

BUSINESS STRATEGY AS A CONTRIBUTOR TO ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

MUSIBAU AKINTUNDE AJAGBE

Department of Management Sciences,
Ritman University,
Ikot Ekpene, Nigeria.
Email: ajagbetun@yahoo.com

OJOCHIDE FRED PETER

Department of Business Management,
Covenant University,
KM 10 Canaan Land,
Ota, Nigeria

EKANEM EDEM UDO UDO

Department of Management,
Ritman University,
Ikot Ekpene- Nigeria.
Email: Ekaniem.udoudo@ritmanuniversity.edu.ng

ANTHONY AKWAWA UDUIMOH

Department of Accounting and Finance,
Ritman University,
Ikot Ekpene- Nigeria.
Email: Auakwawa57@gmail.com

SUNDAY EDEM AKPAN

Department of Accounting & Finance,
Ritman University,
Ikot Ekpene- Nigeria.

Abstract

Strategies to enhance performance in business organizations are of great importance to organization leaders in today's business environment. Research relating to both large, medium, small and micro sized firms constantly emphasized a positive relationship between business strategies, management activities and organisational performance. This is because it is often detailed that best business strategies produce outstanding organisational performance. This study reviewed diverse empirical literature on business strategies and their effects on organisational performance. The authors were able to ascertain from various literature reviewed that business strategies have a major role to play in enhancing organisational performance. This study finds that recognizing the causes of organizational performance is important especially in the perspective of the current global competitive and turbulent business environment. In addition, it helps an organisation to identify those factors that should be emphasized to improve performance in business organizations.

Keywords: Business Strategy, Organizational Structure, Organizational Strategy, Organizational Performance.

1.0 Introduction

There are proofs that as business organizations continue to find proper avenues of achieving competitive edge, they also endeavour to achieve competence in every valuable area of their businesses to boost business operations which often times result to enhanced business performance. However, it is generally believed that organisational activities involve methods, processes, structures and widely embraced strategies carried out by managers to achieve set objectives (Ajagbe, 2007; Long et al., 2012a, Gemini de Alwis & Senathiraja, 2003; Mandal et al., 2008). The authors further argued that practices of business activities in organizations are made up of the ways they are able to convert values into processes for achieving organizational goals and objectives.

Srinivasan et al. (1994) termed performance as “an act of performing; of carrying out something successfully; using acquired knowledge in a unique manner from just possessing it. Lau et al. (2004) discovered a positive relationship between good organizational practices and high organizational performance. In addition, Pushpakumari & Wijewickrama (2008) reported the same outcomes that link organizational strategies, management operations and organizational performance. Mandal et al. (2008) maintained that the most suitable organizational activities yield high organizational outcomes. The acceptance of such practices based on the application of quality control ideology and instruments by management will result to a progressive enhancement in business performance (Herzberg, 1984; Henekom, 1987; Prajogo & Sohal, 2003). The fact that the world around us is constantly changing requires that change must be studied by every organisation and the various ways in which it presents itself to successfully handle and be able to move ahead of it (Crittenden & Crittenden, 2008). The levity of handling business operations in the past will no longer be applicable to the future. The events of globalisation and the development of new areas of economic and consumer activities will lead organizations to seize different opportunities globally and still be able to meet local requirements. Govinderajan (1988) argued that this ability enables organisations to diversify into different new niche markets of consumers, whose behaviour is fundamentally unpredictable. Dezember et al. (2005), believed that management must create a future where strategic management is seen by an organization as a “going concern” and for constant progress in the activities of the organization and its significance in the marketplace. This leads to product innovation, service innovation, new processes, and new business opportunities (Ajagbe et al., 2011; Ajagbe & Ismail, 2014). In view of the foregoing, it is expedient to note that constant improvements in the way business activities are run give rise to basic changes. Managerial teams should understand what is going to happen to lifestyles, technology, regulations, and so on in order to predict the future and give an edge to organisations. Figure 1 shows the conceptual research framework indicating that motivation factors are a bridge between business strategy and organisational performance.




Figure 1: Conceptual Research Framework

2.0. Literature Review

2.1. Organisation

Pryor et al. (2007) referred to an organization as the gathering of a group of people with the intention to achieve a common purpose. In view of this, the authors cited examples of a family, a society, school systems, charitable foundations and, of course, commercial ventures as typical forms of organisations. O'Reilly et al. (2010) argued that these organisations, of whatever shape or size or form, industrial or social, have to carry out four functions if they are to achieve a common goal. The researchers listed the said functions, in no priority order, as:

- Fitting in with others not in the organisation, i.e. following society's conventions, laws, satisfying external stakeholders.
- Managing the environment, getting resources, trading outputs.
- Doing practical tasks to accomplish their goal.
- Keeping those in the organisation motivated and interacting effectively.

Porter (1980) developed three potentially successful generic strategies for creating a defensible position and outperforming competitors in an organisation. Pryor et al. (2007) explained that the first strategy, which is overall cost leadership, although not neglecting quality, service, and other areas, emphasizes low cost relative to competitors. The second strategy, differentiation, requires that the firm creates something, either a product or a service that is recognized industry wide as unique, thus permitting the firm to command higher than average prices. The third is a focus strategy, in which the firm concentrates on a particular group of customers, geographic markets, or product line segments. Porter (1980) supported that the generic strategies represent three broad types of strategies and hence, the choice of strategy "can be viewed as the choice of which the organisation competes in". Pryor et al. (2007) highlighted that business firms oriented towards specific strategies should outperform firms characterized by Porter as "stuck in the middle." Porter maintains that this latter class of firms, by failing to develop a strategy along at least one of these lines, is almost guaranteeing low performance and profitability (1980).

