

ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE AS PREDICTOR OF EFFECTIVE SPORTS MANAGEMENT AMONG SPORTS ADMINISTRATORS IN SOUTH-WEST, NIGERIA

¹S. K. ODIOR, ²E.O. Morakinyo & ³T.D. Bamitale

¹National Institute for Sports, Lagos

²Dept. of Human Kinetics, University of Ibadan

³Dept. of Sports Science, Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti

Abstract

Nigeria relatively lacks contemporary requirements of ESM as most sports administrators function on trial and error basis leading to poor performances in sporting festivals and other sporting events. However, reports have shown that South-west zone is not doing well in major competitions which may be an indication of poor ESM by sport administrators. Previous studies focused mainly on managerial capabilities with little consideration on organisational structure. This study therefore, was designed to investigate Organisational Structure (OS):-formalisation, centralisation, complexity as predictor of effective sports management among sports administrators in the South-west, Nigeria. The study was anchored on Organisational Theory and descriptive research design of correlation type was adopted. Multistage sampling procedure was used. Purposive sampling technique was used to select staff of the state Sports Councils and Ministries of Youth and Sports who are in the managerial cadre. Total enumeration technique was adopted to select all the managerial cadre staff in sport council and Ministry of Sports. One thousand and thirty four sports administrators in South-west were enumerated. The instruments used were Formalisation ($r=0.71$), Centralisation ($r=0.73$), Complexity ($r=0.70$) and ESM ($r=0.74$) scales. Data were analysed with Pearson product moment correlation, Analysis of variance and Multiple regression at 0.05 level of significance. The respondents' age was 37.60 ± 2.30 years and 76.7% were male. There was a significant difference in sports participation based on states ($F_{(5;1028)} = 18.57$). Lagos ($\bar{x} = 20.30$) performed best, followed by Ogun ($\bar{x} = 17.91$), Oyo ($\bar{x} = 17.22$), Ondo ($\bar{x} = 16.73$), Osun ($\bar{x} = 15.30$) and Ekiti ($\bar{x} = 13.87$). Formalisation ($r=0.04$), centralisation ($r=0.76$) and complexity ($r=0.65$) correlated with ESM. There was a significant joint contribution of OS ($F_{(3;1030)} = 528.527$, $p < 0.05$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.605$) on ESM, accounting for 60.5% of its variance. Centralisation ($\beta = 0.60$) and complexity ($\beta = 0.24$), contributed significantly to ESM, while formalisation did not. Centralisation and complexity influenced effective sports management in the South-west, Nigeria. The authorities of the Ministries of Youth and Sports as well as Sports' Councils / Commissions in South-West, Nigeria should intensify efforts to educate their staff on the need to imbibe organisational structure for effective management of sports.

Keywords: Organisation Structure, Sports Management, Sport Administrators

INTRODUCTION

Management is essential in all organisations and spheres of life including sport organization. This is because a lot in term of human and technical resources is needed to cope with the complexity of changes at the structure and capabilities level for a successful management and achievement of organisational goals. Effectiveness refers to the extent to which goals are achieved, thus, concerned with the capacity to use strength and aspirations to achieve high performance. This creates a pertinent issue concerned with recruitment, development, and keeping sports administrators to be effective in sports management. Sports management has been of great importance due to its major influence in determining the success of any sport organisation. For sports organisation to succeed, there is need for effective management of the available resources; both human and material. Fasan (2000) stated that, both human and material resources must be well annexed by sports administrators in order to have effective management in the sports sector. On the other hand Fasan (2000) stated that one of the major factors, militating against the development and administration of sports in Nigeria is the lack of effective sports management.

Effective sport management requires excellence in leadership to perform successfully. With several aspects involved in being a good sports administrator that demands motivation, direction, organization, planning, patience, flexibility, vision, energy, integrity and skills. These traits are absolutely essential for sports managers in becoming one of the best in the industry of sport management. Thus, sports administrators must be leaders, motivators, organizers that must be able to inspire people to work together to reach shared goals and experience success as a team. Furthermore, they must be involved in problem-solving, decision making and critical thinking, necessary in the field of sports management. Being tactful, considerate and making people feel comfortable are necessary as these play a major role in effective management through effective managerial capabilities and organizational structure that is put in place by such organisation.

