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ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the perceived influence of organizational structure on ECB at Vivo Energy Kenya. The research design involved a descriptive survey since it focused on many employees within Vivo Energy Kenya. Data was collected using a questionnaire that was administered through drop and pick later method. Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the objective whereas chi square was used to analyze the relationship between organizational structure and employee citizenship behavior.

The findings were presented in tables and pie charts. The study established that Vivo Energy had an organic structure which had been introduced in the year 2012. It was evident that the association between organizational structure and employee citizenship behavior was strong and significant ($X^2=14.4$, $P<0.05$, df=3). The respondents perceived organic structure as most appropriate for promoting organizational citizenship behavior.

Further research on the same study can be done in other organizations similar to Vivo Energy Kenya to establish whether there is any association between organizational structure and employee citizenship behavior. The study recommends training and development programs on ECB to educate employees on the importance of practicing ECB. Organizational management is required to provide an enabling environment through providing facilities to enhance ECB and leading by example.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study
Organizational structure is increasingly becoming an important tool in influencing employees behavior. Interpersonal Adaptation Theory (IAT) clearly states that people enter into interactions with others with a combination of expectations, requirements and desires. In an organization, an employee’s expectations refer to how they assume and respond to responsibilities assigned to them in the organization. Employee’s character in the organization is a constituent of biological factors and social learned behavior that influence them to act in a particular manner (Riehl & Roy, 1980).

Employees adopt some behaviors in the organization in order to survive. An example of a biological need for survival could be the use of behavior matching or mirroring. When an employee is engaged in responsibilities in the workplace, he tends to develop some traits as a result of the need for survival. However, these traits are vital for survival and growth of employees. Although a few organizations fail to reward these traits, they are important for developing a working culture in the organization (Andrews and Roy, 1991).

According to IAT, organizations that understand and appreciate employees needs perform better than those that tend to ignore the needs of the employees. Levine believes that an individual’s adaptation occurs in four different modes. According to Roy (1980) these adaptation include: physiological mode, the self concept mode, the role function mode, and the interdependence mode. Employees seek to fulfill these fundamental needs for their survival in the organization; if these needs are not fulfilled they tend to adopt some behaviors to fulfill these needs for example: engaging in responsibilities that are not in their contractual obligations.

1.1.1 The concept of Perception
Like most concepts within the social science disciplines, perception (or what other scholars refer to as social perception) has been defined in a variety of ways since its first usage. From the lay man’s perspective, perception is defined as an act of being aware of
“one’s environment through physical sensation, which denotes an individual’s ability to understand” (Chambers Dictionary).

However, many social psychologists have tended to develop the concept around one of its most essential characteristics that the world around us is not psychologically uniform to all individuals. This is the fact, in all probability, that accounts for the difference in the opinions and actions of individuals/groups that are exposed to the same social phenomenon. According to Nelson and Quick (1997) “social perception is the process of interpreting information about another person.” What this definition has clearly highlighted for your attention is that the opinions you form about another person depends on the amount of information available to you and the extent to which you are able to correctly interpret the information you have acquired. In other words, you may be in possession of the same set of information that other people have on a particular situation, person or group but still arrive at different conclusions due to individual differences in the capacity to interpret the information that you all have (Michener, 2004).

Rao and Narayan (1998) obviously share the main characteristics of the above definition. However, they emphasize that perception ranks among the “important cognitive factors of human behaviour” or psychological mechanism that enable people to understand their environment. In their own words, “perception is the process whereby people select, organize, and interpret sensory stimulations into meaningful information about their work environment.” They argue that perception is the single most important determinant of human behavior, stating further that “there can be no behaviour without perception.” Though focusing on managers in work settings, Rao and Narayan (1998) draw attention to the fact that since there are no specific strategies for understanding the perception of others, everyone appears to be “left with his own inventiveness, innovative ability, sensitiveness and introspective skills to deal with perception.”

From a third perspective “social perception refers to constructing an understanding of the social world from the data we get through our senses” (Michener, DeLamater and Myers, 2004: 106). Thus, perception “refers to the process by which we form impressions of other people’s traits and personalities.” You may have noticed that by referring to “our
senses” as the means of data collection the authors may have placed too much emphasis on its perception component, which the first two definitions clearly avoided. In other to shed more light on this concept it is important for you to pay attention to the following elements of the above definitions of perception listed by Rao and Narayan (1998): Our attention, feelings and the way we act are influenced by our environment. Perception helps you to gather data from your surrounding, process the data and make sense out of it,. In perception it is sometimes difficult to separate the information from the action, it is basically a process of gaining mental understanding, Perception guides the perceiver in harnessing, processing and channeling relevant information towards fulfilling the perceiver’s requirements.

1.1.2 Organizational Structure
Aiken (2005) indicated that different organizational have different organizational structure depending on the nature of work that an organization engages into. Mostly, small organizations have a flat organizational structure where the process of decision making is less bureaucratic and faster compared to big organizations with tall organizational structures. Institutions will tall structures of organizations experience challenges when making decisions since a decision made must pass various stages before it is approved by the top level management (Barrick, 2005).

