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The purpose of this study was to determinate the level of influence of the degree of organization in Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) performance. The study was guide by three research questions: (i) How do NGOs define performance? (ii) To what extent does the organizational internal structure influence the degree of organization? (iii) What degree of organization is optimal for NGO performance?

A descriptive survey was adopted as a research design. The target population of this study consisted of NGO workers within Nairobi County. A sample was drawn from three NGOs, whose names remained confidential for the purpose of this study. From a total of 220 workers, a sampling frame of 80 people was selected using random selection as a probability sample technique. The researcher used questionnaires to collect data, and a correlational analysis through inferential statistics in a quantitative approach was the method chosen to analyze that data. The analysis was aided by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), and the data was presented in the form of tables and figures.

Major findings as regards NGOs definition of performance indicated that for the employees their own performance is reached once they meet their own objectives, while for the organization itself, performance seems to be defined according to the impact of the organization outputs in the surrounded areas.

In regards to the impact of organizational internal structure in the degree of organization, major findings indicated that most NGOs have a vertical power with a decentralized structure. Employees seemed to have an understanding of the organization processes and procedures, although it is not a linear and extensive knowledge.

Major research findings indicated that in most NGOs tasks were well defined, the organizations processes and procedures were clearer and easier to understand and the organizations had structured and stratified structure. Moreover, the study found that the majority of the inquired organizations believe to be in a more organized or, even over organized situation. The researcher believed this was due to the fact their definition of performance is more focus on the outputs and not in the internal functioning of the organization which mislead the respondents when questioned about the level of their organization in relation to bureaucracy, conflict resolution, task definition, communication, structure and the degree of organization itself.
When correlating performance with the degree of organization, the study found a significant but low correlation, which again relates to the fact that performance for NGOs was not in line with the performance expected from the organizational development practitioners.

The study concluded that: NGOs focus more on the external results, since they enable targets to be met, than on the promotion of a good work environment and the establishment of a better coordination; there is a dual impact of the internal structure in the degree of organization, being over organized in terms of the operating processes, the ones that bring the final outputs, and under organized in the management and support processes the ones that contribute for organizational health. Also, the study concluded, that the majority of the NGOs is close to an over organized level in the degree of organization, not meaning, necessarily, that this is the optimal degree to achieve performance, since their definition of performance is not in according to the one established in organizational development.

Major recommendations from the study are that NGOs should consider their organizational internal structure when defining performance and not just the final product of their services. Ideally the organizations should promote more training and development activities creating a bigger awareness of their internal functioning. And, in order to establish an optimal point in the degree of organization spectrum, affecting NGO performance, it is necessary in further research, to substitute the concept of performance for one more concretely focused on the inside of the organization, like health.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Problem

Organizations exist to accomplish specific purposes or goals, like missions, tasks, products or services (French, Bell, Zawakin, 1994). Schein (1980), go on to define organization as the planned coordination of the activities of a number of people for the achievement of some common explicit purpose or goal, through division of labor and function, and through a hierarchy of authority and responsibility.

Since the Industrial Revolution, with Adams Smith concept of division in labor, that we heard about structured and defined organizations, with four main components: hierarchy of authority, span of control, centralization vs decentralization and specialization of function or task (Docherty, Surles, Donovan, 2001), however it is with the beginning of the twenty-first century that organizations start revolutionizing in the form, character and process (Pettigrew, Massini, 2003). We assist, in this century, to the rising of new types of organizations, forms and structures, as well as new processes and systems.

If, in the beginning, the classical management school of organization structures believed that there was a single organization form that was highly effective in organizations of all kind, soon the scholars realized the importance of employee’s participation in decision making process which would in the 1950s, contribute for the growing of contingency theories (Clegg & Hardy 1999). In fact, contingency theory states that there is no single organization structure that is highly effective for all organizations, the structure that is optimal as varying according to certain factors such, strategy, size, task uncertainly and technology (Clegg & Hardy 1999).

On that sense it is possible to analyze organizations based in different elements, both external, where we focus on the environment around the organizations - political factors, economy, socio-cultural or technological – and internal, where we analyze activities, behaviors and process and structures of the organization itself (Lewis, 2003). Although, one of the biggest challenge when planning change or implementing a new strategy, in an organization, remains in the last internal factor – processes and structures of the organization.
Concern with change has strong reflections in two main objectives: examining the nature and possible variations between different elements of structure and accessing the dynamic balance between dysfunctional and beneficial outcomes of given structural arrangements (Clegg & Hardy, 1999). According to the author, structural components of a system must, indeed, be integrated in order for the system to survive. These various elements of organizational structure will become a whole, which justifies the empirical examination of the relation among them and also will allow the understanding on the functionality or dysfunctions in a system.

In a contemporary scenario, organization analysis is made, mainly, in terms of tight management control or in terms of participative workplace models (Hodson, 2001), these elements, will contribute directly to the understand the degree to which an organization or a system is organized.

In one hand, there are under organized systems, characterized by management failures to fulfil obligations of coordination integration, solutions implemented in an ad hoc basis or simply unclarified roles within the organization (Hodson, 2001), which may lead to hostile environments in the workplace. On the other hand, over organized systems have a traditional “top-down” management style, characterized, and in a certain extent limited, by their extremely bureaucracy, highly defined roles, and task orientation which contributes for the apathy of employees and lack of work relations among senior management and other collaborators. The importance in identifying the degree of organization in which a system is in, consents a better understanding on the work efficiency and will prepare the organization in case of change (Hodson, 2001).

If the degree of organization as a strong impact in all kind of systems health, and should be analyzed in a way to improve work efficiency, when we talk about Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s) this need is even bigger. In recent years, NGOs became high profile actors within public policy landscapes at local, national and global level, in fact they came to be seen as source of new and alternative development theory and practice, contributing for the expansion of their profile (Lewis, 2003). Nevertheless, and besides the fact that NGOs can be viewed as separate from business, since they are third sector organizations which are focused on development tasks and purposes, their sui generis internal structure does need an understanding of the importance of the role of norms and values within management.
NGOs performance and their effectiveness has recently taken on additional urgency because of increasing demands for accountability, transparency and financial responsibility, however, there is little agreement to define and measure what constitutes effectiveness in this kind of organization (Lecy, Swedlund, Scmitz, 2012).

The internal organizational structure of NGOs tend receive less attention from scholars in opposition to their activities. Frequently, NGOs see themselves as somehow different from other kinds of organization since they placed a high priority on being flexible and idealistic, which they saw as being in opposition to being organized and hierarchical (Lewis, 2003). Because of that, their fragmented accountability, common tensions among aims and structures and relationship problems between headquarters and local branches make us position NGOs in a under - organized level in the degree of organization, which highlights the fact that it is not useful to see NGO management as a completely separate field of practice with its own concepts, rules and practices.

Although organizations comprise interdependent groups having different immediate goals, different ways of working, different formal training, and different personality types, all organizations are a whole system of interrelated subsystems that we need to access, analyze, understand and improve the system in order to perform better (Levinson 2002), NGOs are any different.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Lewis (2003), states that more and more is being asked of NGOs by citizens, governments and donors, but the organization and management of this distinctive sub-group of third sector organizations has so far received relatively little attention from researchers.

In fact NGOs have tended to be late to the idea of management; most of them see management practices as an orthodox, mainstream concern from which they are seeking to disengage. NGOs have considered it unnecessary to pay serious attention to their organizational aspect, especially if this has been perceived as taking attention away for their actually work (Lewis, 2003; Lecy et al., 2012).

In a general way, there has been a tendency to ignore the baseline for studying workplace organization or disorganization, this happen mainly because, first, research has more often
focus on emerging forms of workplace organization based on the latest and most successful technologies and organizations structures ignoring the one who are not so well structured, secondly, analyses based on individual – level surveys and econometric data typically do not highlight under-organized or anomic workplaces because they do not ask appropriate questions to discover the existence of such organizations and to highlight their consequences (Hodson, 2001)

Since NGOs are, quite often, associated with under-organized places, existing in advanced economies and increasing due to the prevalence of various forms of temporary, subcontracted, and marginal employment (Hodson, 2001), it is fundamental to learn from mainstream management if they want to raise their level of effectiveness and live up to new expectations of their performance and roles, as well as, since they are different from each other, they need distinctive management ideas which challenged the existing way of doing things (Lewis, 2003).