Organizational structure and managerial capability play important role in efficient management of sports. Katsikea (2011) opined that, organizational structure serves as a guide and also helps to control workers in their activities and actions according to their line of responsibility. It is used by various organisations (including sports), as a control mechanism to affect employee's work outcomes, to ensure that, the required tasks are performed effectively

and efficiently, as well as assist the attainment of organizational goals and objectives. In the same vein, managerial capability helps to build and maintain general capabilities which are shared with activities and functions, particularly in sports' administration. According to Barba-Sanchez and Atienza-Sahuquillo (2010) who described capabilities as the ability to adequately manage resources for performance of a task within an organization. Organisations perform work, when the tasks by individuals; are useful and effectively perform. Thus, assessing competency, approach increased capabilities of organizations in terms of role for actual performance and the result provides a proof of capabilities.

Organisational structure is described as the hierarchy of authority in an organisation that shows who performs which responsibility and in what orders. Structure is one of the enduring and critical determinants of not only organisational effectiveness, but also of the ways in which humans interact within an organisation, especially in a sports industry. Indeed, the influence of structure on human behaviour may be a significant factor in organisational functioning. In line with this, Amis, Slack and Hinings (2004) revealed that, structural features, precipitated conflict between organisational sub-units and identified structural dimensions as one of the four key drivers of decision making in sports. In so doing, the basic structure of any organisation can be broken down into three essential components which include complexity, formalization and centralization.

Organizational structure can be managed and changed through the process of organizational design. In its usual characteristics, organizational chart is typically used as a picture to show the structure with the aim of identifying roles and expectations. Consequently, distinctive manager, who understands an organization's structure and relationship will be able to expedite decision and have greater understanding of the organizational environment (Barahemah, 2015; Lovorka, 2013). Hence, sports administration is a technical area which requires adequate preparation to manage with thorough knowledge of sports; educational training preferably in the area of sports administration, professional attitude and commitment, in addition to personal characteristics; such as personality, intelligence, fairness, flexibility, integrity, honesty, leadership and sincere interest. Duru (2001) asserts that, basically nothing is wrong with structure, instead, the problem lies in most sports' administrators who are not prepared professionally at the helm of affairs of the job. Ajiduah (2001) confirmed that, those who are not

professionals in sports area and without the capacity about sports administration do find themselves at the helms of sports administration.

Thus, proper individual and team work within an organization are well coordinated and managed, essential elements of the organization taken into consideration. With the elements include: work specialization, departmentalization, chain of command, span of control, centralization and decentralization which profile into formalization. Hollenbeck, Moon, Ellis, West and Ilgen (2002) defined work specialization as the degree to which tasks in an organization are subdivided into separate jobs. The essence of work specialization is that, an entire job is not done by one individual but instead, it is broken down into steps, and each step is completed by a different person. This means that, each employee specializes in doing part of an activity, rather than the entire activity. Hence, work specialization helps productivity to raise, increase efficiency and increase job breadth

Draft (2009) described complexity as the numbers of works performed in an organisation or numbers of secondary systems that exist in an organisation. Robins (2007) quoted in Alwani and DanaeiFard (2007) stated it as the level of breakdown which exists in an organisation. Thus complexity is the result of environmental uncertainty and increasingly becoming complex and the changing environment increases the environmental uncertainty. Hence, the increase of complexity and diversity in environment, organization create complexity in itself for adapting to the environment. Rezaeian (2009) opined that complexity is the requisite variety that can neutralize the effect of environmental variety. Consequently, complexity refers to the breakdown level which exists in an organization (Child, 2008).

The complexity of spatial differentiation is seen as the geographical dispersion of an organisation. Specifically, an organisation with one central location is less spatially differentiated and in this respect, more easily managed, than the one which has a number of regional associations. While horizontal differentiation refers to the number of different areas of work specialization in an organisation. In sport, organisation these may include areas such as coaching, administration, marketing, media relations, junior development, membership and fundraising. As the variety of specializations increases so does the level of horizontal differentiation.

