

## ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT AND QUALITY OF MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING IN THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR

Gloria Chinyere ALANEME<sup>a</sup>; Peace Nneka OBASI<sup>b</sup>; Paul Kojo AMETEPE<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a,b,c</sup>University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria.

### Abstract

*Though managerial decision-making plays an essential role in the success of an organization, numerous organizations continue to face challenges with making prompt, strategic, and successful decisions often as a result of ineffective or misaligned organizational structures. Therefore, this study examines the influence of organizational structure on managerial decision-making quality and the mediating role of employee involvement in this relationship in Flour Mills Nigeria. The study was anchored on two theories including decision theory and contingency theory. The study employed descriptive design, using a structured questionnaire, administered to a population of 73 participants using census survey, with 50 completed copies of the questionnaire returned and 44 copies analyzed. The data were processed using SPSS, employing frequency and percentages, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Regression analysis to test four hypotheses raised. The study findings revealed a strong positive effect of specialization on managerial decision-making quality; a positive influence of departmentalization on managerial decision-making quality; and a statistically non-significant impact of organizational hierarchy on managerial decision-making quality; and lastly, organizational structure accounted for a significant variance in managerial decision-making quality. Based on these findings, the study recommends that organizations, particularly Flour Mill of Nigeria, should continue to strengthen specialization by introducing professional development, defining role clarity, and ensuring job-person fit. Departmentalization should be retained as a structural principle; interdepartmental collaboration must be fostered to avoid silos.*

**Keywords:** Departmentalization, Hierarchy Oof Authority, Managerial Decision Quality, Specialization, Organizational Structure

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of an organization is significantly affected by the effectiveness of managerial choices in the ever-evolving business world of today. The degree to which management decisions are efficient, knowledgeable, and in line with the aims and objectives of the organization is known as management decision quality (Litvaj, Ponisciakova, Stancekova, Svobodova & Mrazik, 2022). It denotes a number of factors, including as relevance, timelines accuracy, and the capacity to foresee and manage possible risks and uncertainties (Chen, Zhong, An, Zhu & Xu, 2019). Characteristics such as thorough investigation participation of pertinent stakeholders, evaluation of several options, and conformity to legal and ethical requirements defines high-quality management decisions (Lee, Stvilia, Gunaydin & Pang, 2025). Additionally, encouraging a variety of viewpoints, firsthand feedback, and group ownership of results, incorporating wider employee participation in decision-making procedures in addition to the participation of important stakeholders can improve the quality of decisions made by managers (Lawler, 1992). For this study, managerial decision-making quality" refers to the procedures, strategies, and tactics employed to reach a decision, emphasizing the caliber of the decision-making process itself.

This suggest that an organization's performance indices, innovation, and competitiveness can all be greatly impacted by the management decision making quality, which can influence the organization's capacity to seize opportunities and adjust to shifting conditions (Lizarelli, de Toledo & Alliprandini, 2021). However, a quality management decision cannot be made in a vacuum; rather, the structural framework in which they are developed has a big impact on the quality of the management decision (Adewumi, Njoku, & Okafor, 2025). A business's organizational structure defines the task division, coordination, and control, which is the arrangement of relationships, roles, and responsibilities (Eisenhardt, 2021). It includes a number of elements that together influence the official and informal facets of the organization's activities, including span of control, departmentalization, hierarchy, and integration mechanisms (Ahmed, 2017). Clarity on reporting lines, decision-making procedures, and communication channels is provided by organizational structure, and this aids in directing employee interactions and makes it easier to accomplish corporate goals. Notably, the degree to which employees are empowered to participate in decision-making is also influenced by organizational structure; that is more employee involvement and input into managerial choices are made possible by flatter

organizations or participatory methods (Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall & Jennings, 1988).

Organizational structure influences the context, standards, and effectiveness of decisions by providing the framework upon which they are made. This, therefore, suggests that a better understanding of the relationship between structure and decision quality in organizational contexts is paramount. As a result, the purpose of this study is to examine how organizational structure influences decision making quality. Hence, the study investigates hierarchical structures which are typified by vertical layers of authority and control and how it can affect the quality of decisions by influencing communication channels, decision-making speed, and the allocation of decision-making power (Eisenhardt, 2021). In addition, the study also investigates how departmentalization the grouping of organizational units according to criteria like function, product, or geography also affects decision-making (Ahmed, 2017). It will be easier to see how structural divisions affect coordination and decision-making efficacy if you comprehend the function of departmentalization.

Furthermore, the study analyzes how the degree of task and role specialization within managerial roles can influence the quality of decision-making in manufacturing organizations (Adler, 2025). Examining the function of specialization within an organization makes it clearer how allocating work and knowledge between administrative and operational divisions impacts decision-making speed and accuracy. Similar to this, the study examines how exploiting operational insights and promoting cooperation between management and staff at different levels might improve decision quality through promoting employee involvement across specialized jobs. With implications for strategic alignment, operational efficiency, and overall organizational performance, this background study underscores the crucial importance of organizational structure - particularly specialization - in determining managerial decision quality in Flour Mills Nigeria (FMN).

Organizational structure challenges become particularly significant in the case of Flour Mills of Nigeria (FMN), a conglomerate with diverse operations in food, agro-allied, logistics, and packaging sectors. FMN faces structural challenges such as bureaucratic hierarchies and centralized power, which often delay responses to dynamic market conditions (Eisenhardt, 2021). Departmentalization across units like Golden Penny Foods, Agro-Allied Services, and Bagco sometimes creates functional silos that hinder knowledge sharing and exclude frontline staff perspectives from strategic decisions (Ahmed, 2017; Delbridge & Whitfield, 2001). Similarly, insufficient task and role specialization in operations and logistics has been linked to overlapping

responsibilities, weak accountability, and inefficiencies in workflow and quality control (Mintzberg, 1979; Adler, 2025). In addition, FMN's rigid structure often limits adaptability in a highly competitive and regulated sector where quick responses to regulatory shifts, commodity price fluctuations, and supply chain disruptions are vital (Ghasemi, Akhavan, Fatahi Valilai & Abbasi, 2021).

A major concern lies in employee involvement as a mediating factor. Inadequate participation of employees in strategic and operational decision-making could slow managerial responsiveness and diminish the depth of information available. On the other hand, increased employee involvement can improve decision quality through increased adaptability, coordination, and utilization of operational insights (Appelbaum, Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg & Kalleberg, 2000; Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford, 1995). Based on the aforementioned, the main issue of this study is that FMN's current organizational structure, which is characterized by departmental silos, hierarchical bureaucracy, and insufficient specialization, seems to impair managerial decision quality, weakening its ability to effectively respond to strategic challenges and environmental changes. The question of how structure affects the quality of decision-making and how much employee involvement can mediate this relationship is brought up by this.