2.2. Business Strategy

Long et al. (2012b) defined Strategy as large scale action plans for interacting with the environment in order to achieve long-term goals. Pushpakumari & Wijewickrama (2008) posit that Strategy is a pattern of actions and resource allocations designed to achieve the goals of the organization. Long et al. (2012a) views Strategy as the determination of long-term goals and objectives, the adoption of courses of action and associated allocation of resources required to achieve goals. Strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long-term which achieves advantage in a changing environment through its configuration of resources and competences with the aim of fulfilling stakeholder's expectations. Armstrong & Barron (2002) refers to Strategy as a set of decision-making behaviour in an organization for the purpose of achieving a pre-determined objective. Thompson et al. (2004) see Strategy as a game plan which management of an organization adopts to stake out market position, attract competent employees and please customers, compete successfully, conduct operations and achieve organizational goals. Strategy can therefore be viewed as a means by which a particular goal of an individual or organization is attained. This implies that for any organization to achieve its goals there is the need to devise appropriate Strategies to facilitate such. Ajagbe (2007) mentioned that in most situations, a well taught out strategy may not be fully executed as expected due to a number of obstacles, such as vision, people, resource and management. These obstacles are briefly explained below:

Vision: This is when majority of the people in the organization do not understand the strategies of the organization.

People: Most people have objectives that are different from the Strategy of the organization.

Resource: Time, energy, and money are not assigned to important activities in the organization. For example, budgets are not made in line with Strategy and this leads to wasted resources.

Management: Management devotes less time to Strategy and spends too much time on short-term tactical decision-making.

2.3 Importance of Business Strategy

Lewis (2008) argued that Strategy is an indispensable tool for an organization's success. He added that it helps a company to be more proactive than reactive in moulding its own future. Strategy also enables an organization to initiate and implement activities that could help exert control over its own destiny (Adegbuyi et al., 2015; Fadeyi et al., 2015; Maduenyi et al., 2015). Some of the functions of Strategy are stated below:

- It generates greater commitment to achieve objectives, to implement Strategies, to work hard.
- Strategy well implemented aids improvement in sales, profitability and productivity.
- It can improve understanding of competitors Strategies. A good SWOT can help us to understand the difference with our competitors, including the awareness of threats.
- It helps to reduce resistance to change.
- It helps to objectively define management problems.
- It provides a template for an organization to coordinate and control its activities.
- It enhances communication among the employees and managers.

2.4 Types of Business Strategy

Wheelen & Hunger (2006) recognized corporate, business and functional Strategies as essentials to an organisation. Corporate Strategy involves the overall firm. This is the strategic decision taken at the top management level. The first major assignment is to carry out an environmental scanning by studying the business environment to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses. Ajagbe (2007) opine that it would be compared with the firm's mission, the segment of the market the organisation belongs to and the consolidation of their business activities. According to Connelly et al. (2007), the accomplishment of these gives answers to the questions Corporate Strategy must answer such as; what are the corporate performance objectives? How should the firm's resources be distributed to meet up corporate, business and functional needs? Should the policy of selection, promotion and motivation of employees change? Aamodt (2007), posits that Business Strategy focuses on where an organisation has competitive advantage, that is, where to compete, and how, in order to outrun their competitors. Management should carry out the business operations in alignment with overall Corporate Strategy. Boyne et al.(2003) added that the methodology for building a Business Strategy includes developing the mission of the business, carrying out another environmental scanning and scrutinizing the key activities of the value chain. The results direct the Business Strategy, programs and budget of an organisation. The functional level includes strategies of various functional units such as finance, human resource, information technology and marketing etc. to carry out the objectives and mission set at the Corporate and Business Strategy levels. This is realized by developing action plans and setting budgets. With regards to the strategic planning process, it is not a top-down or bottom-up flow of

ideas. Armstrong (2003) argued that it is a consolidation of objectives from managers at the corporate level combined with a flow of cooperation of program and budget alternatives from the business and functional levels. If all these are sincerely carried out, the strategic planning process encourages broad participation at all levels, a wealth of ideas and creativity, consensus and clarity in moving forward. Everyone is aware of what to do, when to do it and why it is to be done.

2.5 Strategy Formulation

Boyne et al. (2003) stated that in many business corporations, there are two key processes through which Strategy is crafted. The conscious and analytical process is the first, this involves assessing the structure of the market, competitive strengths and weaknesses, the nature of customer requirements, and the drivers of market growth. Strategy here is normally formulated with a discrete beginning and end. Fredriksson (2004) thinks that the process is a deliberate technique of formulating Strategy. The author mentioned that this type of Strategy can be adopted as it is suggested when the following three requirements are fulfilled; Firstly, employees must understand the cogent details in management's intention while formulating the Strategy. Secondly, there is need to make as much sense to each of the members in the organization as they view the world from their own dimension, as it does to higher executives. Thirdly, the joint ambition must be realized with little unanticipated external political influence as well as technological or market forces. Lewis (2008) contributed that the difficulty in finding situations where all three of these terms apply makes it quite improbable that an anticipated Strategy can be adopted without substantial alteration. The second Strategy-making process is identified as emergent Strategy. This is the cumulative impact of daily prioritization of decisions made by middle level executives, engineers, salespeople and financial personnel. Ihunda (2007) stressed that they are decisions made despite, or in the absence of, intentions. He therefore concludes that executives often do not craft these decisions as strategic at the time they are made.

2.6 Strategy Implementation

There is the concern that when anxious and creative processes of formulating new strategies for business firms are concluded, top executives are often frightened and lost when it comes to the implementation of such Strategy. Ibrahim et al. (2012) argued that the executives wonder how they can move from great plans for a successful future to actions that will translate to improved organisational performance. They emphasized that there is a difference between having a Strategy in mind and actually executing such. In addition, several strategies never make it into the real business operations (Kim & Mauborge, 1993). In a study conducted by Slater & Olsen (2005), they found that a firm's performance is strongly influenced by how well it's Strategy is matched with its Organizational Structure and Employee Behaviour. They saw many organizations adopted Structures and encouraged behaviours that reinforce their Market Strategy and concluded that firms that match Structure and Behaviour to Strategy fare better than those that do not. This shows the connection of strategy, structure and behaviour. Lewis (2008) reported consistency with such thinking that matching Organisational Structure and Behaviour with Strategy is connected with superior performance.