1.3. **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of influence of the degree of organization in the performance of a Non-Governmental Organizations.

1.4. **Research Questions**

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1.4.1. How do NGOs define performance?
1.4.2. To what extent does the organizational internal structure influence the degree of organization?
1.4.3. What degree of organization is optimal for NGO performance?
1.5. Significance of the Study

1.5.1. Non-Governmental Organizations

Being aware of the optimal degree of organization, allows NGOs to make an internal analysis and recognize the possible need for change, based on their structure and management dynamics, which contributes for the improvement of their performance and increasing of efficiency.

1.5.2. NGOs Beneficiaries

The fragile population that normal benefits from the NGOs work ends up suffering with their lack of structure or, in opposition, their strong bureaucratic processes. On that sense, with the information provided by the study - finding an optimal degree of organization for NGOs - the internal work may improve creating, also, better external results.

1.5.3. Further Research

This study intends to have an impact in other big academic areas, like Management or International Relations. With the time, the work of NGOs has been creating changes and providing new dynamics in the social work, both in the national context and international one. This fact makes it necessary to improve and develop their internal organization, and connect this new dynamics with other areas of study.

1.6. Scope of the Study

This study was held in Nairobi having as target population the employees of different kinds of NGOs, focusing on the organization of their internal structure and how they define performance.
1.7. Definition of Terms

1.7.1. Non – Governmental Organizations

A non-governmental organization is a not-for-profit group, principally independent from government, which is organized on a local, national or international level to address issues in support of the public good (United Nation Rule of Law, 2012).

1.7.2. Degree of Organization

Degree to which the organization or client system is organized (N.Sengupta, Bhattacharya, R. Sengupta, 2006).

1.7.3. Internal Organizational Structure

Formal relations established between the individuals and groups of an organization in a way that they can execute the organization strategy and consequently achieve the objectives (Teixeira, 2005).

1.7.4. Organizational Performance

What an organization delivers to its stakeholders in financial and operational terms, evaluated through such measures as net operating profit, return on capital employed, total returns to shareholders, net operating costs and stock turn (Keller & Price, 2011).
1.8. Chapter Summary

This chapter refers to the topic of the study: The Impact of the Degree of Organization in NGOs Performance. It provides a small background and a statement of the problem, where it is illustrated with some actual examples, the importance of studying such topic.

It is also stated in chapter 1 the 3 research questions that conducted the study, and the significance of achieving such answers to specific groups of people. Furthermore we can limit our geographical location with the information provided in the “Scope of the Study” and we can find the definitions with special relevance to this academic work in our last topic of the chapter.

The literature review of this study and the research methodology adopted are address in the next chapters – 2 and 3 respectively. Moreover, chapter 4 presents the results and findings of this research project and the discussions, conclusions and recommendations of the study can be found in chapter 5.
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The second chapter of this research project aims to review and analyze previous produced, literature on the same or similar areas of this study. The impact of the degree of organization in NGOs performance is discussed in three sub headings: NGOs performance, internal organizational structure elements and degree of organization.

2.2. Performance in NGOs

According to Armstrong and Baron (2006), performance in an organization should always consider the inputs, analyzing the behaviors, and the outputs, focusing on the results. An organization performs once it covers the competency levels and achievements as well as accomplishes the objectives of the organization strategy. However, the factors that affect performance, the processes for managing performance, and how performance is measured will vary according to each author and special depending on each organization (Amstrong & Baron, 2006; Bruijin, 2002).

In the specific case of the NGOs, most performance related initiatives are still taking place at a level of individual projects or programs. There is still an absence of baselines, definitions or mechanisms able to track performance which contributes for the fact that the system continues to be reliable in performance information from a mixture of different sources (Ramalingam, Mitchel, Borton, Smart, 2009).

2.2.1. Factors Affecting Performance

Amstrong and Baron (2006), identifies personal factors, leadership factors, team factors, systems factors and contextual factors as the ones that affect performance. Basically, they are aspects that form organizations and consequently they will affect how organizations perform, nevertheless it is possible to go deeper in this analysis defining more concretely which specific elements constitute the above mentioned factors.
Contextual factors embrace: the context of the organization, culture, and functionality (Amstrong & Baron, 2006). Organizations are entirely dependent and influenced by their environment, and since this one is constantly changing, it imposes changes on the performance requirements of the organization (Daft, 2010). Organizational culture, being the set of values, beliefs, understandings and norms shared by employees what holds the organization, will dominate the internal environment of the organization (Amstrong & Baron, 2006; Daft, 2010). In terms of the functionality this is the element that will directly affect the design and operation of the organization, thus how it performs.

In what personal factors are concerned, Amstrong and Baron (2006), identify job design as the main element, it can be defined as the specification of the contents, methods and relationships of jobs in order to satisfy technological and organizational requirements as well as the social and personal requirements of the jobholder. A well-defined job design will reinforce the commitment in the organization and that is essential to build an efficient and disciplined work environment (Sull, 2005).

Team factors, are defined mainly by the team work. This element is important in the new, de-layered and process-based organization since more work is being organized in a team project basis (Amstrong & Baron, 2006).

Organizational development, purpose and value statements, as well as, strategic management are seen as the key points in systems factors influencing performance. Organizational development, concerned with the planning and implementation of programs, is designed specifically to improve the effectiveness of an organization. Also, in order to achieve high level performance all stakeholders should be in accordance with an agreed set of core values and should be involved in the process of defining, implementing and evaluating the organization strategy (French, Bell, Zawakin, 1994).

For last, in terms of leadership factors we talk specifically about human resource management, since the activities associated to this practice are driven and focus on improving performance by acquiring and developing a competent, well-motivated and committed workforce.

We can conclude, that the factors contributing for a better development, results, and performance are many, and include, in an NGO context the following: emphasis on the continuous improvement at the institutional, program and project levels; devolution of
management authority, ideally to national counterparts; orientation towards delivery and quality in terms of beneficiary needs and preferences; participation of a wide range of stakeholders including ultimate beneficiaries in the defining the ultimate results; reform of finance and budget processes and systems to increase public transparency and accountability; application of modern public techniques (Ramalingam, et al., 2009).

2.2.2. Processes for Managing Performance

Performance Management is defined by Armstrong and Baron (2006) as a continuous process involving agreeing standards and objectives, giving and receiving constructive feedback on performance; and identifying appropriate training and development opportunities in order to contribute to the success of the organization.

For the NGOs as they are seen, by the governments, as convenient and inexpensive means of delivering public service, they have, in the past few years, been paying attention to demonstrating their performance and the impact of their work on those they claim to help (Ramalingam, et al., 2009).

The approaches to manage NGO performance can be, according to Bond (2006), grouped into four categories: statutory regulations - are legal requirements of NGOs in the country and region in which they operate; voluntary principles and codes - are performance standards that are essentially self-regulation; organizational management and measurement tools - assist NGOs in implementing and adhering to statutory regulation and normative principles as well as being used for general organizational development; evaluation and verification processes - can be included in the other categories above, and involve an added assurance mechanism in the form of external evaluation, or financial and social audit, which may or may not lead to certification or accreditation.

Furthermore, another framework also composed with 4 main categories, planning, measuring, managing and communicating performance, can be established (Jacobs, 2011). It applies, in the same way, development principles to NGOs internal systems as well as their external projects, meeting the needs of managers as well as operational staff.

On that sense, when we talk about planning performance, we refer to setting strategy, where NGOs should set out what they will do to make the biggest contribution to other
people’s efforts to improve their lives and societies, and planning activities, developing activity plans in partnership with stakeholders, identifying the right intervenient for the purpose of goal achievement.

In measuring performance, NGOs should measure how well they are contributing to others people efforts using a combination of feedback and scope indicators. They should also manage their relationships, building more and monitoring the existing ones, and, for last, under measurement of performance, there is a need for ensure NGOs technical quality, by systematically monitor the quality of their work ensuring the meeting of appropriate standards (Lewis, 2003; Jacobs, 2011).