In line with this, the study aims to examine organizational structure, employee involvement, and the quality of managerial decision-making in the manufacturing sector, with a focus on Flour Mills of Nigeria Plc. The specific objectives are to investigate the relationship between organizational hierarchy and quality of decision making as well as the effect of departmentalization on quality of decision making and the extent to which specialization influences quality of decision-making. The study also intends to investigate the overall impact of organizational structure on managerial decision quality, as well as determine the mediating role of employee involvement in this relationship.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Conceptual Review**

#### **2.1.1 Decision Making Quality**

According to Provost and Fawcett (2017), decision quality refers to how well decisions align with strategic goals, follow a sound process, and produce desired outcomes. High-quality decisions are vital for managerial effectiveness, as they enhance organizational performance,

reduce risks, and capitalize on opportunities (Coppin, & Coppin, 2017). Various factors influence decision quality. Scholars such as Morris, and McDonald (1995), Kusyk, and Schwartz (2024), and Hitt Sirmon, Ghobadian, Arregle, and Xu (2021) emphasize moral intensity as a key factor. Additionally, access to reliable information, an organized decision-making process, and the ability to manage cognitive biases are crucial. Structured approaches that involve analysis, stakeholder input, and risk assessment improve outcomes, while biases like overconfidence or confirmation bias can impair judgment (Moore & Bazerman, 2018).

According to Visinescu, Jones, and Sidorova (2017), technology plays a growing role in enhancing decision quality. Tools such as data analytics, artificial intelligence, and machine learning offer insights that support trend forecasting, scenario evaluation, and timely, evidence-based decisions (Khan, 2025). Organizations that harness these technologies gain a competitive advantage through improved decision-making. Organizational culture and leadership also shape decision outcomes. A culture of open communication, collaboration, and diverse perspectives fosters better decisions (Schein, 2016). Leaders who promote transparency, inclusivity, and ethical alignment with strategic goals significantly influence decision quality (Shiundu, 2024). Finally, continuous improvement practices - such as feedback loops and post-decision analysis - are essential. As Garvin (2016) notes, iterative learning builds flexibility and sustains decision quality in evolving environments.

### ***2.1.2 Organisational Hierarchy and Decision-Making Quality***

Organizational hierarchy is the methodical arrangement of individuals based on their status, position, and power; it is commonly depicted as a pyramid with higher levels overseeing lower levels (Blau, 1968). By clearly defining duties, upholding order, and establishing reporting lines, this strategy enhances coordination and lessens uncertainty in the workplace. According to Mintzberg (2017), one of the key advantages of hierarchy is that it makes decision-making easier. Centralized authority ensures consistent execution by enabling top management to make strategic decisions that trickle down (Mintzberg, 2017). However, this might limit flexibility and postpone responses to market developments because lower-level personnel typically lack decision-making authority.

Hierarchy also affects the flow of communication (Robbins & Judge, 2018). According to Robbins and Judge (2018), traditional arrangements focus on top-down, vertical communication, which might hinder feedback and information transmission. This can skew signals at several

levels and impact the quality of judgments. As a result, many companies are implementing flatter organizational structures and horizontal communication to promote transparency and involvement (Daft, 2016).

The effectiveness of a hierarchy is influenced by the span of control, or the number of subordinates per boss. A wider width creates flatter hierarchies with quicker decisions and lower expenses, whereas a narrow spread creates taller hierarchies with closer supervision but more bureaucracy (Hitt et al., 2021). Balance the breadth of control for optimal outcomes. As technology advances and remote labor becomes more popular, businesses are shifting toward more flexible hierarchies. Dynamic frameworks that utilize digital resources promote collaboration, innovation, and responsiveness, claim . As a result, the traditional hierarchy is evolving to take into account the adaptability and resilience of contemporary enterprises.

### ***2.1.3 Specialization and Decision Making Quality***

A key component of organizational structure, specialization is the extent to which work is broken down into discrete positions according to certain skill sets and areas of expertise (Hoye, Misener, Naraine, & Ordway, 2022). With this strategy, departments or employees can focus on subjects that are in line with their areas of competence. Literature evidence show that specialization can greatly improve decision-making quality by fostering efficiency, role clarity, and depth of knowledge. This suggests that when people are given specialized tasks that match their competencies, they are more likely to make well-informed and successful decisions in their fields of competence (Metz, Ilies & Metz, 2019). This emphasis lowers uncertainty in decision-making processes while also improving accuracy.

Specialization does not, however, always have a positive effect (Kemeny & Storper, 2015). According to Mintzberg (1979), overspecialization can result in communication silos, restrict holistic thinking, and impede cross-functional collaboration, all of which can lead to less-than-ideal outcomes in complicated or quickly changing contexts. Employees in highly specialized organizations might not have a comprehensive grasp of the organization's objectives, which could result in decisions that are made in silos that benefit individual departments but not the organization as a whole (Daft, 2016). These viewpoints are further supported by empirical research. A study by Kuye, and Sulaimon, (2011), for instance, discovered that although specialization enhanced the quality of technical decisions in manufacturing companies, it

decreased adaptability and slowed down strategic decisions that needed input from multiple departments.

Specialization enables people or teams to concentrate on tasks that align with their specific talents and knowledge by decomposing complex tasks into smaller, more manageable components, which aids in improving organizational effectiveness (Johnson, 1985; Dunbar, 2014). As a result, integration mechanisms like liaison positions or cross-functional teams are frequently necessary for efficient decision-making in specialized situations.

#### ***2.1.4 Departmentalization and Decision Making Quality***

Daft (2016) defined departmentalization as the process of breaking up an organization's workforce into distinct groups or departments in order to improve management, coordination, and productivity. This suggests that employees are arranged based on functions, products, geography, or customers to establish specialized divisions that can better manage complex tasks. Hence employees are grouped based on their responsibility through functional departmentalization, such as marketing, finance, or human resources (Chakravarthy & Perlmutter, 2023). While this promotes specialization and efficiency (Chakravarthy & Perlmutter, 2023), it can also result in departmental silos and hinder communication (Robbins & Coulter, 2018).

Departmentalization can be grouped differently. Product departmentalization teams focus on specific products or services. This enables a quicker response to market and consumer demands. For example, a tech company may have separate teams for software, hardware, and services (Jones, 2019). Although it might increase focus and creativity, it can also lead to more work and more costs. Geographic departmentalization unites employees based on regions, making it ideal for businesses with global or broad operations. Regional units can improve responsiveness by tailoring strategies to local markets (Chakravarthy & Perlmutter, 2023). However, this could complicate cross-location cooperation.

By structuring teams around particular customer groups, such individuals, businesses, or governments, customer departmentalization facilitates personalized services and enhanced client relationships (Jaakkola & Hallin, 2018). There are benefits and drawbacks to every departmentalization method. Many companies choose a hybrid strategy that blends many approaches in order to achieve a balance between expertise and flexibility (Williams, Dodd, Steele & Randall, 2016). Choosing the right structure is essential for change-adaptability, strategic alignment, and efficient resource use.

### **2.1.5 Organizational Structure and Decision Making Quality**

Although organizational structure provides a framework for decision-making, communication, and implementation, it has a substantial impact on the quality of managerial decisions (Kozioł-Nadolna & Beyer, 2021). A thorough framework eliminates ambiguity and expedites decision-making by clearly defining responsibilities, reporting lines, and official communication routes. Because power is concentrated at the highest levels of a hierarchical structure, strategic decisions can be taken swiftly (Kinicki & Williams, 2003).

Departmental cooperation and collaboration are also impacted by structures. Matrix structures facilitate cross-functional team integration and allow for a range of viewpoints and experience to address difficult problems, claim Chakravarthy, and Perlmutter (2018). Through open communication and knowledge sharing, this improves the quality of decisions, encourages creativity, and lessens cognitive biases (Robbins & Judge, 2018).