3.1 Organizational Structure

Ibrahim et al. (2012) defines Organizational Structure as the way jobs are divided, where decisions are made and how work roles are coordinated. The role of Organization Structure is to facilitate the performance of firms through the implementation of Strategy. Dezember et al. (2005) stated that for an organization to manage its strategies well in

practice a good Structure is required. Lewis et al. (2001), viewed the Structure of an organization as an authority and responsibility for result achievement. They added that the Structure of an organization takes the shape of a pyramid. It is made up of the following:

- Formal relationships with well-defined duties and responsibilities.
- Hierarchical relationships between superior and subordinates within the organization.
- Tasks or duties assigned to different persons and the departments.
- Co-ordination of the various tasks and activities.
- Set of policies, procedures, standards and methods of evaluation of performance which are formulated to guide the people and their activities. All these together sum up an Organisational Structure which can positively impact Organisational Performance if well combined.

3.2 Organizational Behaviour

Crittenden & Crittenden (2008) described Behaviour as things that concern individual persons in a business organization. The authors added that it is the reactions of the staffs and managers at each level of the organizational hierarchy to situations in such business organisation. Crittenden & Crittenden posit that behaviours of individuals should be consistent with the Strategy of that organization (2008). According to Lorange (1998), human resources become the main resource on which to focus the implementation of an organization's Business Strategy. MacMillan (1978) believed that there is a need to build high degree of commitment by employees to key strategic decisions. He added that people are motivated more by their perceived self-interest than by the organizational interest unless these interests align. Crittenden & Crittenden (2008) suggested that behaviour can be influenced by; involvement and integration of lower levels, combination of technical skills, interpersonal skills and sensitivity to the needs of other functions, balance between powerful charismatic leadership and sufficient autonomy for members, consistency of leadership, effective and executive leader, cultural context, system of shared values. The motivation of middle level executives to adopt certain Organizational Strategy was studied by Guth & MacMillan (1986). They reported that if middle managers believe that their self-interest is compromised they are likely to redirect, delay or totally sabotage the adoption of such Strategy. Curren (1996) believe organisations can increase commitment with involvement and integration of employees from lower levels. Such suggested involvement will create a kind of ownership, which enormously could boost morale, hence, resulting to high Organisational Performance.

4.0 Motivational Theories

This section is based on the premise that various theoretical concepts focus on different issues regarding Business Strategy and Organizational Performance. Guth & MacMillan (1986), identifies that motivation serves as a bridge between effective implementation of Business Strategy and Organisational Performance and hence, Employee Motivation propels improved Organizational Performance.

4.1 Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

In 1943, Abraham Maslow, a Psychologist proposed the hierarchy of human needs theory as one of the motivational theories (Peretomode, 1991; Adegbuyi et al., 2015). The theory focussed on the variables within individuals that start, propel, energize, direct, maintain and stop behaviour. These variables can spur or dampen human behaviour in the sense that if it is positive it may result to satisfaction and if otherwise may lead to employee dissatisfaction.

Obi in Ndu et al. (1997) reported that motivation is seen as a difficult socially learned pattern of behaviour which is made up of situations, needs, desires, mechanisms and outcomes. They added that motivation involves all areas of an individual's efforts to achieve personal as well as organizational objectives. Peretomode (1991) further stated that motivation consists of the process of inducing someone to take actions that will achieve set goals. Hence, employee motivation is a Strategy of empowering them in carrying out their assigned tasks; it is adopted by senior executives to provide a conducive work atmosphere aimed at satisfying the needs of their personnel. It is very essential that organizational personnel be motivated in order to achieve higher levels of productivity, effectiveness, efficiency and dedication to task accomplishment. Obi (1997) agreed that this will also lead to high commitments in the achievement of organisational goals. Peretomode (1991) believes that worker's motivation has a positive relationship with purposeful and goal-directed action, performance and positive approaches towards work. It involves examining such factors as the physiological, psychological and environmental needs of individual employees. It also results into job satisfaction which one derives from his job and the work environment (Peretomode, 1991; Guth & MacMillan, 1986).

There are five basic human needs suggested by Maslow and listed in hierarchical order. They are arranged based on the degree of relevance an individual attaches to each need: starting with the lowest (most basic need) – physiological, safety and social needs and the higher needs- ego or esteem need and self-actualization. Adegbuyi et al. (2015) argued that Physiological needs comprise the need to satisfy basic biological requirements which include the need for food, shelter, clothing, water, air, sexual satisfaction and others. It is only after the basic needs are met to a certain extent that an individual starts to think of the next order of needs. The salary an employee earns from an organisation enables him to satisfy these basic needs but if not paid then it results into dissatisfaction which in turn negatively affects productivity and leads to low performance in the work place. However, Safety needs arise when basic needs have been attained to an appreciable extent. This is made up of the need for security, safety, protection against danger and accidents (threats, deprivation, psychological harm, economic disaster) and stability in the physical and internal events of day to day life. Organizational personnel are concerned about the safety of their place of work and place of residence. This they believe if not certain may result to poor commitment to work and hence, lower performance. Peretomode (1991) noticed that these needs are often provided for in the organisation in form of fringe benefits, promotion, retirement or pension schemes, insurance benefits, welfare benefits, free or subsidized medical and health services, job security and safe-working environment. If the physiological and safety needs are provided to an appreciable level, then the social need surfaces. Ejiogu (1990) laid emphasis on the need to maintain a democratic atmosphere in a firm since employees are complex human beings and they are experts in their areas of specialization. What is important is to make available a working environment that will aid them to perform their duties more effectively and gives room for professional improvement and job satisfaction in the organization. After the lower needs have been satisfied to a level then the higher needs begin to manifest as Maslow propounded. The higher needs are: the ego or esteem needs involving the need for respect, prestige, recognition, self-esteem, status, personal sense of competence, and the self-actualization needs involving the need for growth, achievement, advancement and self-fulfilment (Peretomode, 1991; Fadeyi et al., 2015). For these self-esteem needs to be satisfied in the organisation it will involve delegating duties to the lower rank with autonomy to exercise power to an extent by superior officers; recognising of workers' competences and proficiency; job title and responsibilities; encouraging performance through financial benefits or merit pay, giving praise and commendations to workers. The feeling of discouragement

and dissatisfaction sets in towards their job when these needs are not satisfied. With the satisfaction of these social needs employees experience the feeling of self-worth, adequacy and self-confidence which result into commitments, proper dedication to duty and boost in performance. Ejiogu (1990) mentioned that Self-actualization needs mean giving opportunities to staffs to become more and more what they aspire to be, this gives them the freedom to be creative and innovative on their job. This can be attained through knowledge acquisition aimed to improve performance.