Jelinek (2010) explained that typically hierarchical arrangement of lines of authority, communications, rights and duties of an organization. Organizational structure determines how the roles, power and responsibilities are assigned, controlled, and coordinated, and how information flows between the different levels of management. A well defined organizational structure facilitates smooth flow of information and goods unlike an informal structure that lacks an organized way of executing its operations through well defined channels (Avolio& Aiken, 2005).

1.1.3 Employee Citizenship Behavior
Employee citizenship behavior (ECB) is culture of doing things that employees adopt in an organization to, ‘work beyond’ or going an extra mile, above what they have been
assigned to do in their employment contract. ECB refers to anything that employees choose to do, spontaneously and of their own accord over and above the specified contractual obligations. This behavior is not necessarily rewarded in some of organization though it adds a lot of value to the organizations’ output. ECB has been shown to have a positive impact on employee performance and wellbeing, and this in turn has noticeable flow-on effects on the organisation.

According to Organ (1998), the correlations between ECB and job satisfaction is approximately 0.4. He argued that satisfied workers perform better, but this is correlational, not causal. However, certain types of performance primarily those related to citizenship behavior will be affected by job satisfaction. Think of workers who are cooperative with their superiors and colleagues, willing to make compromises and sacrifices and are ‘easier to work with’, workers who ‘help out with the extra little things’ without complaining (or even offering to do so without being asked) these behaviors are all encompassed within OCB.

According to Borman (2005), indicated that employees who frequently engage in employee citizenship behavior are not always the top performers however, they could be, as task performance is related to ECB, but they are the ones who are known to work beyond the minimum required efforts in a merely satisfactory job. Podsakoff et al., (1996) insisted that organizations that encourage employees to engage in ECB performs well in terms of productivity, efficiency, cost reduction, customer satisfaction, reduced turnover rates and absenteeism. Barrick & Bobko (2005) argued that even though employee citizenship behavior is not formal it highly contributes in developing a working culture in the organization, those employees who are less productivity may be tempted to work harder due to the prevailing working environment.

Employee citizenship behavior plays a critical role in enhancing the social and psychological state of employees in the workplace; this makes employees to be more productive and innovative in their activities in the workplace (Organ, 2001). Bateman (2005) argued that it is ECB is a reflection of the flexible nature of employees'
responsibilities in the modern work place. He added that most employees in the work place have adopted a culture of working extra harder through helping others and working for long hours to improve their relationships with their managers as well as maintaining a conducive atmosphere in the work place. Most employers however fail to recognize and reward employees who engage in ECB (Van Scotter, Motowidlo & Cross, 2000; Werner, 2001) averred that the colloquial understanding of ECB as going ‘the extra mile’ to help others at work, is an idea that is increasingly becoming very popular, most employees who engage in employee citizenship are perceived as helpers in the work place. There is a great disparity in the understanding of ECB since organizations look at it from different perspectives (Kusluvan, 2003).

Even though, organizations fail remunerate employees based on their performances ECB is a practice that have a significant influence on the organizational performances. According to Baron (2010) the way the organization is structured greatly affects ECB. In a flexible organization structure; employees can easily harness their skills and potential in the job since they are given an opportunity to work on their own. An employee can easily engage in ECB in an organization where freedom is not limited and the freedom of interaction and expression is less restricted. This way, employees are motivated to work towards realizing their full potential compared to those organizations that hardly allow flexibility in the work place.

1.1.4 Vivo Energy Kenya
Vivo Energy, a Shell licensee in 14 African markets, was established on 1st December 2011 to distribute and market Shell-branded fuels and lubricants. Vitol and Helios each own 40% of Vivo Energy, with Shell holding the remaining 20%. Shell and Vivo Lubricants is 50% owned by Shell and 50% owned by Vitol and Helios. Vivo Energy (2013), Shell and Vivo Lubricants manufacture and blend Shell branded lubricant. It will market and sell lubricants through an exclusive Master Distribution Agreements with Vivo Energy companies. Shell remains the overarching customer-facing brand and the name on Vivo Energy’s fuels and lubricants. The Shell brand has had a presence in Kenya since 1900. Today, under Vivo Energy, it is one of the country’s most sought after
fuel and lubricant brands, operating an extensive retail network; major bulk oil storage terminals in Nairobi and Mombasa; aviation services at Jomo Kenyatta International Airport, Wilson Airport, Mombasa International Airport and Malindi Airport; and a lubricating oil blending plant in Mombasa (Vivo Energy, 2013).

Vivo Energy Kenya serves all market segments from retail to commercial customers with a full range of products: automotive fuels, lubricants, aviation fuels, liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) and black fuels. The company offers a full portfolio of Shell’s differentiated fuels (including Shell V-Power, Shell Unleaded Extra and Shell Diesel Extra), supported by the Shell Fuel Card, through Shell-branded retail outlets across the country (Vivo Energy, 2013). The company is also renowned for its high impact Community Investment programmes, partnering with one of the nation’s top schools for more than 50 years, whilst also leading the way in fields such as health, road safety and community development. The company’s HIV/AIDS programme is also well recognized, both nationally and internationally (Vivo Energy, 2013).