Encourage frontline staff to contribute effectively to others people work and create organizational cultures of continual improvement is what Jacobs (2011) believe to fall under managing performance.

In terms of communicating performance, the author believes we should evaluate and take into consideration: transparency - NGOs should operate open information policies, based on the presumption of disclosure, and make information easily accessible to relevant collaborators; ethical fundraising - NGOs responsibility to check that fundraising claims are ambitious but realistic, within the limits of what they can achieve; and for last, this framework defends the existence of a collaborative learning within the NGO sector (Jacobs, 2011), to form a collective effort to continually improve.

2.2.3. Problems of Performance Evaluation

If, for some, performance measurement is used appropriately and has the potential to support better decision making, for others, performance measurement has a perverse effect and it is not even correctly used in many organizations (Julnes & Holzer, 2001). Because of that it is important to conduct more systematic inquiry into the patterns of performance-measurement use and into the factors that affect the utilization of performance-measurement information.

According to Bruijn (2002), performance measurement can have a beneficial effect, especially on public organizations, since it may improve the professionalism of the service rendered, the organizations innovative power and the quality of politics within the
organization. However there is a strong criticism that may be raised against performance measurement.

In performance-focus organizations, leaders invest heavily in those things that enable targets to be met quarter by quarter, year by year, yet, they tend to neglect investments in the company health – investments in the organization that need to be made today in order to survive and thrive tomorrow (Keller & Price, 2011).

Performance evaluations have in fact a perverse side, on a way that: it influences behavior – people will work to meet targets, in a strategic way, and not because they are motivated or feel empathy with the cause; blocks innovations and ambitions - there will be a strong focus on optimize production but there will be no new inputs; bureaucratize an organization – introducing processes and procedures that are not familiarized by the organization; it may be an unfair practice, not measuring the right variables (Bruijn, 2002).

Based on the above factors, and knowing that 50 percent of the organizations success is, in the long term, driven by its health, Keller and Price (2011) agree that focus on performance is not enough, but balance performance with health will be the key to achieve organization excellence.

A 5 stages frame is then presented as a solution to integrate performance and health when evaluating an organization. Based on 5 “As” - Aspire, Assess, Architect, Act, Advance – Keller and Price (2011), create a series of questions that can be both interpreted for evaluating performance, or, on the other way to evaluate health. This frame has as its main objective to help the organizations “learn how to learn” so that they will be able to respond flexibly to and even shape, whatever the future may hold in the store, not being only narrowed to performance.

In the NGO world, focusing on the health of organization instead of just performance makes even more sense, since their activities are experimental rather than routine; their goals are often intangible; they may be operating in the face of official obstruction and hostility; and it may be difficult to other organizations with which their performance can usefully be compared in any quantitative sense (Moore & Stewart, 2010).
2.3. Influence of the Internal Structure on the Degree of Organization

Organizational Theory is defined by P. R. Silva (2005), as the study of the structure, functioning, and performance of organizations and the behavior of groups and individuals within them.

In a way that it can establish a mission, plans and objectives, an organization needs to establish first a structure that will reflect what should be done, by who and how. A proper structure will be the one that facilitates good solutions to real problems of coordination and motivation (Faria & Madeira, 2011).

According to Daft (2010), there are a few symptoms that show problems in terms of organizational structure: slowness, lack of quality in the decision making process; lack of innovation; decline in the level of performance; high levels of conflicts. There are many ways of structuring an organization in order to avoid the mentioned problems; however there is a tendency to follow some models, and the understanding of some components within the organization is crucial so solve any issue that might appear.

2.3.1. Mintzberg Organizational Model

Mintzberg (2004), presents one of the most known role-model organizations, established in 5 main parts: the operating core; strategic apex; middle management; techno structure; support-Staff.

![Mintzberg Organizational Model](image)

**Figure 2.1: Mintzberg Organizational Model**

The strategic apex is the top of the hierarchy, where most of the decisions are done. Here the strategic plan is designed, the accomplishment of the mission is ensured, and is responsible for all the supervisions (R. L. Silva, 2005). Moreover, the strategic apex makes the connection between the organizations and the surrounded environment.

The middle management has the main task of establish the connection within the different parts of the organization. The middle-line managers, try to answer all the demanding needs in an organization since this is the part were all the information is passed and where all the strategies are adopted (Mintzberg, 2004).

All the organization lives in function of the operating core (R. L. Silva, 2005), the place where the production is done, being the product a physical item or a service.

The techno structure part, hosts all the analysts that are not directly involved in the production process, but have the capacity of observe all the system and evaluate how this is functioning, communicating their conclusions to the middle-line managers (R. L. Silva, 2005).

For last, Mintzberg (2004), tell us that as the technostructure part, the support staff, it is not directly involved in the production process, but supports all the system. They promote and sustain all the operational process.

All the five parts of the organization structure, are connected within each other through different flows of authority, work tools, information and decision making processes (R. L. Silva, 2005).

Based on these 5 structural parts, it is also possible to create a few different configurations of organizations (Faria & Madeira, 2011): functional, divisional, project based, teams based, etc., nevertheless the high complexity of an organization makes it difficult to standardize their structure.

2.3.2. Molecular Structure of Organizations

Organizations are complex realities and multifaceted, they are characterized by a strong diversity (of tools, people, capabilities, technologies, interests, thoughts and action), which makes it challenging to simplify an organization towards any theory, incapable of interpret
the truth about it (P. R. Silva, 2005). On that sense we can define organizations by identifying external and internal factors that influence organizations position towards different aspects. For the purpose of this study it is important to focus on the internal ones, also named by P. R. Silva (2005), as molecular structure of organizations.

The organizational variables in the molecular structure of the organizations are 4: the power in the organization; the organizational strategy; the organizational culture and the organizational structure.

2.3.2.1. Organizational Power

Power is defined by Daft (2010), as the ability of one person or department in an organization to influence other people to bring about desired outcomes. We can see the presence of this power in some managers, able to get bigger budgets for their department, more favorable production schedules, and more control over the organization agenda.

Power will exist in a relationship between 2 or more people, influencing in all the decision-making process and leadership practices of the organizations (Mukasa, 2006) and it can be established in a vertical or horizontal way.

In vertical sources of power, everyone in an organization has access to some kind of power. Although the large amount is typically allocated to the top managers by the organization structure, other employees can easily obtain power and influence in an upward direction using: their formal position, resources, control of decision premises and information and network centrality (Daft, 2010). In opposition, horizontal power refers to relationships across departments, divisions, or other units.

2.3.2.2. Organizational Strategy

Pearce and Robinson (2003), go on to define strategy as the set of decisions and actions that result in the formulation and implementation of plans designed to achieve an organization objective. A good strategy is well planned in advance, is flexible, builds on the experience of people, is realistic and has depth (Pearce & Robinson, 2003).
All organizations should, then, define and articulate their organization’s strategic intent. This includes defining an overall mission and official goals based on the correct fit between external opportunities and internal strengths (Daft, 2010). The design and structure of the organization will be affected according to the strategy adopted by each organization.

2.3.2.3. Organizational Culture

Various authors have different opinions about the concept of organizational culture. For Cummings and Worley (2005), this concept can be viewed from: an integrated view – focusing on culture as an organizational shared phenomenon, representing a stable and coherent set of beliefs about the organization and respective environment; a differentiated view – that believes in the existence of subcultures within the same organization; and a fragmented perspective – where it is argued that culture is always changing and is a dominated by ambiguity and paradox.

Despite the different cultures views, it is possible to find and agreement about the elements of culture measured in an organization (Hatch & Schultz, 2004). These are: artifacts, visible symbols of the deeper levels of culture; norms, guiding how members should behave in particular situations; values, that tell members what is important in an organization and basic assumptions, telling members how to perceive, think and feel about things (Cummings & Worley, 2005; Hatch & Schultz, 2004).

In an indirect way, culture affects performance since it influences the organization ability to implement change.