4.2 Herzberg Hygiene Theory

Ejiogu (1990) reported that the motivational-hygiene hypothesis of Herzberg came to be due to a study carried out on the causes of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of some engineers and accountants in the United States of America. The researcher found that there is qualitative difference between those factors which are related to a person's job satisfaction and those associated with job dissatisfaction. However, Peretomode (1991) affirmed certain variables known as dissatisfiers negatively impact on staffs efficiency, productivity and performance. In other words, the satisfiers are those variables that impact motivation and job satisfaction, they are: workers achievement, promotion, responsibility, the work itself, possibility of personal growth while factors such as workers salary, status, job security, working condition, company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships with superiors, subordinates and peers; if these are negatively applied can cause dissatisfaction among the personnel and negatively impact productivity. Akale (2002) stressed that the dimensions that can result to job satisfaction are referred to as motivators/satisfiers. They are; job recognition, job enrichment, job advancement and job achievement. The dimensions that can result to job dissatisfaction are known as hygiene factors e.g. company policy and administration, strict supervision, interpersonal relations and bad working environment. Adegbuyi et al. (2015) suggested that employees should be lavished with such motivational variables that will positively impact performance, competence and productivity. The researchers concluded that the presence of such motivational variables will automatically result to a feeling of job satisfaction and in the opposite direction if they are absent.

4.3 Equity Theory

Ejiogu, (1985) posits that equity theory affirms that the major manner an individual assesses his task is by making comparison between his job exposure with that of other people in other professions. This has a relationship between his feelings and performance on the job. For example, teachers are considered as poorly paid professionals when compared with their counterparts in engineering, banking and medicine especially in developing countries such as Nigeria. Maduenyi et al. (2015) found that this has affected the elevation of classroom teachers, their salary and remuneration, fringe benefits particularly in schools owned by private individuals, hence, influencing negatively their commitment, productivity and performance at work. The equity theorists believe that the feeling of an individual at work in terms of satisfaction or non-satisfaction is because of the calculation of the ratio of the person's contribution on the job to the outputs he receives from the job. Alake (2002) thinks that an employee can be happy and satisfied with his pay and other benefits only if he feels that what he is being paid is comparable with what someone else with similar backgrounds and in similar position is receiving. The theory further pointed that "even if a man's job meets his needs, he will not show being satisfied with it if he feels that some comparable jobs give better satisfaction even with less effort". Shin (2000) opines that in any business organization, the equity theory is connected to employees' salary, remuneration, working

conditions and other benefits. Maduenyi et al. (2015) added that equity theory draws attention to the role of social comparisons in enhancing satisfaction.

5.0 Organisational Implications of the Motivational Theories

Fadeyi et al. (2015) reported that the motivational theories have great implications on performance in an organisation. Satisfaction of the motivational factors propels high productivity leading to increased performance and quality assurance in an organisation. The motivational theories are very important to management for coordinating and controlling activities within the organisation. With this opinion, Ejiogu (1990) opined that “employees’ motivation is responsible for control and coordination of activities in a given organization”. The author cited staff training and development as among the most essential factors for efficient and effective administration in an organisation. Ajagbe (2007) is of the view that it enables employees realize better ways of carrying out their task by acquiring skills required for proficiency leading to enhanced performance. The theories also influence employees’ job satisfaction levels either negatively or positively. When used negatively in an organisation, it causes dissatisfaction which results into resentment, withdrawal, neglect of duty and negative outcomes. But when adopted positively, it boosts satisfaction which produces increased commitment, productivity and outstanding performance. Fredrickson (2004) argued that a strong bond exists between employee’s motivation, job satisfaction and job performance. The relationship among these variables have implications for business organisations. There is also a close relationship between employees’ stability and efficiency in the organisation. Experienced employees contribute to increased efficiency in the organisation. Adegbuyi et al (2015) stressed that employee motivation is of utmost relevance when it comes to their stability and turnover in an organisation. In another dimension, motivational factors also influence the degree of participation of workers in decision making, innovative and creative contributions, and high levels of their commitment to duty. The dissatisfaction of employees to their job rewards could eventually result to labour turnover.

6.0 Organisational Performance

According to Boyne et al. (2003), information on performance is very important to management of any organization. It helps management to ascertain whether the organization is improving, deteriorating or stagnant. Organisational performance is measured by the reliability, competence and cooperation of other functional units. For example, the performance of a business firm is dependent on the supplier quality, decision flexibility, product delivery, cost performance and prompt response to essential issues (Shin, 2000). However, financial performance has been generally adopted as a yardstick to determine business performance, some authors have used operational performance indicators such as various areas of time-based performance in different levels of the total value delivery cycle (Jayaram et al. 1999). The suggested time-based performance includes delivery speed (Handfield & Pannesi, 1992), new product development time (Vickery et al., 1995), reliability of delivery time (Roth & Miller, 1990), new product introduction (Safizadeh, 1996), manufacturing lead-time (Handfield & Pannesi, 1992) and responsiveness of customers (Hendrick, 1994). In addition, to be able to determine business performance, a few authors recently used a market performance calculator that describes a wider view of business performance and emphasizes on variables that ultimately result to financial performance (Vorhies & Morgan, 2005). Also, it enables organizations to adjust with a view to improving on their services for survival and growth.

Armstrong & Barron (2002) put forward that Organisational performance is a strategic and an encircling technique to deliver continued prosperity to businesses by enhancing performance

of the people who are employees and by building the capability of the teams and individual contributions. It involves running the organization, everyone in the organisation, improving commitments to duties, employee development, stakeholders' satisfaction and finally, communication and involvement (Armstrong, 2003; Maduenyi et al., 2015). Organizational performance lean on the philosophy of management by acceptance or agreement rather than management by command. The focus is on building and introducing self-improved learning process as well as the integration of individual and corporate goals. It is a non-stop and flexible process that includes superiors and their subordinates within an organisation, how they can best work together to achieve the required results. Lewis (2008), believes that its focus is on future outcome planning rather than of retrospective performance assessment. It gives room for frequent communication between managers and subordinates/teams on performance and development requirement. Organisational performance lies on re-assessment to make decisions on related pay, as well as individual/team development plans etc. It is also a process for determining outcomes in the form of delivery of performance in comparison to expectations expressed via objectives, targets, standards and performances indicators. Organisational performance is a chain that links organizational vision, missions, values and strategic goals to divisional, departmental and individual goals, objectives and tasks/ targets together (Henekom et al., 1987; Armstrong, 2003; Hughes, 2003). Determining organizational performance strongly has an impact on the behaviour of people from within and outside of an organization. The approach employed by the organization needs to be an all-inclusive one that is derived from its Strategy and capabilities (Kaplan & Norton, 1992).

