure and communication. (2008). In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 128–152). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203930045-17

Patel, P. C., & Cardon, M. S. (2010). Adopting a System Perspective in Organizational Studies. *Journal of Business Research,* 63(4), 410-415.

Puranam, P. (2018). Division of labor. In *Oxford University Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199672363.003.0003

Rahman, M. M. (2016). *Leadership. Analysis of Trait, Behaviour, and Contingency Theories*. GRIN Verlag.

Resource allocation decisions and organizational structure. (2008). In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 259–288). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080914343-19

Ries, F. (2016). Population Ecology: How the Environment Influences the Evolution of Organizations. In *Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-36039-7_7

Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2012). *Management*.

Rohleder, E. (2010). Management. *Is there an Ideal Structure for all Organisations?* GRIN Verlag.

Rowden-Racette, K. (2012). What's So Important About Roles and Responsibilities? *The ASHA Leader*, *17*(10), 22–23. https://doi.org/10.1044/leader.ftr4.17102012.22

Ruffini, F. A., Boer, H., & Van Riemsdijk, M. (2000). Organisation design in operations management. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *20*(7), 860–879. https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570010330801

Sasono, H., & Razikin, D. A. (2022). Effect of Motivation, Compensation and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, *05*(12). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v5-i12-71

Saunila, M., Mäkimattila, M., & Salminen, J. (2014). Matrix structure for supporting organisational innovation capability. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, *8*(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijbir.2014.058044

Schermerhorn, J. R. (2018). The Classical Model in Organizational Studies Revisited: Context, Criticisms and Opportunities. *Business Horizons, 61*(1), 45-55.

Schneider, M., & Somers, M. J. (2006). Organizations as complex adaptive systems: Implications of Complexity Theory for leadership research. Leadership Quarterly, 17(4), 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.04.006

Scott, R. W. (2022). Systems Management: Dealing with Complexity in Organizations. *Organizational Studies, 43*(1), 1-15.

Scott, W. R. (2003). *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Random House.

Shenhar, A. J. (2001). One size does not fit all projects: Exploring classical contingency domains. *Management Science*, *47*(3), 394–414. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.47.3.394.9772

Skyttner, L. (2008). *General Systems Theory: Problems, Perspectives, Practice*. World Scientific.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a Theory of Paradox: A Dynamic Equilibrium Model of Organizing. *Academy of Management Review, 36*(2), 381-403.

Strati, A. (2018). Art, Everyday Aesthetics and Organizational Theory. In *Organizational Theory and Aesthetic Philosophies* (pp. 50–81). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315104454-4

Wong, W. S. (2012). The Importance of Organizational Structure. In *Cornell University Press eBooks* (pp. 53–83). https://doi.org/10.7591/cornell/9780801450792.003.0003

Wren, D. A., Bedeian, A. G., & Breeze, J. D. (2002). The foundations of Henri Fayol's administrative theory. *Management Decision, 40*(9), 906-918.

Zhang, A. Y., & Bartol, K. M. (2018). Linking Empowering Leadership and Employee Creativity: The Influence of Psychological Empowerment, Intrinsic Motivation, and Creative Process Engagement. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(1), 107-128.