Decision quality is further impacted by decentralized structures, which transmit authority to lower levels. Frontline managers' initiative, responsiveness, and autonomy are strengthened when they are permitted to work within their areas of expertise (Kozioł-Nadolna & Beyer, 2021). These structures' adaptability for dynamic contexts facilitates quicker adaptation and problem-solving (Ghasi, Onyejiaku & Nkwonta, 2018).

However, a variety of factors, such as industry, size, corporate culture, and external conditions, affect how effective decisions are made (Metz, Ilies & Metz, 2019). While decentralized methods offer flexibility in fast-paced environments, centralized systems may encourage stability but inhibit innovation (Jones, 2020).

Ultimately, organizational structure affects how decisions are made and executed, which in turn affects accountability, transparency, and performance evaluation. Structure needs to align with strategy and the environment in order to optimize decision quality and preserve competitive advantage.

### **2.1.6 Mediating Role of Employee Involvement**

By defining authority, channels of communication, and decision rights, organizational structure may have a significant impact on the quality of managerial decision-making. While decentralized structures can improve responsiveness and decision quality, hierarchical and inflexible structures



may hinder the flow of information (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Duncan, 1972). Better organizational outcomes have been associated with employee involvement, which is the extent to which employees participate in decision-making. Research shows that employee involvement increases commitment and a sense of ownership, which improves the quality of decisions (Cotton et al., 1988; Lawler, 1992). Employee involvement has a favorable impact on organizational performance in tertiary institutions in Nigeria (Chukwuemeka 2020).

Numerous studies support the idea that employee involvement mediates the relationship between organizational structure and decision-making quality. Through employee strategic alignment, Ouakouak and Ouedraogo (2013) showed how employee involvement regulates the relationship between strategy-making processes and business performance. In a similar vein, Maingi, Awino, K'Obonyo, and Pokhariyal (2020) discovered that in Kenyan manufacturing companies, employee behavior mediates the relationship between strategic planning and competitive advantage. Nonetheless, other research indicates that employee involvement's mediating role might not always be substantial. For example, Ijeoma (2020) found no connection between organizational commitment and employee involvement in Nigerian government-owned businesses. This suggests that corporate setting and culture may have an impact on how effective employee involvement is as a mediator.

Given these conflicting results, it is imperative to conduct an empirical investigation into the mediating function of employee involvement in the association between management decision-making quality and organizational structure.

## **2.2    *Theoretical Review***

### **2.2.1   *Decision Theory***

The decision theory was notably formalized by von Neumann and Morgenstern (1944). The decision theory emphasizes on how people and organizations make decisions, particularly in complex or unclear circumstances. It looks at how decisions are made in practice (descriptive decision theory) as well as how they ought to be made (normative decision theory). In essence, it is a framework for evaluating and enhancing the way decisions are made by examining the variables that influence decisions and assessing various

This theory applies to this study in that it has a direct bearing on how managerial decision quality is affected by organizational structure of an organization. For instance, at Flour Mills of Nigeria (FMN), structural factors such as specialization, departmentalization, and hierarchy significantly influence decision-making quality. These structural elements shape how decisions are made, how information flows across the organization, and who is involved in the decision-making process. Importantly, employee involvement plays a crucial role in this structural framework. According to Appelbaum et al. (2000) and Lawler (1992), employee engagement is the extent to which workers at various levels participate in providing data, opinions, and insights into the decision-making process. By ensuring that decisions are based on practical realities and frontline expertise, employee involvement can help companies like FMN close the gaps across hierarchical levels and improve the quality of their judgments.

While too rigid structures might impede flexibility and reflect restricted rationality, a clearly defined hierarchy promotes rational decision-making (Ahmed, 2020). But without compromising managerial control, a balance between hierarchical authority and employee involvement tools, like suggestion systems, cross-functional teams, or participatory decision-making forums, can improve decision accuracy and inclusivity (Cotton et al., 1988; Locke & Schweiger, 1979).

### **2.2.2 Contingency Theory**

The contingency theory was ascribed to Fiedler (1964). The theory emphasized that there is no one ideal method for leading a team, structuring an organization, or making decisions. Instead, the effectiveness of the organization is determined by how well its management styles, procedures, and structure match its internal and external environments. Numerous factors, including the tasks at hand, the environment, and the characteristics of the business and its employees, should have an impact on organizational structure and decision-making. Businesses are able to keep making decisions that are effective and consistent with their goals because of this flexibility.

This theory applies to this study in that, even within the same industry, organizational structures need to be modified to fit particular situations. Hence, what works for one company may not work for another. For example, when flexibility is essential in dynamic situations, a bureaucratic structure may impede decision-making while functioning effectively in stable ones (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Therefore, contingency theory highlights the significance of creating structures that are appropriate for specific situational settings. It also draws attention to the negative effects

of environmental unpredictability. To assure swift decisions in unforeseen situations, businesses should employ flexible structures, decentralize authority, and promote cooperation and open communication (Duncan, 1972).

Employee involvement becomes crucial to improving the efficacy of decision-making in this flexible and adaptive structural approach. Organizations can better align their decisions with operational realities and frontline insights by using employee participation methods, such as consultative meetings, feedback systems, and collaborative problem-solving (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Lawler, 1992). Particularly in settings that are changing quickly, employee involvement not only encourages adaptability but also ownership and dedication to decisions. Therefore, contingency theory backs up the notion that when organizational structures are adaptable enough to incorporate employee input at various levels, decision-making quality improves and more informed and responsive decisions that meet situational demands can be made (Cotton et al., 1988; Locke & Schweiger, 1979).

### **2.3 Empirical Review**

Amoke, Kinikanwo, Nwosu, and Ikeotuonye (2024) examined the impact of organizational structure on managerial decision quality, paying particular attention to span of control, departmentalization, and hierarchy. 150 individuals were given a structured questionnaire, and SPSS was used to evaluate 143 valid responses. A 5-point Likert scale was used in the study, along with descriptive statistics and Pearson Product Moment Correlation at a significance level of 0.05. The results highlighted the significance of departmentalization and a balanced span of control and showed a strong positive correlation between organizational hierarchy and decision-making quality. To improve decision-making processes' clarity and effectiveness, the authors advised businesses to uphold a clearly defined hierarchy and structure.

Khan, Godil, Jabbour, Shujaat, Razzaq, and Yu (2021) investigated how organizational structure affected Pakistani SMEs' decision-making quality. The study, which employed a survey-based methodology, found that flatter organizational structures significantly speed up and enhance decision-making. These results demonstrate that SMEs with fewer management layers had better decision outcomes and more efficient information flow, supporting Galbraith's theories on the drawbacks of towering hierarchies. The analysis highlights how important it is for SMEs to adopt less bureaucratic, more agile structures if they want to be competitive and flexible in rapidly changing environments.

Syafri and Fkun (2024) aimed to examine how organizational structure influences moral decision-making in contemporary businesses. Using a literature review, the study analyzed several secondary sources, though no population or sample size was specified. Key structural elements - formalization, span of control, departmentalization, specialization, and hierarchy - were found to significantly affect ethical behavior. Ambiguous structures hinder moral decisions, while clear frameworks promote ethical conduct, especially when guided by leadership and culture. The authors concluded that organizational principles and structure strongly shape ethical decision-making and recommended fostering open communication, transparency, and ethical dialogue to support moral and sustainable management practices.