As Ruben (1999) has put it “one of the significant subject of modern organizational theory is the highlighting of information and measurement for evaluating, tracing and promoting organizational excellence.” Ruben added that business managers should believe in the necessity of measuring organizational performance. This is because the challenge rears its head when it comes to what should be measured and how it should be measured. Brancato (1995) stressed that profit making firms determine performances using a financial accounting model that focus on profitability, return on investment, sales growth, cash flow or economic value contribution (Ruben, 1999; Fadeyi et al., 2015). Today's business environment showed that finance dependent determinant have inherent setbacks to adequately represent the range of constructs connected with organizational excellence in modern times (Brancato, 1995; Kaplan & Norton, 1992; Ruben, 1999). In addition, the accounting-based measures are too narrow to capture key factors of an organization's mission, customer satisfaction and loyalty, employee satisfaction and turnover, employee capability, organizational adaptability to creativity and innovation (Ajagbe & Ismail, 2014), environmental competitiveness, research and development, productivity, market growth and success, and other important indicators. O'Reilly et al. (2010), identified some performance enhancing strategies which are explained below;

6.1 Corporate Social Responsibility and Performance

The concept of social responsibility is relatively new and the question is: what has been responsible for the upsurge in demands for social responsibility? Ojedele & Fadipe (1999) argued that the demand for social responsibility is largely the price of the success of the business system. Furthermore, it arises from the growing disenfranchisement with government and the growing disbelief in the ability of government to solve major social problems. This, social responsibility often arises from the societal impacts of business organizations. Also as a result of the problems of society itself, in effect, what organizations do to society and what they can do for the society. O'Gorman (2006) stressed that a healthy business cannot exist in a sick society, this means that management has self- interest in a healthy society. Based on

the above conceptual background, Ihunda (2001) defined social responsibility as the duty of a business enterprise to ensure that it does not disrupt the life of the community in which it operates. He went further to stress that, social responsibility is a show of interest for the well-being of the people in a society, which stops business from engaging in destructive activities, whatever their immediate profitability and their fears are on positive contributions to the betterment of society. Ihunda (2007) contends that the earliest definitions of business social responsibility focused on some key areas such as the extent to which a manager must compromise his loyalty and responsibility to his organization. In addition, it also involves maintaining customer satisfaction by reducing consumer complaints. Indeed, it involves cooperating and working hand-in-hand with government by helping to set natural objectives and creating the framework and infrastructures that will help individual components in the economy to promote growth and development (Ihunda, 2007; O’Gorman, 2006). It was argued that the belief that the most important function of a business concern is profit maximization only is unjustifiable as it is socially detrimental. Wheelen & Hunger (2006) also pointed out that making reasonable profit while contributing to the well-being of the society in which they carry out their business activities is important. This is the only continuum within which the idea of social responsibility can have positive impacts which automatically will ensure profit.

6.2. Job Satisfaction and Organisational Performance

Akale (2002) argued that strong positive linkage exist between organisational commitment and desirable work outcomes such as performance, adaptability and employee satisfaction. Riggio (2009) opine that satisfied workers tend to be committed to an organisation, and workers who are satisfied and committed are more likely to attend work, stay with an organisation, arrive at work on time, perform well and engage in behaviours helpful to the organisation. According to Kotze & Roodt (2005), a strong relationship was reported among job satisfaction, employee commitment and retention. However, organisational performance is most often affected by variables such as type of work, variety of work, the autonomy involved in the job, the level of responsibility connected with the job, the quality of the social interaction at work, rewards and remuneration, and the opportunities for promotion and career advancement in the organization (MacMillan, 1978; Aamodt, 2007; Riggio, 2009).

6.3. Training and Development and Organisational Performance

Riggio (2009) described training and development as a subsystem embedded within the many operations of personnel functions. The author added that people are the most dynamic of all resources of any organization; consequently, substantial attention must be given to human development capabilities in the organization. Aamodt (2007) opine that training is the preparation of individuals in an organization for a task, job or an occupation by getting particular skills needed. Training is usually connected to the job rather than personal. Armstrong (2003) viewed development as a wider perspective of knowledge and skills acquisition than training, it is more career-centred; it emphasized on developing individuals’ potential rather than his immediate skill; it sees personnel as flexible resources who are adjustable to situations. Training, as reported by Armstrong (2003) is the use of integrated and planned instruction mechanism to encourage learning. Training enables the implementation of formal processes to instil knowledge and help workers get the needed skills to satisfactorily carry out their duties. The emphasis on training is drawn to practical skills which is concerned with the adoption and utilization of techniques and processes (Cole, 2005; Okoh, 2005). Hence, training is investing in individuals to allow workers perform their assigned tasks effectively and efficiently, and in other words empowering them to put into the best use of their natural endowments. Obi (1997) is of the opinion that training is a

progression that enhances the development and improvement of skills which are related to performance. The aim of training, as enumerated by Armstrong are to develop the skills and know-how of employees to enhance performance; to help workers stabilize within the organisation, to decrease the learning period for employees who are on new appointment, transfer or promotion, and ensure that they are fully equipped for the job. Ajagbe et al. (2011) argued that development is the method whereby an employee is given opportunities to grow on the assigned job, by acquiring a wide range of experience, in-depth and growing confidence which results from varied and tested responsibilities. Long et al. (2013b) posit that the concept also entails learning that is not directly related to the employee's current job. Rather, development makes employees to be prepared to take up other positions in the organisation and increases their ability to navigate into jobs which may not yet be in existence. Armstrong & Barron (2002) contributed that development may also help to prepare employees for changes in their current responsibilities, such as changes that can come up from new technology, work designs or customers. Development therefore is about preparing for change in the form of new jobs, new responsibilities, or new requirements. Development is so important for employees in a firm in order to improve quality and to meet the challenges of globalisation and social change (Ndu et al., 1997; Cole, 2005; Okoh, 2005). The employee is seen as a 'learning customer' in the organisation, bringing personal opinion and motivation to his job, thereby displaying innovation and creativity in his managerial skills. Researchers found there are a great deal of relationships between training, development strategies, job satisfaction, competitive advantage and organisational performance (Jayaram, 1999; Kotze & Roodt, 2005). In learning organizations, training has been related to both corporate strategy and organizational performance: training must be in line with organizational strategy in order to result in high performance (Vorhies & Morgan, 2005). Training propels organizations to carry out analysis effectively by scanning the internal and external environment of their work (Wernerfelt & Barney, 1991).