Formalisation shows how much rules, regulations, procedures, ordinances as well as communications are written and formed (León and García, 2011). It refers to the degree to which formal rules and procedures are dominant on organizational activities and influences. In

general, formalisation refers to the level of establishing writing rules, regulations, guidelines, approvals, job descriptions and description of employee's responsibilities which have received attention in the organization and have been registered (Gresov and Drazin, 2007). The two main parts of formalization this includes; the degree to which rules, regulations and guidelines have been registered in an organization and the degree to which these rules, regulations and instructions are being followed and controlled (March and Simon, 2009). The third organisational structural indicator is the centralization in which theorists refer to as the degree to which a decision is centralized at one point. Besides that, lateral activities affect decision making as well (Child, 2008).

Centralization deals with the amount of independence in one job in decision making and choice. Mihm et al., (2010) described the subcategories of decision making that can form a centralized area; such as determining programmes, allocation of facilities, resource attraction, granting reward, hiring and firing, performance evaluation, promotion, adjusting and allocating budget, access to information and controlling processes. Therefore, the bedrock of sports administration in any organisation or institution's anchors on effective sports management enclosed in the organisational structure and managerial capabilities put in place. This is the aspect responsible for the smooth-running of various sports; in terms of planning, organizing, directing and controlling all essentials inputs in sports. Oloruntoba and Achugbu (2002) opined that, the success or failure of sports can be in direct proportion to the appropriate decisions and actions of those who are responsible for managing them.

Research Question

Answer was provided for this research question

1. What is the relationship between organisational structure (formalisation, centralisation and complexity) and effective sports management?

Hypotheses:

The following hypotheses were tested in the study:

1. There will be no significant joint contribution of organisational structure (formalisation, centralisation and complexity) to effective sports management among sports administrators in South-West, Nigeria.

2. There will be no significant relative contribution of organisational structure of formalisation, centralisation and complexity to effective sports management among sports administrators in South-West, Nigeria.
3. There will be no significant difference in effective sport management among sports administrators in the states of South-West, Nigeria based

Significance of the Study

The outcomes of this study would provide an avenue of understanding a proper structure fitted with goals and needs of organizations required for all sports management decisions in the context of planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling that can be applied to organizational structure where the structure has to be provided with the power of decisions is sufficient.

The finding of the study may furnish State Ministries of Youth and Sports across the six states in South-West, Nigeria, with essential information on the contribution of organizational structure and knowledge management capability to sports management among sports administrators in South-West, Nigeria. The outcome of this study may encourage sports policymakers, government at all levels, sponsors, corporate bodies and other stakeholders in South-West Nigeria to plan and design programmes on sports management. The outcome of the study would serve as a knowledge base and reference point for other researchers who may be interested in sports management in relation to organizational structure, variables and knowledge management capabilities.

METHODOLOGY

The descriptive research design of correlational type was used for the study. The population for this study consisted of sports administrators in South-West, Nigeria. These are staff of Sports' Councils and Ministry of Youth and Sports in Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Osun and Oyo State. The total numbers as at the time of this study was about two thousand (2,000) staff as employment is always an on-going process. The sample for the study was one thousand and seventy eight (1,078) respondents, who were drawn from sports administrators in South-West. However, only one thousand and thirty four (1,034) respondents who filled the questionnaire correctly were used for the study. Purposive sampling technique and total enumeration were used to select the sample for this study. Purposive sampling technique was used to select staff of the state Sports Councils and Ministries of Youth and Sports who are in the managerial cadre (from grade level 7 and above) because they form the bulk of decision makers. Total

enumeration technique was adopted to select all the managerial cadre staff in the selected sport organisations in the selected States in the South-West, Nigeria.