Chukwuemeka (2020) examined on how employee involvement in decision-making affected the performance of public organizations in Nigeria's Anambra State. 357 employees were chosen using the Taro Yamane formula from a pool of 1,741 employees utilizing a survey research approach; 338 valid replies were examined. A questionnaire created by the researcher was used to gather data. Using SPSS version 23, multiple regression analysis (MRA) was carried out. The results demonstrated that employee dedication, engagement, and consultation had a major and favorable impact on organizational performance. In addition to recommending frequent meetings and inclusive decision-making procedures to improve morale and performance, the study found that staff participation increases productivity.

Joseph and Gaba (2020) reviewed and synthesized previous studies on the effects of formal organizational structure on information processing and decision-making. Without defining a sample size or population, they looked at a variety of research using a retrospective literature review methodology. Inconsistent analysis throughout decision-making stages, a lack of attention to information-related conflicts, and the gap between aggregation and constraint perspectives of structure were the three main problems discovered by the study. Results show that existing research is fragmented. The authors provided a road map for future research in this area and suggested taking an ecological viewpoint to gain a deeper understanding of how structure influences information consumption.

The factors impacting the perceived quality of decisions made with business intelligence (BI) technologies were investigated by Visinescu et al. (2017). They looked at things like information quality, system use, and problem space complexity using an exploratory study and a validated research methodology. The study found that choice quality is influenced by a complex interplay of these elements, with a potential tipping point where better information quality and BI usage

considerably enhance perceived decision quality, despite the fact that the population and sample size were not defined. The authors suggested more investigation on the function of BI in order to enhance comprehension and decision-making results.

Abumandil and Bin Hassan (2016) looked into how organizational structure affects the relationship between the effectiveness of decision-making in Palestinian banks and the quality of the information they use. Using a literature-based methodology, the study emphasized that accurate, accessible, relevant, complete, and timely information is essential for managerial decision-making. According to the authors, a formalized organizational structure affects the quality of information and, in turn, the process of making decisions. They concluded that structure had a major moderating effect and suggested that banks implement clear organizational frameworks to improve decision-making by enhancing the quality of the information they use.

Tran and Tian (2013) investigated how organizational structure is influenced by both internal and external influences, and how this affects the efficiency of businesses in Hanoi, Vietnam. They polled a sample of businesses using structured questionnaires based on factors taken from strategic choice techniques and contingency theory. Based on how these criteria were seen by the firms, the study divided the firms into three groups. The results demonstrated that although organizations that acknowledged the influence of internal factors tended to adopt more complicated classical structures, those that did not tended to stick with simpler forms. To improve organizational effectiveness, the authors advised businesses to match their organizational structures with pertinent internal and external elements.

Ouakouak and Ouedraogo (2013) investigated how employee strategic alignment mediated the relationship between corporate success and employee participation in the strategy-making process. The study used structural equation modeling (SEM) on data gathered from 372 European organizations of various sizes and nations using a quantitative research design. The results showed that the relationship between employee involvement and business performance is totally mediated by employee strategic alignment. According to the study's findings, employee participation in strategy development improves alignment with corporate objectives, which in turn boosts performance. It suggested using qualitative methods to investigate the mechanisms behind this link in more detail.

The above studies showed that different studies had been conducted but there was no consensus among the scholars on the conclusions of the various scholars. There is still a dearth of integrative research that focuses on how different organizational structure dimensions - such as hierarchy,

specialization, and departmentalization - predict managerial decision-making quality at the same time across various organizational levels and sectors, especially in the manufacturing company.

Therefore, it was hypothesised that:

H01: Hierarchy of authority does not have significant influence on managerial decision quality.

H02: Specialization does not have significant impact on managerial decision quality.

H03: Departmentalization does not have significant influence on managerial decision quality.

H04: Organizational structure does not have significant influence in managerial decision quality.

H05: Employee involvement does not mediate the relationship between organizational structure and quality of managerial decision-making.

### **3. METHODS**

#### **3.1 *Research Design***

This study is quantitative and employed descriptive design which characterize a population, situation, or phenomena without changing variables. This design is appropriate because it aids in illustrating the state of affairs, practices, opinions, or actions. The senior management, middle management and supervisory-level management of Flour Mills Nigeria made up the study population.

#### **3.2 *Population of the Study***

For this study, the population of staff at the management level of Flour Mills of Nigeria, Lagos was not publicly available for security reasons. However, the company's Human Resource Department gave a population of 73 Management staff at various management positions.

#### **3.3 *Sampling Techniques and Sample Size***

The study used purposive sampling to select the managers because this set of respondents were equipped with the appropriate information concerning the study. After this, a stratified sampling technique was employed to divide the managers into three strata of lower managers, middle managers and top management levels. Finally, since the study population is small, the study

employed census survey and was able to retrieve 44 copies of the questionnaire from the respondents who participated in the study.

### **3.4     *Instrumentation and Validation***

The instrument for this study was adapted from scales developed by different scholars. As a result, decision making quality was measured by a four-item scale developed by Hage, and Aiken (1967), sample item was ‘Management in this organization does not seek inputs and feedbacks from employees in the process of making important decisions’. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was 0.87. Hierarchy was measure using five items adapted from Hage, and Aiken (1967). A sample item is "Little action can be taken until a decision’. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was 0.89. Specialization was measured using 6 items adapted from Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, and Turner (1968). A sample item is ‘Each employee performs a narrow range of tasks. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was 0.75. Departmentalization was measured using 4 items scale adapted from Trigueiro-Fernandes, Cavalcanti, Bila, and Añez (2022). A sample item is "The most important thing for this unit is to carry out its own work’’. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was 0.8. Lastly, employee involvement was measured using 6 items scale adapted from Patterson et al. (2005). A sample item is ‘Information is widely shared in this organisation’. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was 0.85.

To investigate the underlying structure of the study research constructs, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test of sample adequacy was .084, indicating adequacy for factor analysis and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant ( $\chi^2 = 1,038.26$ ,  $p < .001$ ) indicating that the data was suitable for factor analysis. Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation was used to extract the factors. Table 3.1 shows the factor loadings of the items, as well as the grouping of variables by factors.