6.4. Communication and Organisational Performance

Thompson et al. (2004) noted that, "although an organisation is devoted to the study of organizational strategy, including strategy implementation; much attention has not been given to the relationship among communication, strategy and performance." The authors pointed out that researchers in the communication domain have become keen in the contribution of corporate communication to a firm's ability to fashion and pass across its strategy to all strata of employee in the last decade. Vickery et al. (1995) mentioned that the content of the communications agenda is; clearly describing the new responsibilities, tasks, and duties required to be carried out by the staffs, the reasons for changed responsibilities, and basically the reasons for new strategic decisions. Rumelt (1984) found that organizations where employees can easily access management via open and supportive communication environment outperform those with more restraining communication environments. Also the findings of Porter (1985) show that effective and efficient communication is a key prerequisite for outstanding strategy implementation. Organizational communication plays a pivotal role in training, knowledge dissemination and learning during the implementation process of strategy. In fact, communication cuts across every aspect of strategy implementation, because it is concerned with a complex way of organizing processes, organizational context and implementation objectives which, in turn, have an effect on performance. Herzberg (1984) argued that barriers of communication are visibly seen than any other type of barriers, such as organizational structure barriers, learning barriers, personnel management barriers, or cultural barriers. These communication problems may be influenced to some extent by the organizational hierarchy. Shin (2000) states that communication and shared understandings play a significant role in the process of carrying

out assigned duties. Particularly, when vertical communication is frequent, strategic consensus is enhanced and an organisational performance is positively impacted on. The study of Safizadeh (1996) in a fast food industry in America revealed that senior-level employees do not communicate the company's vision and business strategy to all of their subordinates. This survey also strengthens findings that frequent up and downward communication in an organization enhances strategic co-operation through the promotion of shared attitudes and values. Communication serves as the tentacles of an organization for harvesting reactions from key areas to the strategy of the firm. Srinivasan & Cooper (1994) discovered that the alliance between corporate communication function and strategy implementation process was particularly visibly seen in those firms that were going through basic strategic change: "All of the firms surveyed were actively involved in significant efforts in communications and felt that it was the hub of prosperity of an organisation.

6.5. Employee Autonomy and Organisational Performance

Autonomy refers to the independent actions of an individual or a team in bringing forth an idea or a vision and carrying it through to completion (Roth & Miller, 1990; Lewis, 2008). To encourage autonomy, business uses both 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' methods. The top-down technique includes areas such as management support for programmes, giving incentives that will motivate an atmosphere that fosters independent decision-making. Rhodes (2011) is of the opinion that such business policy features are cogent to organisational prosperity. To foster autonomy in an organisation from the bottom up, it will require putting in place special incentives and make structural adjustment designed to encourage and build support for employees' initiatives and creativity. Ruben (1999) added that many firms have been engaged in actions such as flattening levels and delegating authority to functional units. Although these changes are put in place to encourage autonomy, the process of business autonomy needs much more than an alteration in structural design of an organisation. Solomon et al. (2012) suggested that Organisations must actually allow autonomy, and employees must be encouraged to carry out their duties freely. Autonomy, however, is made up of one of the cores for innovation and creativity amongst employees (Srinivasan & Cooper, 1994; Ajagbe & Ismail, 2014), and businesses that depend on initiatives to generate new values and progress must encourage autonomy behaviour by letting employees act and think more freely (Thompson et al., 2004). Autonomy is therefore a vital ingredient to the process of taking advantage of a business's existing strengths, identifying new opportunities and inspiring the development of new ventures and improvement on the current business techniques. Prior research by Long et al. (2013a), also supports the view that autonomy propels innovation. Ajagbe & Ismail (2014), stipulate that the launching of new ventures raises the competitiveness and effectiveness of a business concern.

6.6. Customer orientation and Organisational Performance

Slater & Olson (2001) initially defined customer orientation as the clear understanding of an organisation's target market in order to be able to repeatedly develop higher value for them. Hanfield & Pannesi (1992) view customer orientation as a set of task-oriented behaviours, which helps in identifying the needs and wants of the target market, delivering products and services that will satisfy these needs and wants are key to attaining organisational goals of achieving high performance (Penrose, 1959; Akale, 2002). In another opinion, Hanfield & Pannesi (1992) believe that customer orientation is also made up of behaviours intended at fostering a personal relationship with the customer, which is, getting to personally know the customer. It is not surprising that the essence of a customer orientation within the corporate world is gaining grounds, especially today's globalised environment where there is increasing competition in addition to the pressure of rapidly changing customers' tastes. It is important

to note that the association between market/customer orientation and organisational performance has been widely studied (Brancato, 1999; Boyne et al., 2003). Evidence exist that organisations that practise customer orientation and fully understand customers' expressed and latent needs are better off than those that do not. This is expressed in terms of better satisfying these needs creatively and innovatively which in essence leads to higher customer satisfaction and increased organisational performance (Crittenden & Crittenden, 2011).

7.0. Business Strategy and Organisational Performance

Slater & Olson (2001) posit that no matter how super a strategy is, it has to be well implemented to achieve the desired results. The authors believes that effective implementation of strategy is very important to organization's ability to achieve and maintain competitive advantage over other organizations. They also found a positive relationship between strategy and corporate performance. However, Ajagbe (2007) argued that without a clearly defined strategy, a business will have no sustainable basis for creating and maintaining a competitive advantage in the industry where it operates. There are also opinion that effective strategy planning and implementation has positive contribution to the over-all performance of organizations. Long et al. (2013a) supported that when the strategies have been cascaded down to the operational level for delivery by the organisation's workforce where their execution is critical, they are seamlessly flown and aligned into high performance. Pryol et al. (2007) stressed that effective performance should begin with a clear understanding of the organisation's strategic process. They added that organisational performance is a critical success factor for a flawless implementation of strategy. This implementation is achieved by linking the organisation's strategic goals and objectives with its budget and operational systems in order to achieve organisational efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.