Currently, Vivo Energy Kenya operates in an Organic structure that ensures easy decision making since the decision does not need to go through many stages. This increases the speed of operations and thus positively impacts on the organizational performance. To maintain a competitive advantage, Vivo Energy Kenya requires this type of structure that is simple, less bureaucratic and efficient. With an Organic structure, it is easy to cultivate a performance culture among employees. This provides an opportunity for employees to practice employee citizenship behavior through engaging in activities that are not included in the contractual engagement for example: helping new employees in the workplace. (Ambrose et.al, 2003)

1.2 Research Problem

Employee citizenship behavior is conceptualized as synonymous with the concept of contextual performance; it is defined as ‘performance that involves going an extra mile to execute a duty or responsibility that is not in the contract’. Organ (1997) indicated that this kind of performance supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place. While this reflects the flexible nature of workers’ roles in the
modern workplace, and acknowledges the fact that employees do get recognized and rewarded for engaging in ECB (Van Scotter, Motowidlo & Cross, 2000; Werner, 1994), the colloquial understanding of ECB as going ‘the extra mile’ or ‘above and beyond’ to help others at work is an idea that many are familiar with, and these ideas continue to be a popular way of conceptualizing ECB. Typical examples of ECB include offering to help a newcomer become familiar with his/her role and the office, a colleague who may be struggling with deadlines, or volunteering to change shifts.

The former organization Kenya Shell had a mechanistic structure whereby processes and procedures were very bureaucratic taking so much time. In most cases, employees were not engaged in decision making processes and a lot of time was spent before a decision was approved. This however, negatively impacted on the performance of employees leading to poor performance. Currently, Vivo Energy enjoys flexibility between employees and the management in processes and procedures especially decision making. Vivo Energy employs an organic organizational structure which allows free interaction, communication and enhanced relationships between top level management and the employees in the workplace. This has improved efficiency and effectiveness in the organization leading to an increase in productivity. (Nambaka, 2010).

Influence of employee relations strategies on organizational performance was carried out by Oguwa (2011); he stated that employee relations strategy is an integral element of organizational strategic blueprint. Employee relations strategy is the employee to employer relationship which governs the rules of employment. Oguwa (2011) insisted that employee is a major asset valued greatly by the organization. This study was set out to verify how true the statement is. The study established how employee relations strategies implemented by banking institutions in order to improve their overall organizational performance and to enhance the achievement of organizational goals. Nambaka (2010) carried out a study on the relationship between employee psychological contract and employee citizenship behavior. This was set to determine the relationship between employees’ psychological contract and organization citizenship behavior, the
study found an exchange relationship between employee’s psychological contract and organization citizenship behaviour, for instance the fulfillment of the organization's obligations towards its employees is important in explaining the willingness of employees to engage in organization citizenship behaviour. This study did not pay much attention to employee citizenship behavior instead it focused on organizational citizenship behavior.

From the above, it is evident that most studies focused on how organizational structure influence employee performance and organizational citizenship behavior. This research therefore, sought to address the following research question: Does organizational structure influence employee citizenship behavior?

1.3 Research Objective
To determine the perceived influence of organizational structure on employee citizenship behavior

1.4 Value of the study
To the energy companies, the findings from this study were to provide an insight into the effect of organizational structure on employee citizenship behavior. Information from this study was to provide clear direction that will ensure Vivo energy and their employees to feel proud to work for the company and be a key part of the organizational model by giving employees responsibility and accountability in equal measure.

Other firms were to benefit since they can be able to have a better understanding of how organization structure influences employee citizenship behavior. The findings of this study especially on employee citizenship behavior can be used by most organizations as a tool for maintaining competitive advantage against competitors. An organization that encourages employees’ citizenship behavior is able to improve its performance at a cheaper cost.
Most organizations that do not practice employee citizenship behavior can be motivated to start practicing after the realization on how employee citizenship behavior affects organizational performance. Oil companies also stand to benefit from the findings of this study since they can be able to understand how employee citizenship behavior affects organizational performance in the industry as well as devising ways of encouraging a performance culture in the organization.

Academicians and researchers may use the findings from this study as a source of reference. Besides; this study was to be a basis for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
The purpose of this section is to provide a critical evaluation of the available research evidence about Organizational structure and how it influences employee citizenship behavior in oil industry. It includes a review of the various studies that have been conducted by other researchers on organizational structure and employee citizenship behavior. Among the areas reviewed include: Organizational Structure, dimensions of organizational structure and employee citizenship behavior. The chapter also covers the conceptual framework of this study.