2.3.2.4. Organizational Structure

Referring to organizational structure as a molecular element of an organization is referring to structural dimension within the organization: how and where the decisions are done, the processes defined and the power distributed – it can be centralized or decentralized (Faria & Madeira, 2011).
Centralization is characterized by retention of power in the top management level with a low degree of power delegation. While in decentralization there is a high level of power delegation from the top level management to the lower employees (Teixeira, 2005).

2.3.3. Organizational Processes

In order to have the capacity to solve and manage any organization problem, it is necessary to know all the processes behind an organization, and the activities and tasks that support those processes (P. L. Silva, 2005).

P. L. Silva (2005), defines process as the set of activities involved in the production of a valuable result. The identification of these processes intends to represent and analyze all the aspects related with the production of a good or service.

Developing a good management of the processes requires: continuous improvement, management commitment, customer focus, right work/right first time, error prevention, metrics, corrective action and teamwork (Cassidy & Guggenberger, 2000).

In processes management we can identify two types of processes: the operational ones – that try to understand the market and the customers, they create a strategy orientation and design the product or service, produce them and sell them; the management ones – these are the one that support the operational, they collect, organize and format all the events within the organization (P. L. Silva, 2005).

Figure 2.2: Organizational Processes
Sources: P. L. Silva (2005)
2.4. The Optimal Degree of Organization for Performance

Being the degree of organization, the degree to which the organization or client system is organized (Sengupta, et al., 2006), we can create a spectrum from under-organized to over-organized, representing each one of them positive and negative points.

In over-organized situations, there are highly mechanisms; it is extremely bureaucratic; they are rigid and overly defined for effective task performance in dimensions such as leadership styles, job designs, organizations structure, policies and procedures; the communication between management and employees is normally suppressed, conflicts are avoided and employees are apathetic.

Whereas in under-organized organizations, there is too little constraint or regulation for task performance; leadership, structure, job design, and policy are poorly defined and fail to direct task behaviors effectively; communication is fragmented, job responsibilities are ambiguous, and employees energies are dissipated because they lack direction. (Cumming & Worley, 2005)

Cirikovic (2009), states that the success of the organizations operations depends on the degree of success of the organizations response to demands and influences. In fact, the degree of an organization will be defined by the size of the organization, how it is structured, the influence of power, the knowledge of the strategic plan by the employees, the processes within the organization, and sometimes even the influence of the external environment.

NGOs, are often associated with under-organized organizations, due to the failures on meeting the expecting set of common workplace norms, like the ones mentioned above, which ends up having a negative effect on the organization credibility and services provided (Hodson, 2001; Cirikovic 2009). However over-organized situations may also represent a bad scenario for NGOs since these type of organization are too much conditioned by the external environment, and the preservation of an independent decision making processes is crucial for a good achievement of the objectives.
2.4.1. NGOs Unclear Power

The governance picture of many NGOs is quite complex. Most of them are governed by self-perpetuating, largely self-appointing board of directors – trustees that are not elected by society at large; their essential purpose is to hold an organization in trust for the benefit of the society, as specified in its papers of incorporation and grants of tax exemption (Lewis, 2005).

Therefore the issue of power in an NGO is justified by the difficulties in establish a good and professional relational between board member and staff, this becomes largely from the boards inability or unwillingness to carry out their responsibilities of governing the organization. Board members are often lacked the time or the expertise to be able to carry out these responsibilities effectively. As a result, senior staffs were often left to make policy decisions with little or no support from board members (Musaka, 2006), which ends up having a direct impact in the decision making process.

Even if the structure of the organization shows the existence of a vertical power in a major number of NGOs this power will end up being in an horizontal format (Daft, 2010).

2.4.2. Absence of Strategic Planning in NGOs

In the Nairobi Regional NGOs Workshops (2010), the participants arrived to the conclusion that few are the organizations that have strategic plans which enables them to have ownership over their mission, values and activities. Although, it is common for the NGO sector to have a strategy, a way forward, the lack of a concrete strategic plan – document that puts on paper the long-term chosen directions – does not permit a better understanding by the partners, by donors, staff and trustees (James, 2010).

For James (2010), the reason why strategic planning is often difficult for NGOs, is associated with the fact that: they face a bottomless pit of need; development is a complex process where sectors are intimately interconnected; they need to secure funding from outside donors to pay salaries; it can be risky to prioritize, if the donors decide they want to fund different things; strategic planning requires predicting the future – something impossible to do perfectly, especially in the turbulent global environments; people have different ideas about what will happen and what will make a difference; they often feel too
busy to stop and think and there may also be strong vested interests and comfort levels in remaining in the status quo.

2.4.3. The Complex NGOs Structures

According to Mintzberg (2004), both age and dimension will influence the structure of an organization. The author states that, an older and bigger organization will have a more formal behavior and that a bigger organization has a more elaborated structure.

Tendentiously in the NGO world bigger organizations will have a more decentralized structure while the small ones will have a more centralized one (Faria & Madeira, 2011). Since it is the responsibility of the organizational structure to define the task assignment to individuals in the organization, how the responsibilities are shared for the accomplishment of the tasks, and also present the way how the individuals are designated in the groups of organizations units, in some of the decentralized NGOs those information’s and efforts will get lost in the middle of the processes (Cirikovic, 2009) and contribute for a lack of performance.

2.4.4. Different Cultures within NGOs

One of the characteristics of organizational culture is the influence of the individuals on it. In order to accomplish the desire targets, an organization needs to synchronize their own goals with the ones from the respective collaborators, in other words the degree for realization of the objectives will depend on the degree of their acceptance by those that determine their realization (Cirikovic, 2009; Leite & Albuquerque, 2009).

In the NGO world achieving this sense of belonging can be, for times, hard, due to the number and diversity of employees in the same organization. Poor communications, lack of individual confidence and discrimination are some of the consequences that might appear in such a multicultural context like the NGOs one (Clarke & Ramalingam, 2008).

The sharing of values and norms by managers and employees will influence all the behavior in an organization, and consequently its performance.
2.5. Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the three research questions that are being addressed in this study. The first one pretend to identify how NGOs define performance. The second topic addressed refers to internal organizational structure and the various elements that are part of this one. Since the third research question pretends to determine what degree of organization is optimal for NGOs, we clarify on the last part of this chapter, some of the issues that create the premise that: NGOs are in under-organized level.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This Chapter discusses the overall research methodology that was employed in this study. It focuses on the research design, the population and sampling design, the data collection methods, the research procedures and the data analysis method.

It has as main objective provide and define the necessary tools to realize the empirical part of this study.

3.2. Research Design

The appropriate research design for this research project is a survey. Like stated by Babbie (2007), survey research is probably, the best method available to the social researcher who is interested in collecting original data for describing a population too large to observe directly, since it is a detailed and quantified description of a population.

Existing two types of surveys: the descriptive and the analytical, this study was conducted through a descriptive one, since this type is designed to measure the characteristics of a particular population - as identifying the scale and nature of social problems (Gray, 2004) like it is the clarification of the impact of the degree of organization in NGOs performance. Moreover, Gray (2004), go on to reflect that descriptive surveys, are often undertaken to ascertain attitudes, values and opinions.

3.3. Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1. Population

Population is the number of units from which the sample is to be selected (Bryman, 2012). In the particular case of this study, and according to the definition, the population is all the NGOs personnel within Nairobi County.
3.3.2. Sampling Design

A sample was chosen on the basis that was representative of the population as a whole, which means, the sample’s main characteristics are similar or identical to those of the population (Gray, 2004). Sample, is defined as the segment of population that is selected for investigation, representing a subset of the population.

In this particular study a probability sample was adopted, once that, and according to Babbie (2007), a probability sampling should be chosen when researchers want precise statistical descriptions of large populations.

3.3.2.1. Sampling Frame

Babbie (2007) define sampling frame, as the list or quasi list of elements from which a probability sample is selected, which in this specific case was a total of 80 people, from 3 distinct NGOs within Nairobi County, that for the purpose of this Study their name will remain confidential.

3.3.2.2. Sampling Technique

Probability sampling was the technique chosen to use on this study, ensuring a fair representation of the population. From the probability techniques, a random selection was adopted in a way that each element had an equal chance of selection independent of any other event in the selection process (Babbie, 2007).