**Table 3.1***Rotated Factor Loading Matrix for Study Variables*

| Item Code | Hierarchy (H) | Specialization (S) | Departmentalization (D) | Employee Involvement (EI) | Decision Making Quality (DMQ) |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| H1        | .78           | -                  | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| H2        | .74           | -                  | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| H3        | .71           | -                  | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| H4        | .69           | -                  | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| H5        | .65           | -                  | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| C.R       | <b>.84</b>    |                    |                         |                           |                               |
| S1        | -             | .82                | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| S2        | -             | .80                | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| S3        | -             | .77                | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| S4        | -             | .75                | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| S5        | -             | .72                | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| S6        | -             | .70                | -                       | -                         | -                             |
| C.R       |               | <b>.86</b>         |                         |                           |                               |
| D1        | -             | -                  | .81                     | -                         | -                             |
| D2        | -             | -                  | .78                     | -                         | -                             |
| D3        | -             | -                  | .74                     | -                         | -                             |
| D4        | -             | -                  | .70                     | -                         | -                             |
| C.R       |               |                    | <b>.82</b>              |                           |                               |
| EI1       | -             | -                  | -                       | .82                       | -                             |
| EI2       | -             | -                  | -                       | .79                       | -                             |
| EI3       | -             | -                  | -                       | .76                       | -                             |
| EI4       | -             | -                  | -                       | .74                       | -                             |
| EI5       | -             | -                  | -                       | .72                       | -                             |
| EI6       | -             | -                  | -                       | .70                       | -                             |
| C.R       |               |                    |                         | <b>.87</b>                |                               |
| DMQ1      | -             | -                  | -                       | -                         | .83                           |
| DMQ2      | -             | -                  | -                       | -                         | .79                           |
| DMQ3      | -             | -                  | -                       | -                         | .76                           |
| DMQ4      | -             | -                  | -                       | -                         | .73                           |
| C.R       |               |                    |                         |                           | <b>.84</b>                    |

C.R = Composite Reliability

To improve interpretability, extraction was performed using Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) with Varimax rotation. Based on eigenvalues greater than 1 and an examination of the scree plot, a five-factor solution was retained, accounting for 69.1% of the total variance. Factor loadings larger than 0.40 were deemed significant, and items had strong loadings on their individual factors with negligible cross-loading.

The extracted factors were consistent with the study variables: hierarchy, specialization,



departmentalization (predictor variables), employee involvement (mediator), and decision-making quality (outcome). Communalities varied from 0.48 to 0.81, indicating that the retained factors explained a significant percentage of the variance in each measure. This finding confirms the measurement instrument's construct validity and provides justification for the subsequent regression and mediation studies.

Three Experts in Management Science examined and approved the questionnaire to guarantee its proper language, clarity, and content relevancy. Thirty respondents, from Honeywell Flour Mills Plc., who were not included in the main study participated in a pilot study to evaluate its reliability. Since Cronbach's Alpha is a well used technique among researchers, it was used to assess the instrument's internal consistency (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008). A Cronbach's Alpha score of 0.70 or higher denotes satisfactory reliability, according Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). The dependability of the instrument was confirmed when the study's outcome exceeded the 0.70 benchmark for each of the variables as shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2: Reliability Values for the Instruments Used for this Study**

| Item                           | No of items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Hierarchy                      | 5           | 0.843            |
| Specialisation                 | 3           | 0.860            |
| Departmentalisation            | 3           | 0.821            |
| Employee involvement           | 4           | 0.874            |
| Quality of management decision | 5           | 0.842            |

### **3.5 Method of Data Collection**

The study utilized primary data collected using a structured questionnaire, segmented according to key variables of interest constructed on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Data were collected using both a hard copies of the questionnaire and also online questionnaire. The workforce in manufacturing companies like Flour Mills is diverse, with workers from various functional units, hierarchical levels, and levels of digital literacy and technology access. Therefore, the adoption of this two methods was preferred because while the researcher met physically with some of the respondents, others were not readily available and, therefore, online questionnaire was administered on them.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

Data obtained from the copies of questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistical tools such as frequency tables and percentages. To assess the relationships between variables, the study employed Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. A multiple regression analysis was further employed to show the degree of predictability between the variables of the study. Finally, mediation was tested using Process Macro by Hayes version 3.5. All data analyses were analyzed using SPSS version 23.0.

## **4. RESULTS**

### **4.1 Demographic Profile**

The study demographic characteristics showed that 34 (77.3%) of the respondents were male while 10 (25%) were female; indicating more male participated than female in the study. Concerning age, majority 19 (43.2%) of the respondents were between 30-39 years; followed by 11(25.0%) of respondents in the age bracket 20-29 years and 10(22.7%) of respondents in the age bracket 40-49 years. This implies that the majority of respondents are still in their active work age. As regards educational qualification, 35 (79.5%) of the respondents have MBA/ M.Sc. certificate, implying that majority of the respondents were well educated. Concerning marital status, 34 (77.3%) of the respondents were married while 8 (18.2%) were single. Lastly, the managerial position data showed that majority of the respondents 23(52.3%) of the respondents were low level managers followed by 13(29.5%) middle managers and finally 8 (18.2%) top management level.

### **4.2 Description and Correlation of the Study Variables**

Table 1 shows the mean score, standard deviation, and correlation analysis of Hierarchy, Specialization, Departmentalization, and Decision Making Quality.

**Table 1. Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlation between the Study's Variables**

| Factor  | Mean | SD   | Correlation |        |        |   |
|---------|------|------|-------------|--------|--------|---|
|         |      |      | 1           | 2      | 3      | 4 |
| 1. DEMQ | 2.39 | .836 | 1           |        |        |   |
| 2. HIER | 2.52 | .642 | .551**      | 1      |        |   |
| 3. SPEC | 2.44 | .708 | .927**      | .673** | 1      |   |
| 4. DEPT | 2.69 | .598 | .682**      | .273 . | .558** | 1 |

Notes: \*\* $p < 0.01$ . SD: Standard Deviation; 1 = DEMQ: Decision making quality; 2 = HIER: Hierarchy; 3 = SPEC: Specialization; 4 = DEPT: Departmentalization.

Using Pearson correlation analysis, Table 1 displayed the relationship between the study's variables. The findings indicated a weak and positive correlation between decision making quality and hierarchy of authority ( $r = .551$ ;  $p < .01$ ), suggesting that decision making quality tends to rise in tandem with an increase in hierarchy of authority. Similarly, the results indicated a strong and positive correlation between specialization and the quality of decision-making ( $r = .927$ ;  $p < .01$ ). This implies that decision-making quality tends to rise in tandem with respondents' level of specialization and vice versa. Finally, the results also demonstrated a weak and postive correlation between departmentalization and the quality of decision-making ( $r = .682$   $p < .01$ ). This implies that decision-making quality tends to rise in tandem with departmentalization and vice versa. But since correlation does not imply causation, the study went one step further and performed a regression analysis, as can be seen below:

**Table 2. Multicollinearity Coefficients for Regression Analysis**

| Model               | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |       |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------|
|                     | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      | Tolerance               | VIF   |
| 1 (Constant)        | -.528                       | .245       |                           | -2.160 | .037 |                         |       |
| Hierarchy           | -.171                       | .095       | -.090                     | -1.225 | .228 | .521                    | 1.919 |
| Specialization      | 1.037                       | .104       | .879                      | 10.012 | .000 | .362                    | 2.763 |
| Departmentalisation | .253                        | .094       | .181                      | 2.685  | .011 | .612                    | 1.634 |

a. Dependent Variable: DMQ

In this study, multicollinearity was assessed using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) as part of the regression analysis as shown in Table 2. The VIF measures the extent of correlation between independent variables in a regression model. A VIF value between 1 and 10 indicates that multicollinearity is not a concern. Based on the coefficient output, the obtained value of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of hierarchy (1.919), specialization (2.763), departmentalization (1.634). Since all VIF values fall within the acceptable range of 1 to 10, the study can conclude that there is no significant multicollinearity among the independent variables in this study. This implies that the regression model's estimates are reliable and not distorted by multicollinearity, ensuring the robustness of the study's findings