2.2 Theoretical Foundation of the Study
Miner (2006), classical organization theory was developed in the first half of the 20th century as a way of bringing together scientific management, bureaucratic theory and administrative theory. Scientific management focused on getting the best people and equipment, and scrutinizing each production task. Bureaucratic theory involved establishing a hierarchy to describe the division of labor in a company and recognizing the importance of specialization. Administrative theory worked to establish a set of management principles that applied to all organizations. Improvements in organization theory led to consideration of the work environment. Productivity improves in an environment with coherence of values and purpose. Organizations can succeed with a cohesive environment where subordinates are accepting of managerial authority. The key to this theory is maintaining equilibrium (Baligh & Miner, 2006).

Contingency theory deals primarily with conflict, which previous theories considered something to be avoided at all costs. Conflict is unavoidable, but according to contingency theory it is manageable. Organizations evolve to meet their own strategic needs in rational, sequential and linear ways. Adapting to changes in the environment is important to managerial and organizational success. Managers must be able to make decisions contingent on current circumstances. Systems may not always interact in a
lineal manner. Small changes in one part may cause big changes in another part, while large changes in one area may only result in small changes in another. Organizations act as systems interacting with their environment. Any equilibrium is constantly changing as the organization adapts to its changing environment (Donaldson, 1983).

Burnes (2000) postulated that mechanistic structures were developed to operate at high efficiency in stable environments and were based on the belief that organizations are rational entities in which the design of organizations is a science and people are considered as economic beings. Mechanistic organizations are structured to demonstrate the following characteristics: Clear tiers of hierarchy: Organizational vision emanates from the top (Johnson, 1992). Decision is made through a long chain and over a prolonged process, and communicated down to the employees. Functionalism: There is rigid departmental separation and work specialization (Johnson, 1992). Strong management control and centralization of power: Vertical linkages are used to coordinate corporate activities between the top and the bottom of the organization. Top management controls planning, problem solving, decision-making and directing. A higher level of formality: There are many bureaucratic and rigid rules and set procedures, and little individual freedom of action (Jamali, 2005); communication is formalized; there is restricted flow and sharing of knowledge; knowledge management process is primarily based on deduction from practices and personal skills into theorized and formalized knowledge.

Organic structure promotes a metaphor in which organizations are seen as complex and social entities featured by a collection of competing and interacting forces between individuals and social forces. The organic structure has the following dimensional characteristics: Flat and team-based. There is a shift from vertical decision making to horizontal collaboration (McCalman, 1996). Organization composition typically consists of top management, strategic groups and project teams. Divisionalized: Departmental barriers erode to facilitate cross-functional teams and integration of specialized sources of knowledge (Chandler, 1962). Decentralization of power and control: Managers empower employees to proactively participate in organizational management and promote a culture of openness and trust. A higher level of informality: There is freedom from rules; there
are more informal, face-to-face communications and two loops of communications downwards and upwards; management expands to include managing people, technology, knowledge, and processes; there is general encouragement of interaction, which is regarded as the main mechanism to create new knowledge (Hankinson, 1999).

Cross (2009) noted that organizations that have “flexible structures facilitate the development and implementation of new ideas” (p. 401). As compared to centralized rigid structures, organizations with decentralized-flexible structures support innovations because their structures facilitate open communication, and less formal decision-making processes that help accelerate innovations. It also permits managers in individual units to undertake changes that later may be adopted by other units in the organization.

2.3 Employee Citizenship Behavior
Podsakoff & MacKenzie, (1996) distinguished 30 different forms of employee Citizenship behavior. Scholars have developed a variety of taxonomies to classify these citizenship behaviors. One of the most prevalent taxonomies was propounded by Organ (1988), who differentiated five facets or factors: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. He insisted that the five factors were very important in enhancing a working culture in employees’ citizenship behavior in the organization.

According to several studies, three of these five factors can be readily distinguished by managers: sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness (Organ, 2001). Sportsmanship describes employees who are willing to tolerate difficulties in the workplace that are intended to improve the organization, abstaining from unnecessary complaints and criticisms. Civic virtue refers the active involvement, interest, and participation in the life of their organization, such as functions, events, and meetings. Conscientiousness, sometimes referred to as compliance, reflects the genuine acceptance and adherence of workplace rules, regulations, and procedures.

Some of the other factors, such as altruism and courtesy, cannot be as readily distinguished. According to Podsakoff & MacKenzie (1998), all of these factors might
correspond to a broader dimension, which they label as helping. These traits are not given so much attention in the work place. Employees who possess these characters add value in the work place working extra harder in ensuring that everything is done the right way. A different taxonomy was proposed Kelly & Borman (2005), which differentiated behaviors directed towards individuals, called organizational Citizenship behavior identification (OCBI), and behaviors directed towards the organization, called organizational Citizenship behavior while within the organization (OCBO). OCBI, for example, might include altruism, as well as the other helping behaviors such as courtesy, peacekeeping, and cheerleading. OCBO might entail conscientiousness, as well as perhaps civic virtue and sportsmanship (Karambayya, 1990).