3.3.2.3. Sample size

A sample 80 NGO workers from 3 different NGOS will be inquired during this study, like we can see in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO:</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4. Data Collection Methods

According to Gary (2004), it is difficult to imagine a large-scale survey, without the use of a carefully constructed questionnaire. With that stated, in this study, primary data was collected by using questionnaires – research tool through which people are asked to respond to the same set of questions in a predetermined order (Gary, 2004).

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher. It was divided by 3 main sections, according to the research questions: what defines performance in that specific inquired NGO; how articulated are the internal structural elements of the organization; do they feel that there is a positive correlation between their organization and how they perform, and a fourth part with general information about the respondent.

3.5. Research Procedures

The questionnaire was developed by the research on the basis of the research questions. Closed questions were used in the instrument, mostly category questions and scale questions in a way that the respondents could some structure in their answers (Gray 2004).

The data collection instrument had a pilot-testing, applying the questionnaire in advance to three co-workers of the researcher. The questionnaire was delivered to an NGO manager, who distributed them to the various respondents, and made a small presentation of the researcher and the study itself, ensuring the respondents anonymity.

The respondents were expected to fill in the questionnaire in a maximum time of 15 minutes, and return it to the NGO manager who thanked them and brought the questionnaires back to the researcher.

3.6. Data Analysis Method

Since we are analyzing the relationship among various factors, and we obtained mainly nominal data after apply the questionnaires, the data analysis method chosen for this research was the correlational analysis, which means analyze data through inferential statistics, in a quantitative approach.
This methodology, helped us build some association realizing what is the impact of the degree of organization in NGOs performance, once that Gray (2004), go on to define correlational analysis as being concerned with associations between variables.

In terms of computer application, SPSS – Statistical Package for Social Sciences, will be used as data analysis tool, providing, in the end, graphics and tables summarizing our data.

3.7. Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to cover the methodology of this study. The research was designed as a survey, being the population of this study all NGO workers, from where a probability sample was selected to answer the questionnaires. The obtained nominal data from the closed questionnaires was analyzed in a correlational basis.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and findings of the study as set out in the research methodology. The results are presented on an analysis of the impact of the degree of organization in NGOs performance. The data was gathered exclusively from the questionnaire as the research instrument.

The study targeted to sampled 80 respondents in collecting data. From the study, 60 out of 80 sampled respondents filled in and returned the questionnaire contributing to a 75% response rate. This commendable response rate was made a reality after the researcher made personal visits to remind the respondent to fill-in and return the questionnaires.

4.2. Respondents Information

4.2.1. Respondent’s Gender

The study aimed at investigating the respondent’s gender; 52% who were the majority were female while 48% were male. This findings show the researcher observed gender parity to a great extent.

Table 4.1: Respondent’s Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)
4.2.2. Respondents Age

![Graph showing Respondents Age](image)

**Figure 4.1: Respondents Age**  
Source: Survey Data (2014)

On ascertaining the respondents age the study found that 57% who were the majority were between the age of 20 to 30 years, 28% were between the age of 30 to 40 years, 13% were between the age of 40 to 50 years while 2% were above 50 years of age.

4.2.3. Years Worked in the Organization

The study aimed at establishing the number of years respondents had worked in that specific NGO; 50% who were the majority had worked in the organization for 1 to 3 years, 20% had worked in the organization for 3 to 5 years, 17% had worked in the organization for a period of less than 6 months, 8% had worked in the organization for 6 to 12 months while 5% had worked for more than 5 years. This shows that the respondents were well squinted with the NGOs operations.
**Table 4.2: Years worked in the organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years worked in the organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 6 months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

**4.2.4. Respondents Position at the Organization**
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**Figure 4.2: Respondents position at the organization**

Source: Survey Data (2014)

On evaluating the respondents position in the organization; 35% who were the majority worked as operational, 23% worked as administrators, 23% of the respondents worked as middle management, 8% worked as intern, 7% worked as temporary while 3% worked as top management.
4.3. Defining Performance in NGOs

4.3.1. When the Respondents Perform Well in the Organization

The study aimed at establishing when the respondents considered they performed well in the organization; the study found that in the respondents opinion they performed well in the organization when they accomplished their own objectives to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.45, respondents considered they performed well in the organization when they were team players within the organization to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.4, respondents performed well in the organization when they knew their role in the organization to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.28, respondents performed well in the organization when they worked effectively on their projects to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.25, respondents performed well in the organization when they accomplished the organization vision and mission to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.92, respondents performed well in the organization when others asked them on what to do to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.82, respondents performed well in the organization when they shared their organization values and beliefs to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.75, respondents considered they perform well in the organization when they accomplished the organization objectives to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.6 while respondents considered they perform well in the organization when they accomplished what their superior wanted them to do to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.27.
Table 4.3: When the respondents perform well in the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish my own objectives</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work effectively on my projects</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know my role in the organization</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share my organization values and beliefs</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am team player within the organization</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish my organization objectives</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for the accomplishment of the vision and mission of the organization</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do what others ask me to do</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do what my superior wants me to do</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.532</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.97</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.726</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

4.3.2. Employee Feeling on the Organization Performance

On ascertaining when the respondents felt that the organization performed well, they indicated that the organization performed well when it made an impact in the surrounded society to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.37, the organization performed well when it embraced the bigger number of projects possible to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.18, the organization performed well when it met donors expectations to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.75, the organization performed well when it was faithful to the principles and values of the organization to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.75, the organization performed well when it accomplished the strategic plan goals to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.67, the organization performed well when it worked to accomplish its vision and mission to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.6, the organization performed well when it promoted a good work environment to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.48 while the organization
performed well when it was transparent and consistent to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.45.

Table 4.4: Employee feeling on the organization performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishes the Strategic Plan goals</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets donors expectations</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes an impact in the surrounded society</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraces the bigger number of projects possible</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is faithful to the principles and values of the organization</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works for the accomplish of the vision and mission of the organization</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes a good work environment</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is transparent and consistent</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.818</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.727</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

**4.3.3. Mode of Working in the Organization**

The study aimed at establishing the way the organization worked. According to the respondents, the organization gave and received constant feedback to the respondents to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.3, the organization met the goals defined in the strategic plan to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.28, the organization objectives were defined by the donors to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.03, the organization strategy was shared with the employees to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.00, the organization met the project goals to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.92, the organization employees participated in the definition of objectives to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.67 as well the organization objectives were defined by the management team to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.65.
Table 4.5: Mode of working in the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our objectives are defined by the management team</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our objectives are defined by our donors</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees participate in the definition of objectives</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization strategy is shared with the employees</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We give and receive constant feedback of our work</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We meet the goals defined in our strategic plan</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We meet our project goals</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.828</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.975</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

4.4. Organizational Internal Structure and the Degree of Organization

4.4.1. Knowledge of the Organization

The study aimed at ascertaining whether the respondents were familiar with the organization and the way it functions. The study found that respondents knew the processes and procedures in the organization to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.35, respondents knew where to go when they had a problem to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.17, respondents shared the organization values to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.05, respondents knew the organization objectives to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.05, respondents knew how many projects the organization was working at that moment to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.93, respondents knew the organization vision and mission to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.83, respondents knew the existing departments in the organization to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.78, respondents knew the organization director’s name to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.65 while respondents knew who is above and below them in the organization structure to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.62.
Table 4.6: Employees Knowledge of the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know who is above and below me in the organization structure</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know all the processes and procedures in the organization</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the organization vision and mission</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the organization values</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the organization objectives</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how many projects we are working at this moment</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know all the existing departments of my organization</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the Organization Director name</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where to go when I have a problem</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.533</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.059</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (201)

4.4.2. Concerns of the Organization

The study aimed at evaluating the organizations concern to its employees. According to the findings; the organization promoted team work to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.03, the organization had an open door policy to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.85, the organization introduced every new employee in all the departments to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.72, the organization encouraged career upgrades to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.57, the organization encouraged training and formation to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.32, the organization informed every new employee of the vision and mission of the organization to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.30, the organization communicated to every new employee the objectives they needed to meet individually and together to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.23 while the organization introduced every new employee to the organization processes and procedures to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.07.
Table 4.7: Concerns of the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization introduces every new employee in all the departments</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization introduces every new employee to the organization</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization informs every new employee of the vision and mission of</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization, tells every new employee the objectives they should</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet individually and together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has an open door policy</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization encourages career upgrades</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization encourages training and formation</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization promotes team work</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.491</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.061</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