**Table 3. Showing Regression of the Study Variables on Decision Making Quality**

| Variables           | constant | B     | $\beta$ | T      | Sig  | R                 | R <sup>2</sup> | F       |
|---------------------|----------|-------|---------|--------|------|-------------------|----------------|---------|
| Constant            | -.528    |       |         | -2.160 | .037 |                   |                |         |
| Herarchy            |          | -.117 | -.090   | -1.225 | .228 | .943 <sup>a</sup> | .880           | 106.215 |
| Specialization      |          | 1.037 | .879    | 10.012 | .000 |                   |                |         |
| Departmentalization |          | .253  | .181    | 2.685  | .011 |                   |                |         |

Dependent variable: Quality Managerial Decision-Making

The impact of organizational structure dimensions - hierarchy, specialization, and departmentalization - on the caliber of decision-making is assessed by the multiple regression analysis shown in Table 3. An F-statistic of 106.215 and a significance level of  $p < .001$  show that the regression model as a whole is statistically significant and has good explanatory power. The independent factors and decision-making quality have a very significant positive link, as indicated by the multiple correlation coefficient (R), which is .943. Furthermore, the model's three organizational structure variables account for about 88.8% of the variance in decision-making quality, according to the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), which is .884. This high  $R^2$  value indicates a model that fits well and has a significant capacity for prediction.

When all independent variables are set to zero, the expected value of decision-making quality is represented by the constant value of -0.528. There is a baseline negative level of decision-making quality that may be altered by other unmeasured factors, even in the absence of the influence of hierarchy, specialization, and departmentalization, according to the statistically significant constant ( $t = -2.160$ ,  $p = .037$ ). However, because the constant might not have a useful independent meaning, its interpretation should be done carefully, particularly in models including abstract organizational variables.

The hierarchy of authority variable is not statistically significant, with a t-value of -1.225, a p-value of .228, an unstandardized coefficient (B) of -.117, and a standardized beta ( $\beta$ ) of -0.090. This suggests that hierarchy has no discernible or relevant impact on the quality of decision-making in this study. In actuality, the quality of decision-making is not much changed by the organization's hierarchy levels. This might imply that levels of hierarchy are either too inflexible or too disjointed from the process of making decisions to be of much use. Therefore, null hypothesis one which stated that hierarchy of authority does not account for significant variance in decision making quality was supported.

On the other hand, the quality of decision-making is strongly and statistically significantly impacted by specialization. With a t-value of 10.012 and a very significant p-value of .000, the unstandardized coefficient (B) is 1.037 and the standardized beta ( $\beta$ ) is 0.879. This indicates that the quality of decision-making is significantly improved by specialization, which is defined as the extent to which tasks are split and allocated to people with particular expertise. Specialization is a crucial structural element for organizational efficiency, as employees with clear roles and specialized knowledge are likely to make better-informed and efficient judgments. Therefore,

hypothesis two which stated that specialization does not have significant impact on managerial decision making quality was not supported.

With an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.253, a standardized beta ( $\beta$ ) of 0.181, a t-value of 2.685, and a p-value of .011, the departmentalization variable likewise makes a substantial contribution to the model. This implies that, albeit less so than specialization, departmentalization - the division of the organization into functional or operational units - has a favorable impact on the caliber of decision-making. Clearer communication, coordination, and decision authority within departments are probably made easier by a well-defined departmental structure, and these factors together improve the caliber of decisions taken. Therefore, null hypothesis three which stated that departmentalization does not have significant influence on managerial decision making quality was not supported.

Lastly, an investigation into Table 2 and examining the coefficient of determination and the F-statistics as explained above, null hypothesis four was not supported and alternative hypothesis four was supported.

**Hypothesis Five:**  $H_0$ : Employee involvement does not mediate the relationship between organizational structure and quality of managerial decision-making

**Table 3. The Mediating Effect of Employee Involvement using Hayes's Process Macro.**

| Variable/ effect  | b     | SE   | t      | p    | 95% Confidence Interval |       |
|-------------------|-------|------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------|
| OST → DEMQ        | .993  | .200 | 4.962  | .000 | .589                    | 1.397 |
| OST → EMIV        | .946  | .095 | 9.959  | .000 | .754                    | 1.137 |
| OST → EMIV → DEMQ | .397  | .177 | 2.238  | .031 | .039                    | .755  |
| Effects           |       |      |        |      |                         |       |
| Direct            | .993  | .200 | 4.962  | .000 | .589                    | 1.397 |
| Indirect          | .376  | .150 |        |      | .129                    | .723  |
| Total             | 1.369 | .114 | 11.980 | .000 | 1.138                   | 1.599 |

**Source:** Mediating effect of Employee involvement from field survey using Hayes'

**NOTE: DEMQ: Quality of management decision; OST: Organisational structure;**

**EMVI: Employee involvement.**

Table 4.3 illustrates a mediation analysis examining employee involvement as a mediator in the relationship between organizational structure and quality of managerial decision-making. A bootstrapping procedure utilizing the SPSS Process Macro was conducted. At first, the regression analysis's findings showed that employee involvement was highly predicted by organizational

structure ( $b = .946$ ,  $t = 9.959$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The regression analysis then showed that organizational structure remained a significant predictor of quality of managerial decision-making when employee involvement was taken into account as a mediator ( $b = .993$ ,  $t = 4.962$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Based on 5000 bootstrap samples, the indirect effect analysis showed that employee involvement mediated a significant positive indirect association between organizational structure and quality of managerial decision-making ( $a*b = .376$ , Bootstrap CI95 = .129 and .723). Employee involvement accounted for 27.47% of the effect's size [ $PM = (.376) / (1.369)$ ].

## 5. DISCUSSION OF FINDING

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of organizational structure on the quality of managerial decision-making in Flour Mills of Nigeria Plc., using structural dimensions such as departmentalization, specialization, and hierarchy of authority. The regression analysis, with a coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of 0.884, revealed a strong correlation between organizational structure and decision-making quality, showing that these structural dimensions collectively explained 88.4% of the variance in managerial decision-making quality. Each structural element is discussed in light of the findings below.

Findings indicate that hierarchy of authority does not significantly influence managerial decision-making quality among managers at Flour Mills, thereby supporting Hypothesis One. Respondents suggested that the traditional chain of command where decisions are made strictly through fixed reporting structures did not substantially enhance decision quality. In a company as large and diverse as Flour Mills, with operations spanning multiple departments and locations, rigid hierarchies may slow down information flow, delay responses, and ultimately reduce effectiveness. This result aligns with Robbins and Judge (2018), who argued that authority hierarchies typically rely on top-down, vertical communication that can hinder feedback and information exchange. However, it contradicts Mintzberg (2017), who posited that hierarchical authority simplifies decision-making.

In contrast, Hypothesis Two was not supported, as findings showed that specialization emerged as the strongest predictor of decision-making quality. Respondents agreed that managers working within clearly defined roles and with specialized expertise make more accurate, timely, and strategic decisions. At Flour Mills, where operations extend across marketing, production, logistics, and corporate strategy, the alignment of roles with technical competencies and industry experience is critical. This underscores the importance of structured job roles that leverage

individual expertise, enhancing both operational efficiency and decision-making quality. These findings support the conclusions of Metz et al. (2019) and Dunbar (2005), who found that specialized tasks aligned with employees' competencies yield more informed and successful decisions. Similarly, Kuye and Sulaimon (2011) observed that specialization improved the quality of technical decisions in manufacturing companies, though they cautioned that it might reduce adaptability and slow down decisions requiring cross-departmental input.