ECB encompasses organizational-related acts such as working overtime without (expectation of) remuneration, or volunteering to organize office-wide functions. Fiol & Lyles (2001) indicated that organizational structure usually determines employee performance itself, while most authors believe structure is an outcome of employee performance. Organizational structure therefore plays a crucial role in cultivating a performance culture in employees (Baligh & Miner), encouraging the attention of other researchers. The organizational structure is arranged in form of a hierarchy of authority from the top to the bottom. The characteristics of organizational structure were also recognized as a critical element in influencing processes and procedures as well as organizational performance in the workplace. Kusluvan (2003). However, according to Fiol and Lyles (2005), the organization can have a mechanical structure or an organic structure. The structure of the organization depends entirely on the objectives of the organization; in addition, it determines the distribution of work and the functions of the organization in each and every department.

Several studies have highlighted the utility of this distinction, revealing that OCBI and OCBO correspond to a distinct set of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. For example, emotional exhaustion is positively related to OCBI but negatively related to OCBO. Furthermore, leader-member exchange, which represents the quality of
relationships between leaders and employees, is slightly more related to OCBI than OCBO (Barrick & Bobko).

2.4 Measures of Organizational Citizenship Behavior
A variety of measures and scales have been developed to assess organizational citizenship behavior. To illustrate, Podsakoff & McKenzie (1990) developed a single measure of organizational citizenship behavior. This measure, according to confirmatory factor analysis, encompasses five facets of organizational citizenship behavior: conscientiousness (e.g., "I obey company rules and regulations even when nobody is watching"), sportsmanship (e.g., "I consume considerable time complaining about trivial matters"), civic virtue (e.g., "Keeps abreast of changes in the organization"), courtesy (e.g., "I take steps to prevent problems with other workers"), and altruism (e.g., "Helps orient new people even though it is not required").

The Tucker-Lewis goodness of fit index associated with this factor model was based on a trait based research. As the importance of ECBs to organizational outcomes became evident to practitioners, attempts were made to identify traits that could predict ECB’s in potential new employees, however, from the research carried out it was evident that to date personality dimensions have not surfaced such predictors and that “job attitudes mediate any effects of personality that is, the effects of personality on ECB are mostly indirect (Kaplan & Norton, 1996).

2.5 Organizational Structure and Employee Citizenship Behavior
Organic and decentralized structures see organizations as complex and social entities, where individual and social forces compete and interact. Their main characteristics are: their flat structures, formed by top managers, strategic groups and multidisciplinary teamwork, where vertical decision making is replaced by horizontal collaboration; narrow horizontal differentiation, based on expertise and knowledge specialization rather than on operative specialization (Organ et al, 2004). This helps to remove departmental barriers leading to employee citizenship behavior.
Flexibility in the work place enhances information distribution and effective coordination, facilitating informal and bidirectional communication, thus creating a conducive environment for employee citizenship behavior, resulting in proactive employee participation and improved organizational performance (Hankinson, 1999). Organic structures also reduce the individual cognitive work, because they reduce the demands of information, and facilitate the assimilation of new patterns in the work place (Fiol & Lyles, 1985). This way, these forms improve the control in international organizations through creating a window for organizational performance that supports employee citizenship behavior (Nambaka, 2010).

An organic structure is more conducive for employee citizenship behavior. Organic structure facilitates the crossing of organizational levels and boundaries, and the communication; consequently, the relevant knowledge and expertise is today normally distributed widely among member groups within organizations (Oguwa, 2011). A mechanistic structure is less conducive to employee citizenship behavior especially in the contemporary business environment, because it encourages differentiation between units and their disassociation into separate reporting lines, this makes it difficult to adopt an employee performance culture since employees are only limited to execute responsibilities assigned. An organizational model has been designed to a working culture and innovation such as “cellular forms”, “modular forms” and “project-based networks”. These studies highlight the different ways in which firms seek to create organizational citizenship behavior which is capable of nurturing skills and reworking productive employees that add value to the organization (Fiol & Lyles, 1999).
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the research methodology that was applied in conducting the study. It discusses the research design, target population, sampling design, data collection, determination of reliability and validity as well as data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design
The research design adopted a descriptive survey since it focused on many employees within the organization. This research aimed at establishing the perceived influence of organizational structure on employee citizenship behavior at Vivo Energy Kenya. The research adopted qualitative methods of inquiry in the form of a descriptive survey design to be carried out through the use of questionnaire.

3.3 Population of the study
The population is the total collection of elements about which a researcher may wish to make some references. The target population in this study consisted of managers and employees in the three branches of Vivo Energy in Kenya. This includes Nairobi (which has a population of 160), Mombasa (which has a population of 42) and Kisumu (with 10 employees).