Table 1.1: Distribution of respondents from States Sports Councils / Sports Commissions

S/n	State Sports Councils / Sports Commissions	Staff strength (From grade level 7)	Total number of selected respondents
1.	Ekiti	137	131
2.	Lagos	392	386
3.	Ogun	180	173
4.	Ondo	98	94
5.	Osun	119	102
6.	Oyo	152	148
	Grand total	1,078	1,034

Source: The State Sports Councils and Ministries of Youth and Sports

The research instrument for this study was questionnaire. The questionnaire tagged Organizational Structure Questionnaire (OSQ) and was adapted from Organizational Culture (OC) by Carmeli and Tishler (2004). The questionnaire development is guided by Robins (2007) Organizational structure questionnaire which is based on the standard organizational structure, questionnaire of twenty-three (23) questions. According to Robbins (2007), organizational structure has three dimensional characteristics: complexity, the degree of regularization and the level of centralization. The structured questionnaire for this study consists of thirty-six items which include: 10 items graded for centralization, 10 items graded of formalization and 16 items graded for complexity structure. The Organizational Structure Questionnaire was used to obtain information from respondents on organizational components variables. Each question response is scored on a 4-point modified Likert format of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) with allotment of points in the following order; SA = 4, A = 3, D = 2, SD = 1.

Also, Sports organizational effectiveness by Shilbury and Moore (2006) with eight effectiveness, dimensions that include; Flexibility, Resources, Planning, Productivity, Availability of Information, and Stability, Skilled Workforce and Cohesive Workforce which influence the operations with emphasis on the Competing Value Approach (CVA) was adapted to developed instruments to assess the effectiveness of sports management. The Effective Sports Management Surveys were used to elicit information from respondents on the concept of sports management, based on criterion taxonomy of the multiple facets of effective management which are tools for individual administrator to identify unique strengths and weakness in their responsibilities as used by researchers such as Thompson and Ware (2003) and Caldwell (2003)

citing Dess and Picken (1999). Thus, this relate to the function, responsibilities and decision-making which mirror into effective management that addresses dimensions such as managing and leading, interpersonal relationships, success orientation and contextual adept. Hence, eighteen (18) items questions were generated. Each response was scored on a 4-point modified Likert format of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) with allotment of points in the following order; SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD=1.

Cronbach alpha (α) was used to establish the reliability coefficient. Organizational Structure Scale had a reliability value of 0.70, while Effective Sports Management Scale had a value of 0.74.

Pearson product moment correlation was used to analyse the research questions while multiple regression was used to test hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance

Results

Research Question

What is the relationship between organisational structure (formalisation, centralisation and complexity) and effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 2: Summary of result on relationship between organisational structure and effective sports management

Variables	Effective sports management	Formalisation	Centralisation	Complexity	Mean	Std. Dev.
Effective sports management	1				16.40	6.13
Formalisation	.036	1			17.67	3.60
Centralisation	.760**	-.041	1		16.43	5.92
Complexity	.647**	-.057	.688**	1	22.91	8.42

sCorrelation is significant at 0.05 alpha level ($p < 0.05$)

Table 2 showed that organisational structure of formalization ($r=0.036$) centralisation ($r=0.760$) and complexity ($r=0.647$) had positive correlation with effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria. It was further established that centralisation and complexity had high positive correlation with effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation had low correlation. Moreover, it was revealed in the table that correlation coefficient's magnitude of centralisation was strong, complexity was high, while formalisation was weak.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant joint contribution of organisational structure (formalisation, centralisation and complexity) to effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria.

Table 3: Summary of result on joint contribution of organisational structure to effective sports management

R=.779 R ² =.606 Adj. R ² =.605 Std. Error=3.84927						
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (p value)	Remark
Regression	23493.404	3	7831.135	528.527	.000	Significant
Residual	15261.425	1030	14.817			
Total	38754.829	1033				

As shown in table 3, it was found that the linear combination of organisational structure (formalisation, centralisation and complexity) was tested significant on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria ($F_{(3,1030)}=528.527$, $p<0.05$). The result yielded a coefficient of multiple regression of $R=0.779$ and multiple R-square of 0.606. The result also revealed that adjusted $R^2=0.605$; indicating that about 60.5% of variance was accounted for by the independent variables. This means that, formalisation, centralisation and complexity had significant joint contribution on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relative contribution of organisational structure of formalisation, centralisation and complexity to effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria.