8.0. Conclusion

The aim of this study is to find out the contribution of business strategy to organizational performance considering the motivational factors implemented by business managers. Hence, the study finds that the highly competitive, technology driven, knowledge intensive nature of today's business environment makes it imperative for business managers to develop a clear mandate in form of appropriate business strategy that will propel higher organizational performance for firms to achieve their desired goals and objectives. This is indicated in the belief that Strategy determines performance. Once organisational strategies are properly matched with organisational goals, it propels organisational performance. Strategy is the main direction of an organization, which is set at the top and has major importance for the survival of an organization. Often managers think that an outstanding strategy alone will guaranty effective performance and competitive advantage for their organization. This paper tries to expose that for a successful organisation, strategies should be linked with performance and performance is propelled by motivation. The interplay of strategies, motivation and performance gives birth to a highly successful organisation. Several evidences were found to justify that a firm's performance is strongly influenced by how well it's Strategy is aligned with its Organizational Structure and Employee Behaviour. This study also found that majority of firms that implemented appropriate Strategy in a properly aligned Structure and encouraged behaviours that reinforce performance are better than their counterpart that do not. This shows the connection among Strategy, Structure and Behaviour which eventually result to superior Performance.

Acknowledgement

The researchers wish to thank the Covenant University, Canaan Land, Ota, Nigeria for providing some of the facilities that enhanced the compilation of this article.

References

- Ajagbe, A. M. & Ismail, K. (2014). Factors Influencing Venture Capital Assessment of High Growth Companies in Malaysia. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 21(4): 457-494.
- Ajagbe, A. M. (2007). *The Impact of Strategic Planning on Effectiveness of Marketing Operations: Case of NEPA*. An Unpublished MBA Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School, Ambrose Ali University, Ekpoma, Nigeria.
- Ajagbe, A. M., Oluyinka, S. & Long, S. C. (2011). The Relationship between Strategic Planning and the Effectiveness of Marketing Operations. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 2(5), 390-396.
- Adegbuyi, A., Oke, A. O., Worlu, R. E. & Ajagbe, A. M. (2015). Archival Review of the Influence of Organizational Strategy on Organizational Performance. In the Proceedings of the Covenant University International Conference on African Development Issues (CU-ICADI 2015) held on 11-13th May, 2015, pp. 334-340.
- Aamodt, A. A. (2007). Strategic Human Resource Management Effectiveness and Firm Performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2): 299-310.
- Akale, A. K. (2002). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Armstrong, R. (2003). *Productive Workplaces: Organizing and Managing for Dignity, Meaning, and Community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Armstrong, G. & Barron, O. (2002). *Strategic Thinking and the New Science : Planning in the Midst of Chaos Complexity and Change*. New York: Free Press.
- Brancato, C. (1995). 'Why change programs don't produce change' in T.D. Jick (ed), *Managing Change, Concepts and Casps*, Boston: Kirwin.
- Balanced Scorecard Collaborative, (2002). "Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work", *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, pp. 134-147.
- Boyne, B., Farrell, S., Law, A., Powell, G. & Walker, V. O. (2003). "Corporate Governance and Expected Stock Returns: Evidence from Germany", *European Financial Management*, 10 (2): 267-293.
- Curran, B. B. (1996). Pre-start-up planning sophistication and its impact on new venture performance in Germany. In M. Fink & S. Kraus (Eds.), *Management in SMEs and New Ventures* (p. forthcoming). London: Routledge.
- Cole, C. L. (2005). Impact of HR Practices on Perceived Firm Performance in Indian. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 42, 301 – 317

Connelly, L. L., Hitt, Y. Z., DeNisi, I. S. & Ireland, A. A. (2007). *The Strategy Process*. London: Prentice Hall.

Crittenden, V. L. & Crittenden, W. F. (2008). "Building a capable organization: The eight levers of strategy implementation", *Business Horizons*, 51, 301-309.

Dezember, O., Slater, S. F. & Hult, T. M. (2005). "The importance of structure and process to strategy implementation", *Business Horizons*, 48, 47-54.

Ejiogu, E. J. (1990). Skills for Managing Human Resources in a Complex Environment: The Perceptions of Human Resource Managers in Singapore. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6 (1): 79-101.

Fredriksson, F. K. (2004). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fadeyi, O., Adegbuyi, A., Oke, A. O. & Ajagbe, A. M. (2015). Review of Organizational Strategy and Structure (1962-2015). In the Proceedings of the Covenant University International Conference on African Development Issues (CU-ICADI 2015) held on 11-13th May, 2015, pp. 341-348.

Gamini, D. A. & Senathiraja, B. (2003). *Uncommon sense, common nonsense: why some organizations consistently outperform others*, London: Profile Books.

Govindarajan, V. (1988). "A contingency approach to strategy implementation at the business-unit level: integrating administrative mechanisms with strategy", *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(4): 828-853.

Guth, W. D. & MacMillan, I. C. (1986). Implementation Versus Middle Management Self-Interest, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Jul. -Aug., 1986), pp. 313-327.

Handfield, D. & Pannesi, A. (1992). *Global Mind Change: The Promise of the 21st Century* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Herzberg, F. (1984). "Mystery systems shape loyalties". *Industry Week*, 12 November, 101-104

Hendrick, K. (1994). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Henekom, K. (1987) *Managing the Unknowable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ihunda, I. H. (2007). Human Resource Systems in Kenya: A Case Study of Hotel Human Resources performance. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 49, 413-427.

Ibrahim, O. O., Alawaye, J. K. & Abosede, S.O. (2012). The middle management perspective on strategy process: contributions, synthesis, and future research. *Journal of Management*, 34(6): 1190-1221.

Jayaram, J. (1999). *Designing Your Organization: Using the STAR Model to Solve 5 Critical Design Challenges*, Jossey-Bass.