3.4 Sample Design
All managers were selected as key informants regarding organizational structure. Simple random sampling technique was applied in determining the appropriate sample size for employees from each of the three branches in Kenya. This technique will segment the population into few subgroups while considering geographical location. The sample size will target 33% (70 respondents out of a possible 212) According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), sampling design involves the research plan on how cases will be selected for observation.
Table 3.1 Total number of employees in the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>SAMPLE (30%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAIROBI</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KISUMU</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOMBASA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Data Collection

The study used self administered questionnaires. Questionnaires were used to collect the primary data. This method has been chosen in order to increase the possibility of a representative sample. This was sent out to the three branches of Vivo Energy Kenya countrywide. The questionnaires included structured questions which were administered through drop and pick later method to respondents. The respondents were directors, human resource managers and operations manager and since they are highly involved in governance and structuring of the organization. Employees also provided important information on ECB since they are engaged in the daily operations of the organization.

The questionnaire was organized in three sections. The first section sought data on the background of Vivo Energy Kenya, the second section on organizational structure and the third used Likert scale look at employee citizenship behavior in the organization. The questions were short and precise to avoid confusion, save time, enhance clarity and make it easier to edit and code the answers. The approach of the questionnaire aims to reduce any demand bias, and devise response scales likely to increase the variability of the response ensuring high statistical value from the data.

3.6 Data Analysis

The questionnaires were checked upon completion of the data collection process. Grouping and arranging of data with respect to specific questions was done. Descriptive statistics such as standard deviation frequencies, media, mean and mode was applied for analyzing data. The relationship between structure and employee citizenship behavior was analyzed using Chi-square (x2).
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This study was carried out to establish the perceived influence of organizational structure on employee citizenship behavior. Data was collected from Vivo Energy Kenya managers, who were in charge of all management functions at Vivo Energy and employees who are involved in the day to day operations. The findings are presented next.

4.2 Response Rate
A total of 70 questionnaires were distributed in all the three branches of Vivo Energy Kenya through their headquarters based in Nairobi County. Out of the 70 questionnaires, 50 were returned to the researcher. This represents a response rate of 71.433%. This percentage was considered sufficient for this study. The 28.57% who never returned the questionnaires cited busy schedules as the main reason for lacking time to fill them. The questionnaire was divided into three into three sections: the first section covered general information, the second section organizational structure and the third section ECB.

4.3 Demographics
4.3.1 Duration of operation
The respondents were asked about the number of years their organization had been in operation. The responses are presented in the table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of operation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ten years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Vivo Energy Kenya period of operation
The findings as illustrated in Table 4.1 above confirm that 98% of all the respondents unanimously agreed that Vivo branches in Kenya have been in operation for more than 10 years. This is a clear indication that most employees at Vivo Energy Kenya had been practicing employee citizenship behavior for a period of more than two decades now.

4.3.2 Position in the organization
The respondents were asked to indicate their various positions in the work place. This study found this information useful because, different positions in the work place come with different experiences. The sought to find out whether the different positions of the respondents had a relationship on the way organizational structure influenced ECB.

Table 4.2 Position of the respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others(Specify)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.2 above show that 73.9% of most of the respondents who participated in the study were in operations, 12.5% were managers, and 8.3% held other positions and the remaining 6.4% were assistant managers.

4.3.3 Gender Distribution
The respondents were asked to state their gender mainly to determine whether it played any role in the relationship between organizational structure and ECB. The findings are in figure 4.1
The findings in figure 4.1 that 55% of most of the respondents who participated in the study are males and 45% of the respondents were females as illustrated in the pie chart above. This is a clear indication that Vivo energy Kenya has a fair balanced gender representation between male and female in the organization. A slight difference of 5% was noted between the male and the female.

4.3.4 Educational Level

The study found the level of education important in this study because it may have influence on the key variables in the study.
From the figure 4.2 above, the study found that most of the respondents (25) were University graduates, the next 20 employees were holders of masters’ degree, 3 had diploma courses and 2 were form four leavers.

**4.3.5 Type of Structure**
This research considered the type of organizational structure as important since it determines the extent of influence of organizational structure on ECB.
From figure 4.3, most of the respondents (88%) indicated that the structure of the organization was organic while (12%) others thought it was a mechanistic type of organizational structure. Most of the respondents agreed that Vivo Energy Kenya was a private organization. This was an indication that Vivo Energy Kenya had a flexible organization structure that enhanced ECB.

This study considered the type of structure as simplifying processes in the organization. The researcher found it important to determine the extent to which organizational structure simplify processes.
The findings presented in the figure 4.4 above reports that 89% of the respondents were of the view that the type organizational structure simplify processes in the organization. The other 11% of the remaining respondents disagreed. From these findings, it is evident to conclude that the type of an organization structure an organization adopts in its operations highly determines the flexibility of the processes for example; decision making processes.

4.3.7 Length of service in the Organization

The study sought to find out the duration served by the respondents in establishing whether there was a relationship between organizational structure and ECB.
From the findings in figure 4.5, 16 respondents worked between 10-15 years, 7 respondents had served below 1 year, 6 respondents worked between 3-5 years and 5-10 years. 5 respondents worked between 20-25 years while 4 respondents worked between 15-20 years. 5 respondents worked between 25-30 years and 30-35 years. This revealed that most employees had worked for more than 15 years and thus had a vast experience on the working relationships between employees and the extent of ECB envisaged at Vivo Energy Kenya.
4.4 Organizational Structure
The research found that Vivo Energy Kenya had an organic structure. This study considered the time when this organization was introduced as important in order to establish when employees started practicing ECB.