Table 4: Summary of result on relative contribution of organisational structure to effective sports management

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Remark
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	2.247	.715		3.142	.002	
Formalisation,	.004	.033	.003	.128	.898	Not. Sig. Significant Significant
Centralisation	.617	.028	.597	22.167	.000	
Complexity	.172	.020	.236	8.753	.000	

Table 4 showed the organisational structure of formalisation, centralisation and complexity, the unstandardised regression weight (β), the standardized error of estimate ($SE\beta$), the standardized coefficient, the t-ratio and the level at which the t-ratio was significant. As indicated in this table, centralisation ($\beta=0.597$, $t=22.167$, $p<0.05$) and complexity ($\beta=0.236$, $t=8.753$, $p<0.05$) were independently tested significant on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation ($\beta=0.003$, $t=0.128$, $p>0.05$) did not. This means that there was a significant relative prediction of centralisation and complexity on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation did not. The null hypothesis which stated that there was no significant relative contribution of organisational structure of centralisation and complexity to effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria was therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in effective sport management among the states in the South-West, Nigeria

Table 5: Summary of result on difference in effective sport management among the states in the South-West, Nigeria

Variables	Source	Sum of square	Df	Mean square	F	Sig. (p value)	Remark
Effective sport management States	Between Groups	3210.271	5	642.054	18.569	0.000	Significant
	Within groups	35544.558	1028	34.576			
	Total	38754.829	1033				

Table 5 revealed that, state was tested significant on effective sport management in the South-West, Nigeria ($F_{(5,1028)}=18.569$; $p<0.05$). This implied that, there was a significant difference in effective sport management among the states in the South-West, Nigeria. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

Table 5.1: Descriptive difference in difference in effective sport management based on state

	State	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
1.	Ekiti	131	13.87	5.51	6 th
2.	Lagos	386	20.30	8.99	1 st
3.	Ogun	173	17.91	4.40	2 nd
4.	Ondo	94	16.73	5.93	4 th
5.	Osun	102	15.30	5.33	5 th
6.	Oyo	148	17.22	6.76	3 rd

Table 5.1 revealed that the respondents who were from Lagos State had the highest mean of 20.30; followed by those from Ogun State, with a mean score of 17.91, and those from Oyo State with a mean score of 17.22. In addition, respondents from Ondo State were ranked as fourth with a mean score of 16.73, followed by those from Osun State with a mean score of 15.30, while the respondents from Ekiti State had the least mean score of 13.87. This means that the respondents that were from Lagos State had higher tendency manage sport effectively than their other counterparts in other states, while those from Ekiti State had the least.

Discussion of Findings

The finding of this study further established that organisational structure of centralisation and complexity were independently tested significant on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation did not. It was further revealed that centralisation and complexity had positive correlation with effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation had negative correlation. Moreover, it was shown that correlation coefficient's magnitude of centralisation was strong; complexity was moderate, while formalisation had weak negative correlation. This implied that, an improvement in each of centralisation and complexity would influence effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria. The outcome of this study on relationship between organisational structure of centralisation, complexity and effective sports management was in contrast to the study of Robbins et al. (2011) which established that the greater the level of complexity, the more difficult it is to effectively manage the organisation.

In the same vein, it was found that the linear combination of organisational structure (formalisation, centralisation and complexity) was tested significant on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria. This means that, there was a significant joint prediction of formalisation, centralisation and complexity on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria. The outcome of this study on joint prediction of formalisation, centralisation and complexity on effective sports management was not in congruence with the assertion of Katsikea (2011) revealed that organizational structure serves as a guide and also helps to control workers in their activities and actions according to their line of responsibility.

Moreover, the finding of this study revealed that centralisation and complexity were independently tested significant on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation did not. This means that there was a significant relative prediction of centralisation and complexity on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation did not. The outcome of this study on relative prediction of centralisation and complexity on effective sports management was in contrast to the study of Robbins et al. (2011) which established that the greater the level of complexity, the more difficult it is to effectively manage the organisation.