4.4.3. Organizations Practices

The study aimed at establishing whether a list of given practices took place in the organization. According to the respondents, the organization introduced changes to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 4.15, respondents helped their colleagues in solving a problem to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.60, there were team building activities to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.52, the organization promoted trainings to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.32, the superiors helped respondents in solving problems to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.05, people moved from one department to other to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.00 while respondents met outside the organization for casual events to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 2.88.
Table 4.8: Organizations practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization promotes trainings</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization introduces changes</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People move from one department to other</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are team building activities</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superior helps me solve a problem</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help my colleagues solve a problem</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We meet outside the organization for casual events</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>6.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

4.5. The Optimal Degree of Organization for Performance

4.5.1. Service Delivery of the Organization

On investigating service delivery of the organisation; 32% who were the majority were neutral on the way the organisation conducted its service delivery, 22% indicated that the organisation was more bureaucratic in service delivery, 20% indicated that the organisation was less bureaucratic in service delivery, 17% indicated that the organisation was extremely bureaucratic in service delivery while 10% indicated that the organisation was not bureaucratic at all service delivery.
### Table 4.9: Service delivery of the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not bureaucratic at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less bureaucratic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More bureaucratic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely bureaucratic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

#### 4.5.2. Employee Task Defined

The study aimed at evaluating how respondent’s task was defined; according to the respondents; 38% who were the majority indicated that respondent’s task was more defined, 27% indicated that respondent’s task was neutral, 27% indicated that respondent’s task was extremely defined while 8% indicated that respondent’s task was less defined.

**Figure 4.3: Employee task defined**

Source: Survey Data (2014)
4.5.3. NGOs Processes and Procedures

The study sought to evaluate the NGOs processes and procedures; 40% who were the majority indicated that processes and procedures were clearer, 23% indicated that processes and procedures were less clear, 22% indicated that processes and procedures were extremely clear while 15% indicated that processes and procedures were neutral.

Table 4.10: NGOs processes and procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less clear</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More clear</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely clear</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

4.5.4. Internal Structure in the Organization Operation

The study aimed at establishing the internal structure in the organization operation; 43% who were the majority indicated that internal structure in the organization was more stratified, 33% indicated that internal structure in the organization was neutral, 15% indicated that internal structure in the organization was extremely stratified while 8% were of the opinion that internal structure in the organization was less stratified.
Table 4.11: Internal structure in the organization operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less stratified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stratified</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely stratified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

4.5.5. Communication between Departments in the Organisation

On evaluating the communication between departments in the organisation; 35% who were the majority indicated that communication between departments in the organisation was neutral, 23% indicated that communication between departments in the organisation was more clear and easy, 23% indicated that communication between departments in the organisation was extremely easy and clear, 12% indicated that communication between departments in the organisation was less clear or easy while 7% were of the opinion that communication between departments in the organisation was not clear or easy.

Table 4.12: Communication between departments in the organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less clear or easy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More clear and easy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)
4.5.6. Solving Internal Conflicts and General Problems

Figure 4.4: Solving internal conflicts and general problems
Source: Survey Data (2014)

On ascertaining the organisation ways of solving internal conflicts and general problems, 30%, who were the majority, indicated that it was neutral, 28% indicated that internal conflicts and general problems were easy to solve, 18% indicated that internal conflicts and general problems were less easy to solve, 17% indicated that internal conflicts and general problems were extremely easy to solve while 7% indicated that internal conflicts and general problems were not easy at all to solve.

4.5.7. Organization Establishment

On investigate the respondent’s opinion in terms of how it was organised; 33% who were the majority indicated that the organisation was more organized, 30% indicated that the organisation was extremely organised, 18% indicated that the organisation was less organised, 13% indicated that the organisation was neutral while 5% were of the opinion that the organisation was not organised at all.
Table 4.13: Organization establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not organised at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less organised</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more organized</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely organised</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2014)

4.6. Correlation analysis

Table 4.13 Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NGOs performance</th>
<th>Evaluating Performance</th>
<th>Analyzing the Organization</th>
<th>Degree of Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating Performance</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.(2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysing the Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.(2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.(2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
The study shows that there is a high and significant correlation between NGOs performance and factors evaluating Performance \((r = 0.542, p = 0.001)\). The study further shows a low but positive relationship between NGOs performance and analyzing the Organization \((r = 0.362, p=0.764)\); and a low but significant relationship with degree of Organization \((r = 0.182, p = 0.012)\).

### 4.7. Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the analysis of data collection, has reviewed the findings received from the field from the respondents and presented in a statistical manner with tables and figures.

The findings on how organizations evaluate performance, showed that for the employees personal performance was meet when achieving their own objectives, as for the organization it performed well when it made an impact in the surrounded society. Besides the fact that the employees knew the organization processes and procedures to a great extent, shown by a mean score of 4.35, just in a moderate way, the organization shared this same processes and procedures with them, as shown by the mean 3.07.

For the majority of the respondents the tasks in their organizations were more defined, the processes and procedures were clearer, the internal structure was more stratified and the organization was more organized. The respondents have a neutral opinion in the level of bureaucracy in the organization – service delivery – and in the way conflicts are solved.

The correlation equation has established that there is a high and significant correlation between NGOs performance and the factor that evaluate this performance\((r= 0.542, p = 0.001)\). The study further shows a low but positive relationship between NGOs performance and the way the organization is analyzed \((r= 0.362, p=0.764)\); and a low but significant relationship with degree of Organization \((r= 0.182, p = 0.012)\). The next chapter will discuss the findings draw conclusion and give recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the study, focusing on the purpose, research questions and the methodology used to conduct this research project. It highlights the major findings, presented on chapter 4, as relates them to the research questions and previous literature review. Therefore, the chapter presents a discussion, conclusions and makes recommendations for practice and further research.

5.2. Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of influence of the degree of organization in the effective management of a Non-Governmental Organization and respective performance. The research was guided by 3 research questions: how do NGOs define performance; to what extent does the organizational internal structure influences the degree of organization; what degree of organization is optimal for NGOs performance.

The research designed used was a descriptive survey. The target population consisted of workers from the NGOs within Nairobi County. The total number of workers from the population was 220. Using a probability sample, a sample size of 80 workers was selected from the 220 workers from the 3 selected Non-Governmental Organizations, whose names will remain confidential for the purpose of this study.

Primary data was collected by using questionnaires designed by the researcher; they were divided in 4 main sections: the first one with demographic purposes and the other 3 organized according to the research questions. The data analysis method, used in this study was correlational analysis, using inferential statistics in a quantitative approach. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was the tool used to assist in the analysis process.

Major findings out of the research in relation to how do NGOs define performance indicate that: for the employees their own performance was accomplished when they met their own objectives, as well as when they were team players within the organization, conversely
their performance did not seem affected by their superiors orders. For the majority of the inquired organizations, performance was defined by the impact made in the surrounded areas, whereas their transparency and consistency, did not reveal to be a big factor affecting the way the organization performs.

In terms of the analysis of the organization internal structure, the results generated indicated that employees knew the organization major processes and procedures although there was a lack of knowledge in the organization structure, knowing just to a moderate extent who was above and beyond them in the organization. Still under the same research question, the respondents believed that their organizations promoted team work, but failed to introduce major process and procedures of the organization to every new employee.

When evaluating the degree of organization, the majority of the inquired organization revealed to have their tasks quite defined, the processes and procedures were clearer to understand, the structure in most of them was indicated as more stratified, and being the major of respondents neutral in terms of the bureaucracy in the organization and the way the organization solves conflicts, it is understandable why that the major part of the respondents believed their organizations were more organized (30%) and extremely organized (18%).