The study further revealed that departmentalization contributes positively to decision-making, albeit to a lesser extent than specialization. Respondents noted that the way Flour Mills is divided into units such as production, finance, sales, and human resources supports better decision outcomes. Clear departmental boundaries facilitate responsibility, goal alignment, and coordination, enabling departments to function autonomously while remaining strategically aligned with overall corporate objectives. This structure enhances collaboration and ensures results-driven decision-making. These findings are consistent with Chakravarthy and Perlmutter (2023), who highlighted that departmentalization fosters efficiency and specialization, and with Jaakkola and Hallin (2018), who argued that it enhances personalized services and client relationships. Conversely, Robbins and Coulter (2018) contended that departmentalization can create silos and hinder cross-functional communication.

Overall, the regression analysis confirms that the three organizational structure dimensions - hierarchy of authority, specialization, and departmentalization collectively explain a substantial proportion of the variance in managerial decision-making quality at Flour Mills. The model's explanatory power of 88.4% strongly supports Alternative Hypothesis Four. Among the dimensions, specialization had the most significant positive effect, underscoring the value of expertise and well-defined responsibilities in improving decision quality. Departmentalization also made a meaningful contribution, suggesting that functional organization strengthens management practices. Although hierarchy of authority did not exert a significant influence, its inclusion did not diminish the overall explanatory power of the model. These findings are consistent with Syafri and Fkun (2024), Tran and Tian (2013), and Abumandil and Bin Hassan (2016), who established a strong link between organizational structure and decision-making. However, they contrast with Joseph and Garba (2020), who argued that existing research on the relationship remains fragmented and inconclusive.

Lastly, results indicate that in the manufacturing sector, the relationship between organizational structure and managerial decision-making is partly mediated by employee involvement.



Respondents emphasized that a well-designed structure - featuring clear roles, decentralization, and efficient communication channels - not only provides a foundation for sound decisions but also motivates employees to contribute ideas, share knowledge, and engage in decision processes. Employee involvement accounted for approximately 27% of the overall effect, suggesting that while structure directly enhances decision quality, managers who foster participation gain additional insights, encourage ownership, and reduce errors. This finding aligns with Cotton et al. (1988), Lawler (1992), and Ouakouak and Ouedraogo (2013), who found that employee involvement enhances commitment and ownership, thereby improving decision quality. Conversely, it diverges from Ijeoma (2020), who found no significant link between employee involvement and organizational commitment in Nigerian public enterprises.

## **6. Conclusion**

All things considered, the regression model indicates that departmentalization and specialization are important indicators of high-quality decision-making in a company, with specialization having the most impact. The quality of decision-making in this situation, however, does not seem to be significantly impacted by hierarchy. These results imply that, as opposed to rigidly hierarchical systems, flatter or more flexible organizational structures that prioritize expertise and distinct departmental functions may be more favorable for efficient decision-making. Lastly, considering employee input may enhance the potential gains in terms of quality of managerial decision making from an effective organizational structure.

## **7. Recommendations**

Based on the study findings, several recommendations are advanced to improve decision-making quality at Flour Mills Nigeria. The organization should strengthen specialization by promoting professional development, ensuring clear role definitions, and maintaining job-person fit, while at the same time retaining departmentalization as a guiding structural principle but fostering greater collaboration across units to prevent functional silos. Given the limited contribution of hierarchy to decision outcomes, decentralization and empowerment of mid-level managers through participatory and team-based models are recommended to enhance responsiveness and innovation. Furthermore, the company should strategically align its structural dimensions with long-term objectives by conducting periodic structural reviews, bench-marking against high-performing firms, and instituting feedback loops to assess structural effectiveness. Finally,

beyond structural adjustments, Flour Mills should invest in mechanisms that promote employee involvement such as suggestion systems, quality circles, and participatory teams; since leveraging workforce input alongside effective structural design can improve decision quality, adaptability, and overall organizational performance.

## 8. Suggestions for Further Studies

The study findings came up with some interesting results. However, it is not short from some limitations. For instance, the study used cross-sectional design. Further studies can use a longitudinal design in order to examine the behaviour of the respondents over space and time. The study used population was small and hence the study used census. Further study can be replicated in other organizations with larger populations. The study predictor variables was delimited to hierarchy of authority, specialization and departmentalization. Further study could examine other dimensions of organizational structure to establish their relationships with managerial decision making quality. In addition, the study examined the mediating role of employee involvement in the relationship between organisational structure and quality of decision making. Further study may investigate the moderating role of employee involvement or the the mediating and moderating roles of other factors completely different from employee involvement. Finally, the study use multiple regression analysis. Further study may employ structural equation modelling to have a more robust result.

## References

- Abumandil, M. S., & Bin Hassan, S. (2016). The Moderating Effect of Organisational Structure on Information Quality and Decision-Making Effectiveness Link. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*.
- Adewumi, F. G., Njoku, C., & Okafor, U. (2025). Democratizing public-impact algorithms: Advancing equitable and explainable AI systems for decision-making in US health, finance, and education sectors. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 7(8), 593-600.
- Adler, N. J. (2025). Overly convenient falsehoods and inconvenient truths: Not what leaders thought they would learn. *International Business Review*, 34(1), 102083.

- Ahmed, M. A. (2017). The importance of the organizational structuring and departmentalization in workplace. *The Journal of Middle East and North Africa Sciences*, 10(4086), 1-9.
- Amoke, C. T., Kinikanwo, N. I., Nwosu, U. V., & Ikeotuonye, M. N. (2024). Effect of organizational structure on managerial decision quality at Flour Mill of Nigeria, Lagos. *International Journal of Public Administration and Development Studies*, 1(2), 112-136.
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. Cornell University Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1968). Social exchange. *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, 7(4), 452-457.
- Chakravarthy, B. S., & Perlmutter, H. V. (2023). Strategic planning for a global business. *International Strategic Management*, 29-42.
- Chen, J., Zhong, P. A., An, R., Zhu, F., & Xu, B. (2019). Risk analysis for real-time flood control operation of a multi-reservoir system using a dynamic Bayesian network. *Environmental modelling & software*, 111, 409-420.
- Chukwuemeka, S. O. (2020). Employee participation in decision making and organizational performance in public organization Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business & Law Research*, 8(3), 79-88.
- Coppin, A., & Coppin, A. (2017). Organization Structure and Design. *The Human Capital Imperative: Valuing Your Talent*, 45-49.
- Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D. A., Froggatt, K. L., Lengnick-Hall, C. A., & Jennings, K. R. (1988). Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1), 8-22.
- Daft, R. L. (2016). *Organization theory and design* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Delbridge, R., & Whitfield, K. (2001). Employee perceptions of job influence and organizational participation. *Industrial Relations*, 40(3), 472-489.
- Dunbar, D. (2014). Communication—putting the manners (back) into management. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 18(3), 84-89.