4.4.1 Introduction of Organizational Structure
From the respondents, the study found that the organizational structure was first introduced in the year 2012 after change of corporate name from Kenya Shell to Vivo Energy Kenya.

4.4.2 Link between Organizational Structure and ECB
The researcher saw the importance of asking the extent to which organizational structure influence ECB since it was part of the research objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table, 4.4 most of the respondents 91.1% (44 respondents) indicated that organizational structure influence ECB. A few 8.3% (4 respondents) of the respondents had an opposite opinion. This was a clear indication that according to the respondents’ organizational structure highly influenced ECB.

4.4.3 Easy Communication
The researcher sought to determine the significant role of organizational structure in enhancing communication within the organization.
From the figure 4.6 above, 90% of the respondents were of the view that organizational structure plays a significant role in enhancing faster communication between the managers and the employees. With faster communication, easy flow of information and improved decision making was easily achieved. Only 10% of the respondents disagreed. This indeed was a clear indication that organizational structure highly determines flow of communication and efficiency in decision making in the organization.

4.4.4 Free Interaction

Respondents were asked to indicate whether organizational structure influenced interaction in the organization. This was important in determining the extent to which organizational structure allow interaction and relationships in the work place which was a key ingredient of ECB.
Table 4.4 Free Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 indicates that 93.8% of the respondents felt that the organizational structure allowed free interaction between employees in the workplace. The remaining 6.3% of the respondents disagreed. Generally, this showed that organizational structure had a significant influence on the extent of interaction between employees in the workplace.

4.4.5 Relationship between organizational structure and Employee Citizenship Behavior
The respondents were required to indicate the extent to which they agree with these statements on ECB at Vivo Energy in Kenya. This scale was used: 1=To a very large extent 2=Large extent 3=moderate extent 4=small extent 5=very small extent.

4.5 Employee Citizenship Behavior
4.5.1 Organizational Structure and Employee Citizenship Behavior
The study sought to determine to what extent organizational structure influences employee citizenship behavior. This was significant for the researcher to identify the kind of organizational structure that would have positive influence on ECB.
Table 4.5 Relationship between organizational structure and Employee Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of structure</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in table 4.6, association between the variables was tested using $X^2$. The results are presented in the table 4.7.

Table 4.6 Chi Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.353a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Assoc.</td>
<td>4.834</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.5 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

As evident in the table the association between organizational structure is strong and significant($X^2=14.4,P<0.05,df=3$). This finding has to be interpreted in light of the difference between organic and mechanistic structure shown in table 4.6. From this table, it is evident that there is a large difference between the overall scores of the measures of the two types of structure (organic versus mechanistic). Thus, the respondents perceived organic structure as most appropriate for promoting organizational citizenship behavior. The Converse is true for mechanistic structure.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction
This final chapter of the study chapter focused on the summary of the research findings, recommendations, limitations of the study, suggestions for further research and conclusions. The findings were presented in respect of the main objective of the study which was to determine the perceived influence of organization structure on employee citizenship behavior.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
The first objective of the study was to determine the influence of organization structure on employee citizenship behavior. Results of the study identified the following as the influence of organizational structure on employee citizenship behavior. Most of the respondents unanimously indicated that organizational structure had a significant influence on employee performance. It was clear that the organic nature of the organization highly influenced the working relationships between employees and the management. An organic structure is more conducive for employee citizenship behavior. Organic structure facilitates the crossing of organizational levels and boundaries, and the communication; consequently, the relevant knowledge and expertise is today normally distributed widely among member groups within organizations.

From the findings, respondents indicated that mechanistic organizational structure hinders innovation and new ideas in the work place. An organization structure that employs mechanistic structure create bureaucracy in key decisions which is attributable to prolonged decision making and low processes of operations. The relationship between employees and their bosses is weak due to poor relationship as a result of an enormous gap between managers and employees in the work place. Quite a number of employees at Vivo Energy Kenya affirm that flexibility in the work place was a key ingredient in enhancing employee performance leading to ECB. It was found that a few employees were more comfortable with good working environment compared to their remuneration.
They argued that poor working conditions had negative impacts on employees’ performance compared to low packages.

The findings showed clearly that Vivo energy provided adequate support to employees in the workplace, most newly employed employees with an experience of less than two years confirm overwhelming support and assistance on the job either by the managers or fellow employees. In consistence with Mintzberg (1999), employee support in the workplace highly contributes to employee performance which may lead ECB.

The study found that employees were motivated to work extra harder since hard work was rewarded and special recognition accorded to those employees who demonstrated exemplary performances. Employees contended that the level of employee performance was determined by compensation. They argued that the relationship between employees and the employer should be mutual meaning that, as the employers achieve their objectives the employees should equally achieve their objective.