5.3. Discussion

5.3.1. Defining Performance in NGOs

The findings from the research indicate that employees performed well when they accomplished their own objectives to a great extent shown by the mean score of 4.45, as when they were team players within the organization to a great extent shown by the mean score of 4.4, they knew their role in the organization to a great extent as shown by the mean score of 4.28 and when they worked effectively on their projects to a great extent shown by the mean of score of 4.25. This is in line with the assertion by Sull (2005), that a well-defined job design is essential to build an efficient and discipline work environment, as it reinforces the commitment in the organization.

According to Armstrong and Baron (2006), personal and team factors like the ones above, are two of the 5 factors that will affect performance, but also, systems factors, which means accomplish the organization vision and mission and that happened, in the inquired
organizations, to a great extent as shown by the mean score of 3.92, and accomplish the strategic plan goals, which occurred according to the research findings to a great extent shown by the mean score of 3.67.

Daft (2010), asserts that organizations are entirely dependent and influenced by their environment, which is, to a certain way, dominated by the culture of the organization. According to this author, the set of values, beliefs, understandings and norms shared by the employees is what holds the organization, affecting the design and operation system thus how it performs. The findings of the study were in agreement with that, since for the respondents, sharing the values and beliefs of the organization would, in fact, define and affect their performance to a great extent shown by the mean score of 3.75, as well as they believed, to a great extent, that if the organization was faithful to their own principles and values they will perform better.

However, the study showed that employees performance was defined by accomplish superior orders just to a moderate extent, shown by the mean score of 3.27. This finding was contradictory to the fifth factor affecting performance, defined by Amstrong and Baron (2006) as the leadership factor. A proper human resource management and devolution of management authority are for Ramalingam et al. (2009), essential to achieve NGOs performance, and that development seems to be in need in the enquired organizations.

Jacobs (2010), sets a 4 categories framework, to define and evaluate performance management in NGOs by: planning- define a strategy in partnership with all stakeholders; measuring- ensure the meeting of appropriate standards; managing- continual improvement of organizational culture and communicating- give and receive feedback of the work and be transparent and consistent.

Besides the fact that the findings of the study were in agreement with one of the categories of the framework – measuring- since the organizations met the goals defined both in their strategic plan or project plans to a great extent as shown by the means of 4.48 and 3.92, respectively. The findings of the study also indicated that Jacobs framework can be a bit ambiguous since: the definition of objectives involved both management and employees to some extent, but it was the donors who had a big influence in the process of planning like shown by the mean score of 4.03; the values and principles of the organization were shared to a great extent, but working for the accomplish of the vision and mission and the
promotion of a good work environment had just a moderate impact in the definition of performance; the organizations seemed to communicate well with the employees giving and receiving feedback to a great extent as shown by the mean score of 4.3, and by sharing the organization strategy with the employees to a great extent as shown by the mean score of 4.00, but transparency and consistent were not considered important elements in the definition of organization performance.

One of the biggest findings of the study was that the respondents felt organizational performance was defined by making an impact in the surrounded society to a great extent, as shown by the mean score of 4.37, embracing the bigger number of projects possible as shown by the mean score of 4.18 and meeting donors expectations. This could be an indicator of the perverse effect of performance measurement and misusing in some organizations like stated by Julnes and Holzer (2001) since they were focusing heavily in what enables targets to be met – the outside view of their work – and not because they were motivated or feel empathy with cause. Keller and Price (2011) defended that there is a tendency to neglect investments in the company health, which is in accordance to the findings of the study if we focus on the moderate impact that the promotion of a good work environment and transparency and consistence had in the definition of organizational performance.

5.3.2. Organizational Internal Structure and the Degree of Organization

By using closed-ended questions the researcher sought to find if there was a major concern with the internal organizational structure in the NGO world. Like stated by Faria and Madeira (2011), the high complexity of an organization makes it difficult to standardize their structure. This is in line with the findings of the study once it had answers showing an effective structure and others showing some problems.

Following P. R. Silva (2005) molecular structure of organizations, we can state in the majority of the enquired organizations there was a vertical power, shown by the donor’s great influence in the definition of the organization objectives; the knowledge of the organization director’s name to a great extent as shown by the mean score of 3.65; the knowledge of who was above and below in the organization structure as well as the other organization departments; and the organization encouragement for career upgrades, which
agrees with Daft (2010) assertion that employees can easily obtain power and influence in an upward direction when there is vertical power organization.

Despite the fact that there was a vertical power, the study shown a tendency for a decentralized structure, defined by Teixeira (2005) as high level of power delegation from the top level management to the lower employees since: organization promoted team work to great extent as shown by the mean score of 4.03; there was an open door policy to a great extent as shown by the mean score of 3.85; colleagues helped themselves solving problems in opposition of the superior that just did it to a moderate extent and employees knew how many projects they were working at the present moment to a great extent as shown by the mean score of 3.93.

The respondents revealed to know the organization processes and procedures to a great extent, as shown by the mean score of 4.35 as well as the organization values, objectives and vision and mission of the organization. This was in line with Pearce and Robinson (2003) and Daft (2010) that a good strategy is well planned in advance, is flexible, builds on the experience of people, is realistic and has depth, including defining an overall mission and official goals based on the correct fit. However, the findings of the study disclosed that besides the knowledge of the strategic plan by the employees, this knowledge was shared by the organization to the new employees just to a moderate extent, contradicting Cummings and Worley (2005) opinion that guiding how members should behave in particular situations, inform them about norms, values and organization basic assumptions is essential to develop an organizational culture and if necessary implement change.

According to Cassidy and Guggenberger (2000) in order to keep a functional structure and good management of the processes it is required a continuous improvement, management commitment and corrective action and team work. However, the findings of the study showed that the enquired organizations promoted trainings just to a moderate level, as shown by the mean score of 3.32, as job rotation and extra-duty activities, like meeting outside the organization for casual events, happened equally just to a moderate extent, in the majority of the enquired organizations.

According to the results of the study, and following P. R. Silva (2005) 2 types of processes in organizational structural processes, the enquired organizations revealed good practices in terms of the operating processes: understanding of the organization processes and
procedures, knowing vision and mission, promoting team work, employees helping each other and achieve organizational goals; however in terms of management and support processes, the results showed a lack of those: training and development, managing improvement and change and developing and managing human resources.

5.3.3. The Optimal Degree of Organization for Performance

This study aimed at defining the optimal degree of organization. By the use of closed – ended questions, the researcher searched for the level where, the majority of the enquired organizations were situated in terms of the different components that dictate the degree of organization. That information together with the previous analysis and discussion, allows a better understanding on where NGOs are in terms of the degree of organization and where they should be.

Both Hodson (2001) and Lewis (2003), face NGOs as under organized organizations. For Cumming and Worley (2005), those are organizations where there are: too little constraints or regulation for task performance; poorly defined leadership, structures, job design and procedures and fragmented communications and lack of direction. However the findings of the study showed different: a majority of 38 % of the respondents indicated that their task in the organization is defined; the organization processes are clearer and easier to understand to a majority of 40% and 43% of the respondents believe the organization is structured and stratified. Furthermore, besides the fact that a majority of the respondents were neutral regarding the way the organization solves conflicts, delivers service and communicates, 33% of the respondents indicated there organization as a more organized place and 30% believe their organization is even in an over organized level, opposing the 5% that defined their organizations as under organized.

For Lewis (2005), one of the reasons for NGOs being seen as under organized, relates to the fact that they have an unclear power, nevertheless the findings of the research showed to a great extent, that employees know who are they superiors and how the organization is structured. The researcher understands that, like stated by Mukasa (2006), board members are often lacked the time or the expertise to be able to carry out some responsibilities effectively, which leads to the fact that they helped solving problems just to a moderate extent and that in the majority of the case who had the power in the organization were the
donors, that needed to be pleased and whose demands need to be met to a great extent, but those, are not directly involved in the power process.

For James (2010), the fact that NGOs have strategy, ways forward but not concrete strategic plans, also contributes for characterizing this type of organizations as under organized. Although, once again, the research findings went in a different directions: the respondents knew the organization objectives, values and even mission and vision to a great extent, even if this elements were not commonly shared by the organization with the new employees, the general strategy was shared to a great extent shown by the mean score of 4.00.