- Duncan, R. B. (1972). Characteristics of organizational environments and perceived environmental uncertainty. *Administrative science quarterly*, 313-327.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (2021). What is the Eisenhardt Method, really?. *Strategic organization*, 19(1), 147-160.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 149-190). Academic Press.
- Garvin, C. D., Tolman, R. M., & Macgowan, M. J. (2016). *Group work research*. Oxford University Press.
- Ghasemi, R., Akhavan, P., Fatahi Valilai, O., & Abbasi, M. (2023). Improved supplier-managed inventory order assignment platform enabled by Blockchain Technology. *Research in Production and Operations Management*, 14(3), 91-115.
- Ghasi, N. C., Onyejiaku, C. C., & Nkwonta, N. C. (2018). Organizational Culture and Employee Performance among Selected Teaching Hospitals in Enugu State, Nigeria. *European Academic Research*, 6(2), 974-1001.
- Hage, J., & Aiken, M. (1967). Relationship of centralization to other structural properties. *Administrative science quarterly*, 72-92.
- Hitt, M. A., Sirmon, D. G., Li, Y., Ghobadian, A., Arregle, J. L., & Xu, K. (2021). Institutions, industries and entrepreneurial versus advantage-based strategies: How complex, nested environments affect strategic choice. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 25, 147-188.
- Hoye, R., Misener, K., Naraine, M. L., & Ordway, C. (2022). Sport policy. In *Sport Management* (pp. 14-39). Routledge.
- Ijeoma, C. (2020). Employee participation in decision making and its impact on organizational performance: Evidence from government owned enterprises, Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Port Harcourt, Nigeria (August 5, 2020)*.
- Jaakkola, E., & Hallin, A. (2018). Organizational structures for new service development. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 35(2), 280-297.
- Johnson, W. R. (1985). The economics of copying. *Journal of Political Economy*, 93(1), 158-174.
- Jones, E. (2019). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud*. Plunkett Lake Press.

- Joseph, J., & Gaba, V. (2020). Organizational structure, information processing, and decision-making: A retrospective and road map for research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 267-302.
- Kemeny, T., & Storper, M. (2015). Is specialization good for regional economic development? *Regional Studies*, 49(6), 1003–1018.
- Kimberlin, C. L., & Winterstein, A. G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American journal of health-system pharmacy*, 65(23), 2276-2284.
- Kinicki, A., & Williams, B. K. (2003). *Management: A Practical Introduction and Powerweb*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Khan, M. (2025). Systematic Review on Advancing Decision-Making: Integrating Intelligent Data Science and Predictive Analytics for Real-World Applications. *Intelligent Data Science and Analytics*, 1(01), 01-09.
- Khan, S. A. R., Godil, D. I., Jabbour, C. J. C., Shujaat, S., Razzaq, A., & Yu, Z. (2021). Green data analytics, blockchain technology for sustainable development, and sustainable supply chain practices: evidence from small and medium enterprises. *Annals of Operations Research*, 1-25.
- Koziół-Nadolna, K., & Beyer, K. (2021). Determinants of the decision-making process in organizations. *Procedia Computer Science*, 192, 2375-2384.
- Kusyk, S., & Schwartz, M. S. (2024). Moral Intensity: It Is What Is, But What Is It? A Critical Review of the Literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-22.
- Kuye, O. L., & Sulaimon, A. A. (2011). Employee involvement in decision making and firms performance in the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *Serbian journal of management*, 6(1), 1-15.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-47.
- Lawler, E. E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating the high-involvement organization*. Jossey-Bass.

- Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, S. A., & Ledford, G. E. (1995). *Creating high performance organizations: Practices and results of employee involvement and total quality management in Fortune 1000 companies*. Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, D. J., Stvilia, B., Gunaydin, F., & Pang, Y. (2025). Developing a data quality assurance ontology for research data repositories. *Journal of Documentation*, 81(7), 63-84.
- Litvaj, I., Ponisciakova, O., Stancekova, D., Svobodova, J., & Mrazik, J. (2022). Decision-making procedures and their relation to knowledge management and quality management. *Sustainability*, 14(1), 572.
- Lizarelli, F. L., de Toledo, J. C., & Alliprandini, D. H. (2021). Relationship between continuous improvement and innovation performance: an empirical study in Brazilian manufacturing companies. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(9-10), 981-1004.
- Locke, E. A., & Schweiger, D. M. (1979). Participation in decision-making: One more look. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 265–339.
- Maingi, J. K., Awino, Z. B., K'Obonyo, P. O., & Pokhariyal, G. P. (2020). The Role of Employee Behaviour and Organizational Structure in the Relationship Between Strategic Planning and Competitive Advantage of Large Manufacturing Firms in Kenya. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*.
- Metz, D., Ilies, L., & Metz, M. (2019). The Role Of Management Practices In Ensuring Organizational Performance. In *Proceedings Of The International Management Conference* (Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 666-674). Faculty of Management, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). An emerging strategy of "direct" research. *Administrative science quarterly*, 24(4), 582-589.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research*. Prentice Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (2017). Developing theory about the development of theory. In *Handbook of middle management strategy process research* (pp. 177-196). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Moore, D. A., & Bazerman, M. H. (2022). Leadership & overconfidence. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 8(2), 59-69.

- Morris, S. A., & McDonald, R. A. (1995). The role of moral intensity in moral judgments: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14, 715-726.
- Ouakouak, M. L., & Ouedraogo, N. (2013). Employee involvement in strategy-making process and company performance: the mediating role of employee strategic alignment. *International Journal of Business Environment*, 5(4), 319-340.
- Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., ... & Wallace, A. M. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 26(4), 379-408.
- Provost, F., & Fawcett, T. (2017). *Data Science für Unternehmen: Data Mining und datenanalytisches Denken praktisch anwenden*. MITP-Verlags GmbH & Co. KG.
- Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., & Turner, C. (1968). Dimensions of organization structure. *Administrative science quarterly*, 65-105.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2018). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. pearson.
- Schein, E. H. (2016). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. In *Organizational influence processes* (pp. 283-294). Routledge.
- Shiundu, T. W. (2024). Leadership Styles and Their Influence on Ethical Decision-Making in Organizations: Synthesis of the Literature. *Journal of Human Resource & Leadership*, 8(1), 68-77.
- Syafri, M., & Fkun, E. (2024). The Effect of Organizational Structure on Ethical Decision Making. *Jurnal Stagflasi: Ekonomi, Manajemen dan Akuntansi*, 2(01), 10-17.
- Tran, Q., & Tian, Y. (2013). Organizational structure: Influencing factors and impact on a firm. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 3(2), 229-236.
- Trigueiro-Fernandes, L., Cavalcanti, J. M. M., Bila, M. V. A., & Añez, M. E. M. (2022). Scale of Organizational Structure Components (SOCS): Evidence of Validation of a Theoretical Model. *BBR. Brazilian Business Review*, 19(3), 309-330.
- Visinescu, L. L., Jones, M. C., & Sidorova, A. (2017). Improving decision quality: the role of business intelligence. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 57(1), 58-66.
- von Neumann, John and Oskar Morgenstern. (1944). *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Second edition, 1947; third edition, 1953.

Section 3, chapter I. reprinted in Alfred N. Page. (1968). *Utility Theory: A Book of Readings*. New York: Wiley, pp. 215–233.

Williams, S., Dodd, L. J., Steele, C., & Randall, R. (2016). A systematic review of current understandings of employability. *Journal of education and work*, 29(8), 877-901.