Kotze, Z. K. & Roodt, O. O. (2005). Linking Competitive Strategies with Human Resource Management Practices. In Strategic Human Resource management, eds R. Schuler and S. Jackson, 159-76. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Kim, M. & Mauborgne, R. (1993). Strategies for Success, Local Government Management Board, Oxfordshire: Henley.

Lewis, I. (2008). "The quantum skills model in management: a new paradigm to enhance effective leadership". Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 22(6): 264-273.

Lewis, L. W., Goodman, N. N. & Fandt, O. U. (2001). Uncommon sense, common nonsense: why some organizations consistently outperform others, London: Profile Books.

Lorange, P. (1998). "Strategy Implementation: the New Realities", Long Range Planning, 31(1): 18-29.

Long, C. S., Perumal, P. & Ajagbe, A. M. (2012a). The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Employees' Turnover Intention: A Conceptual Model. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 4(2): 629-641.

Long, C. S., Ajagbe, A. M., Md Nor, K. & Suleiman, S. E. (2012b). The Approaches to Increase Employees' Loyalty: A Review on Employees' Turnover Models. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 6(10): 282-291.

Long, C. S., Mahanra, R. G. & Ajagbe, A. M. (2013a). Can Employee Share Option Scheme Improve Firm's Performance? A Malaysian Case Study. Information Management and Business Review, 5(3): 119-128.

Long, C. S., Ahmad, J., Ajagbe, A. M. & Lim, C. M. (2013b). A Review on Job Stressor in the Perspective of Health Care Industry. Research Journal of Recent Sciences, 2(3): 81-86.

MacMillan, I. C. (1978). "Strategy Formulation: Political Concepts", West, St Paul, MN.

Mandal, O. O., Venta, M. E. & El-Houb, B. O. (2008). The Strategy Process. London: Prentice Hall.

Maduenyi, S., Oke, A. O., Fadeyi, O. & Ajagbe, A. M. (2015). Impact of Organizational Structure on Organizational Performance. In the Proceedings of the Covenant University International Conference on African Development Issues (CU-ICADI 2015) held on 11-13th May, 2015, pp. 354-358.

Ndu, N. D., Ocho, O. H. & Okeke, K. H. (1997). The Impact of Human Resource Management on Organizational Performance: Progress and Prospects. Academy of Management Journal, 39: 779-801

Okoh, O. O. (2005). Innovative Human Resource management and Corporate Performance in the Context of economic Liberalization in India. Thunderbird International Business Review, 49(2): 1-33

Ojedele, O. J. & Fadipe, F. P. (1999). Strategic Thinking and Strategic Planning to Optimize Organizational Performance. Paper Presented at the 18th Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management, Dunedin, New Zealand.

O’Gorman, P. (2006). Towards a theory of paradox: a dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2): 381–403.

Obi, O. B. (1997). *Strategy and Human Resources Management*. Cincinnati, OH, South Western.

O’Reilly, C. A., Caldwell, D. F., Chatman, J. A., Lapid, M. & Self, W. (2010). “How leadership matters: The effects of leaders' alignment on strategy implementation“, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 104–113.

Pryor M. G., Anderson D., Toombs L. A. & Humphreys J. H. (2007). “Strategic Implementation as a Core Competency“, *Journal of Management Research* Vol. 7, No. 1 April.

Peretomode, M. N. (1991). *Human Resource Strategy and the Impact on World-Class Status*. Total Quality Management.

Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York: The Free Press.

Prajogo, P. & Sohal, P. K. (2003). *Obliquity: why our goals are best achieved indirectly*, London: Profile Books.

Pushpakumari, A. A. & Wijewickrama, W. (2008). *21st Century Management - A Reference Handbook* (pp. 73-81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Rahman R. Sohal P. K. (2001). *Strategic Planning in New Ventures and Young SMEs*. Inc.

Penrose, R. (1959). The middle management perspective on strategy process: contributions, synthesis, and future research. *Journal of Management*, 34(6): 1190–1221.

Rhodes, J. (2011) Competition shines light on dark matter. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/06/27/competition-shines-light-darkmatter>.

Riggio, G. I. (2009). Linking the People with the Strategic Needs of the Business. *Organizational dynamics* summer: 18-32.

Rumelt, E. (1984). “Performance measures, managerial practices and manufacturing technologies in Japanese manufacturing firms: State of the art”, *International Journal of Business Performance Management*, 10(1), 1-16.

Ruben, U. (1999). *The Management of Cross-Cutting Issues*, Discussion Paper no. 8, Committee for Public Management Research, Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Roth, T. & Miller, L. L. (1990). *Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Shin, A. (2000). *Contemporary Management*, McGraw Hill/ Irwin.

Safizadeh, Z. (1996). *The Unshackled Organization*. Portland, OR: Productivity Press, Inc.

Srinivasan, W. & Cooper, A. (1994). *What matters now*, San Francisco: Wiley.

Slater, S. F. & Olson, E. M. (2001). "Marketing's contribution to the implementation of business strategy: An empirical analysis", *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 1055 – 1067.

Solomon, O., Hashim, H. N., Mehdi, B. T. Z. & Ajagbe, A. M. (2012). *Employee Motivation and Organizational Performance in Multinational Companies: A Study of Cadbury Nigeria Plc*. *International Journal of Research in Management and Technology*, 2(3): 303-312.

Thompson, O., Gamble, B. & Strickland, A. A. (2004). *The Truth about Middle Managers: Who Are They, How They Work, Why They Matter*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA
Raynor ME and Ahmed M (2013) Three rules for making a company truly great, *Harvard Business Review*, 91(4): 76-85.

Vickery, Y., Droge, R., Yeomans, O. & Markland, L. (1995). *Changing the Essence: The Art of Creating and Leading Fundamental Change in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vorhies, V. & Morgan, M. (2005). *Images of Organization: The Executive Edition*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Wernerfelt, B. & Barney, F. (1991). "Factors affecting organizational performance: A five country comparison", *Marketing Science Instituted Report*, pp. 97-108

Wheelen, H. & Hunger, K. (2006). *Integrating inside and outside innovators: A socio-technical systems perspective*. *R&D Management*, 39 (4): 410-419.