Conclusion

Based on the outcome of this study, it was concluded that organisational structure of centralisation and complexity had significant positive relationship with effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria, while formalisation did not. It was further concluded that there was a significant joint prediction of organisational structure of formalisation, centralisation and complexity on effective sports management in South-West, Nigeria. Furthermore, there were significant relative predictions of centralisation and complexity on effective sports management, while formalisation did not.

It was established that sports administrators from Lagos State had a higher tendency to manage sports effectively than their other counterparts in other states, while those from Ekiti State had the least.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made

1. The authorities of the Ministries of Youth and Sports as well as Sports' Councils / Commissions across all the six states in South-West, Nigeria should intensify efforts to organise sensitisation programmes about organisational structure for effective sports management.
2. The authorities of the Ministries of Youth and Sports as well as Sports' Councils / Commissions in South-West, Nigeria should also intensify efforts to educate their staff on the need to imbibe organisational structure for effective management of sports.
3. Deliberate effort should be made by the authorities of the Ministries of Youth and Sports as well as Sports' Councils / Commissions in South-West, Nigeria in such a way that centralisation, complexity, human resource management, technical abilities and

conceptual competencies are taken into consideration as specific factors affecting effective management of sports South-West, Nigeria.

References

- Ajiduah ,A.O. 2001. Revitalizing sport in Nigeria: practices, problems and prospects. *Report of the National Committee on Problems of Sport Development in Nigeria*, 3:47-57
- Amis, J., Slack, T. and Berrett, T. 1996. The structural antecedents of conflict in voluntary sport organisations. *Leisure Studies*, 14, 1–16.
- Alwani M. and Danaeifard H. 2007. Explaining the Structural Factors Influencing the Formation of Policy Networks; A Survey on Iranian Entrepreneurship System. *Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 109-136
- Barba-Sánchez, V. and Atienza-Sahuquillo, C. 2010. Entrepreneurial behavior: Impact of motivation factors on decision to create a new venture *Investigaciones Europeas de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa*, 18, (2), 132-138
- Child, J. 2008. Organizational Structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice, *Sociology*, 6(1), 1-22
- Daft, R. (2009). *Theory and design of organization*, translated by Seyed Mohammad A'arabi and Ali Parsaeian, 1st edition, Tehran, Cultural Researchers Office.
- Duru, A. I. 2001. *Problems of sports development in Nigeria Report of the National Committee on Problems of Sports Development in Nigeria* 3.pp. 155-160.
- Gresov. C. and Drazin. R. 2007. Equifinality: functional equivalence in organization design. *Academy of management review*, n. 22, p. 403-428.
- Hollenbeck, J. R., Moon, H., Ellis, A. P. J., West, B. J., and Ilgen, D. R. 2002. Structural contingency theory and individual differences: Examination of external and internal person-team fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87:599-606.
- Katsikea, E. 2011. The Impact of organizational structure on organizational commitment. Retrieved Dec. 22nd, 2018, from <https://www.pdfsemanticscholar.org/4da5/>
- León, I M. M. and García, J. A. 2011. The influence of organizational structure on organizational learning, *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(5/6), 537 -566.
- March, J. and Simon, H. 2009. Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Organizations Social Forces*, 18, 560-568.
- Mihm, J., Loch, Ch. H., Wilkinson, D., and Hubermann, B. A. 2010. Hierarchical structure and search in complex organizations. *Management Science*, 56 (5), 831–848.

Oloruntoba , I.O and Achugbu , P. 2002. Sport management techniques as a function of national development. In Okanlawon, K.O (Ed) .*Journal of Sport Management and Educational Research* I (1) pp. 54-58.

Rezaeian, A. 2009. *Principals of organizational behavior management*, Institute of Studying and Authoring Humanities Books of Universities (SAMT).

Robins, S P. 2007. *Organization theory*, translated by Seyed Mahdi Alvani. Hassan Danaei Fard. Mooj publications, Saffar publications.

Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., Millett, B. and Boyle, M. 2011. *Organisational behaviour*. (6th ed.). Frenchs Forest: Pearson Australia.