The researcher sought the views of the respondents on whether the organizational structure at Vivo energy allowed free interaction between employees in the workplace. The results as illustrated in table 4.5 confirm that 93.8% of the respondents interacted freely within the organization irrespective of their positions and rankings in the workplace. 6.3% of the respondents indicated that there was no interaction between employees in the workplace. This is an indication that Vivo Energy Kenya cultivates a culture of free interaction in the workplace.

Communication is very important in any organization. The structure of an organization should be in such a way that it allows free interaction between the managers and employees of an organization. This study sought to find out whether the structure of the organization at Vivo Energy Kenya allow free interaction between employees and the relationship between them and their managers. The findings from the study indicate that 94% of the respondents agree that there was free interaction while 6% of the respondents
showed that there was no interaction. This is certainly a confirmation that there was free interaction among most of the employees at Vivo Energy Kenya.

5.3 Conclusions of the Study
The structure that an organizational adopts in its functions determines how employees relate in the work place, organizational culture, relationship between departments, motivation and most importantly employees’ performance. Most of the employees agreed that organizational structure was indispensable to achieving ECB. This view was supported by the fact that most employees who practiced ECB were encouraged by the organic structure that Vivo Energy Kenya adopted in its functions which is in line with the organizations principles of simplify, focus and perform.

5.4 Recommendations
The study recommends more training and development on ECB to educate the employees on the importance of practicing ECB. The employees should look at ECB as a norm that adds value to them and the organization through creating a conducive environment in the work place. The management should work extra harder by providing an enabling environment and leading by example in demonstrating ECB.

Some respondents were not sure whether ECB was rewarded. The study recommends that the management should reward and recognize employees who practice ECB. This helps in creating a working culture since employees are motivated to work even harder to reap benefits. Involving employees in decision making is very important since employees feel accepted and they are easily encouraged to engage in obligations that are not in their contractual obligations since their comments are considered. This also improves the relationship between employees and managers.
5.5 Suggested areas for further Study
It would be interesting to carry out further research in organizations similar to Vivo Energy Kenya in terms of size and areas of intervention. Findings can then be compared to assess if there are any commonalities or unique factors.

5.6 Limitations of the Study
A few of the respondents could not distinguish between an organic and mechanistic type of organizational structure. This was a challenge since wrong results could have been collected. Also, new employees who had served the organization longest had been there for a period slightly above two years, this meant that institutional memory had been lost through staff that had since left the organization.

As such most of the current employees in the organization were not there for long to provide sufficient information therefore most of the information they had was from the readings they had done and observations made. The researcher would have wished to interview more of the staff who were there when employees first engaged in ECB but due to time constraint and accessibility this was not done.

The study was also limited to an in-depth descriptive survey of Vivo Energy Kenya hence the findings are unique to this organization and cannot therefore be generalized to be a representation of similar organizations in the industry.
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APPENDIX I: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction

This questionnaire has been designed for the sole purpose of collecting data on the perceived influence of organizational structure on Employee Citizenship Behavior at Vivo Energy in Kenya. The data collected will be treated with a very high degree of confidentiality and it is meant for academic purposes only.

Section A: General Information

a) Name of Business (Optional) ________________________________

b) E-mail address (Optional) ________________________________

c) When did this organization start operating

   Less than 10 years [ ]  More than 10 years [ ]

Please tick your selection

1. What is your position at Vivo Energy
   a) Manager
   b) Assistant manager
   c) Operations
   d) Others (specify)............................

2. Please indicate your gender

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please Indicate your age

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Below 21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Between 22-30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Between 31-40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Between 41-50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Between 51-60 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Above 60 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please indicate your highest level of education

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Does the type of structure employed ensure employees are empowered?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. What kind of an organization is this?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Private Limited Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Public Limited Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Does the type of structure simplify processes in the organization?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How long have you been in this organization? ............... years
Section B: Organizational Structure

1. What kind of Structure does this organization have?
   Organic □   Mechanistic □

2. When this organizational structure was first introduced?

3. Do this organizational structure influence Employee Citizenship Behavior
   Yes □   No □

4. Does the organizational structure promote easy communication within the organization?

5. Does your organization structure allow free interaction between employees
   Yes □   NO □

6. Does the organizational structure involve employees in decision making?
   Yes □   NO □

7. Does the structure allow easy flow of information to employees?
   Yes □   NO □
Section C: Employee Citizenship Behavior

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements on Employee Citizenship Behavior at Vivo Energy in Kenya. The scale below will be applicable:

1= To a very large extent 2= Large extent 3= moderate extent 4= small extent 5=very small extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do your organization encourage employee citizenship behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does your organization encourage employee initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does your organization allow you to interact freely with managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does your organization allow you to assist new employees in familiarizing with the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does your organization reward employee citizenship behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Does your organizational provide room for innovation/new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does your organization consider your comments in decision making process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is employee citizenship behavior a norm in your organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does your organization recognize contributions made by employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Do you feel that the organization encourages you to perform beyond your contractual obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Can your organization be improved to enhance employee’s citizenship behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other? Please state

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for Participating