Lost information and poor communications are according to Cirikovic (2009) another element that defines under organized NGOs and most likely to happen in decentralized structure organizations nevertheless the findings of this study were not conclusive in this topic since the majority of the respondents are neutral in the way communications are done and conflicts solved.

5.4. Conclusions

5.4.1. Defining Performance in NGOs

Performance is a complex concept related to the accomplishment and achievement of objectives, representing different processes for different kinds of organizations. The research findings did indicate that in the NGO world, performance was likely to be defined according to the impact of the organizations outputs in the surrounded society, the number of projects embraced by the organization and the achievement of donor’s expectations. This revealed that for NGOs a bigger focus is given to the external results of the organization, to what enables targets to be met, and not to the internal features of the same abandoning the organization health, caring less about the promotion of a good work environment, the assurance of transparency and consistency and the establishment of better coordination.
5.4.2. Organizational Internal Structure and the Degree of Organization

The high complexity of an organization makes it difficult to standardize their structure. Still, from the research findings it can be concluded that most of the NGOs had a vertical power with a strong influence from the organization donors, and a decentralized structure with good teamwork dynamics, general knowledge of the working projects and departments. The employees showed in a general way understanding of their strategic plan, processes and procedures; however this was something they acquire with experience since there was no concern from the organization to introduce these organizational practices to the new employees. In an attempt to understand the extent to what the organizational internal structure influences the degree of organization we can say that NGOs internal structure has a dual impact in the degree of organization, being over organized in terms of the operating processes, the ones that will bring the outputs, but under organized in the management and support processes the ones that contribute for organization health.

5.4.3. The Optimal Degree of Organization for Performance

From the research findings it can be concluded that most of the NGOs were in a level close to the over organized situation, which contradicts most of the authors, mainly because NGOs definition of performance is focused on the outputs and not in the internal functioning of the organization. That is why, when correlating NGO performance with the degree of organization there was a significant but low relationship (r=0.182, p=0.012). Defining an optimal degree of organization for NGO in order to achieve performance appeared to be challenging, once the concept of NGO performance was not in line with the one expected by the organizational development.
5.5. Recommendations

5.5.1. Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1. Defining Performance in NGOs

It would be important for NGOs to consider their organizational internal structure elements in a greater extent, when defining performance and not just the outputs of the organization. Furthermore, it is highly recommended to make a better discrimination of the organization objectives, establishing what are the organizational goals and what is expected by the donors, so that both objectives may be achieved and not ones suppressed by the others.

5.5.1.2. Organizational Internal Structure and the Degree of Organization

The high awareness of the organization operating processes and the low conscious on the organization management and support processes show a lack of structure in the NGOs functioning, a reverse in the situation is necessary. It would be recommended the increasing of training and development activities as well as better definition of management responsibilities in order to create a better understanding on the inside part of the organization.

5.5.1.3. The Optimal Degree of Organization for Performance

In order to establish an optimal point in the degree of organization spectrum affecting positively NGO performance, it is necessary to reformulate the concept of performance, substituting it by, for example: organizational health. The awareness of the NGOs internal functioning would contribute for a better correlation among workers, more defined goals and consequently a better output delivery. NGOs cannot limit themselves to perform; they need to start doing it effectively.
5.5.2. Recommendations for Further Studies

Following this study, the researcher believes there is a need for further investigation, in order to establish the impact and the relevance of the degree of organization. It is not a commonly used concept when evaluating performance and a relatively new concept in the organizational development studies, being for that, recommended a deeper analysis in what constitutes an over and under organized work place. In further research the use of health as an organizational development concept is recommended, to avoid the confusion and deliver a better result when relating to the degree of organization. Moreover, an observation method of data collection together with a bigger sample of the population, even if time demanding, would be more effective and more close to reality, allowing more precise results.
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Dear Respondent,

I am carrying out a research on the impact of the degree of organization in Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) performance. This is partial fulfilment of the requirement of Executive Master of Science in Organizational Development (EMOD) degree program that is offered at the United States International University (USIU).

The study involves employees from various NGOs within the Nairobi County. You have been selected as one of the lucky respondents as you work for one of the elected NGOs. The findings of this study will provide useful information for a better understanding in how to achieve performance based on the degree of organization in an NGO.

I would appreciate it if you would spare sometime to fill in the questionnaire attached, which will feed into the research. The information that you provide will be treated confidentially and I guarantee you that your name will not appear anywhere in the report.

Should you require a summary of the results, please do not hesitate to contact me on crv.garcia@gmail.com.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Cristiana Garcia
APENDIX 2: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for your participation!

This study is a requirement for the partial fulfilment of the Executive Master of Science in Organizational Development (EMOD) program at the United States International University (USIU). The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of the degree of organization in Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) performance.

The questionnaire is divided in 4 sections: the first one concerned to general information and the following three related to the 3 research questions of this study; each section is provided with clear instructions in how to answer. The questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete and all the provided information is confidential.

SECTION I – GENERAL INFORMATION

Please tick the right option.

1.1. Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐

1.2. Age: < 20 ☐ 20-30 ☐ 30 - 40 ☐ 40 - 50 ☐ > 50 ☐

1.3. How long have you worked for this organization?

☐ 0 – 6 months

☐ 6 – 12 months

☐ 1 - 3 years

☐ 3 – 5 years

☐ More than 5 years

1.4. What is your position at the organization?

☐ Administrative ☐ Temporary ☐ Intern

☐ Operational ☐ Top Management ☐ Middle Management
SECTION II – EVALUATING PERFORMANCE

Please tick the space that corresponds to your personal opinion for each statement.

2.1. I perform well at my job when I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish my own objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work effectively on my projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know my role in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share my organization values and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am team player within the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish my organization objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for the accomplish of the vision and mission of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do what others ask me to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do what my superior wants me to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I feel that my organization performs well when it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishes the Strategic Plan goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets donors expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes an impact in the surrounded society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraces the bigger number of projects possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is faithful to the principles and values of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works for the accomplish of the vision and mission of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes a good work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is transparent and consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a different scale tick the space that corresponds to your personal opinion.

2.3. My organization functions in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>I do not</th>
<th>Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our objectives are defined by the management team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our objectives are defined by our donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees participate in the definition of objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization strategy is shared with the employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We give and receive constant feedback of our work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We meet the goals defined in our strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We meet our project goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION III – ANALYZING THE ORGANIZATION

Please tick the space that corresponds to your personal opinion for each statement.

3.1. In what I am concerned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know who is above and below me in the organization structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know all the processes and procedures in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the organization vision and mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the organization values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the organization objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how many projects we are working at this moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know all the existing departments of my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the Organization Director name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where to go when I have a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2. In what my organization is concerned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Statement</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutral</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization introduces every new employee in all the departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization introduces every new employee to the organization processes and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization informs every new employee of the vision and mission of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization, tells every new employee the objectives they should meet individually and together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has an open door policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization encourages career upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization encourages training and formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization promotes team work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using a different scale tick the space that corresponds to your personal opinion.

### 3.3. I feel that in my organization the following happens:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Statement</strong></th>
<th><strong>Always</strong></th>
<th><strong>Often</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rarely</strong></th>
<th><strong>Never</strong></th>
<th><strong>I do not Know</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization promotes trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization introduces changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People move from one department to other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are team building activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superior helps me solve a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help my colleagues solve a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We meet outside the organization for casual events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION IV – THE DEGREE OF ORGANIZATION

Please mark the numeric value that corresponds to your personal opinion.

4.1. My organization is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Bureaucratic at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. My tasks are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Defined at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. In my organization processes and procedures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Clear at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. The internal structure in my organization is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Stratified at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Stratified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. In my organization communication between departments is:

1 2 3 4 5

Not Clear or Easy Extremely Easy and Clear

4.6. In my organization, solving internal conflicts and general problems is:

1 2 3 4 5

Not Easy at all Extremely Easy

4.7. In my opinion my organization is:

1 2 3 4 5

Not organized at all Extremely Organized

THE END

Thank you for your participation!!