International Journal of Business Management and Processes (IJBMP)
Vol 4. Issue No.2. November, 2018. PP 89-100. ISSN 2616-3209

EFFECTS OF RESTRUCTURING OF OPERATIONS AND SYSTEMS ON JOB SATISFACTION IN OSERIAN DEVELOPMENT COMPANY IN NAIVASHA, KENYA

Brendah Chelimo Koech [1], Hellene Sang[2] & Philip Ragama[3]

[1&2]School of Business and Economics, Kabarak University, Kenya
[3]School of Computer Science and Bioinformatics, Kabarak University, Kenya

Abstract

Organizations are dynamic entities that do not function well if individual components fail to work in unison. Organizational restructuring harmonizes skill sets with business needs in order to meet the overall mission of the company and achieve high performance levels. This however affects employees as a result. The objective of this study was to establish the effects of restructuring of operations and systems on job satisfaction in Oserian development Company in Naivasha, Kenya. The study was guided by the following theories; Job Characteristics Model Theory, Maslow's Five-Level Hierarchy and the Motivator-Hygiene Theory. The target population was 6000 employees drawn from all aspects of job levels. A sample size of 99 employees was used. The study used a pre-tested structured self-administered questionnaire. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages. Regression analysis placed restructuring of operations ($\beta = 0.380$; p value = 0.001) as the most influencer of job satisfaction followed by systems restructuring ($\beta = 0.211$; p value = 0.210). The study thus recomended that the industry players should consider running operation restructuring concurrently with systems restructuring to save on time and resources.

***Keywords**: Job Satisfaction, Operations, Organization, Restructuring, Systems*

I.INTRODUCTION

Corporate firms have practiced organizational restructuring since the 19th Century impacting on the future of both employees and stakeholders. Restructuring is normally being adopted when the organization is no longer able or willing to develop or utilize its capabilities and assets invested as per earlier investment decisions (Lowell, 2003). Organizational restructuring practices take two major forms, renovated restructuring and redistributive restructuring. Renovated restructuring contributes to equitable economic growth, while redistributive restructuring benefits certain group at the expense of others. The redistributive restructuring involves six forms such as divestures, buyouts, outsourcing, relocation, downsizing and bankruptcy. Activities of redistributive restructuring can have a negative impact on a group of people and a positive impact on another group depending on if the group is relocated or remains within the organization after restructuring.

Globally, corporate restructuring contributed a significant effect on workers job in securing and indirectly significant to their health and health behaviours (Chaekyu, 2003). The Korean society revised the strategy of corporate restructuring where the intention was to reduce the cost of operation for a short-term while also contributing to a long-term survival and development of the company. Corporate restructuring has decreased corporate productivity and weakened social integration in Korea (Chaekyu, 2003). Restructuring is a lengthy process, which roughly takes one year to complete. A study by Boone et al. (2007) on 298 firms in the United States from 1989-98, found that due to the time period urgency of resolving critical financial or operational situation the companies ended up with various outcomes from being acquired, bankruptcy no taking no observable actions (Mulherin, 2001). The study also found out that from the 298 firms propose for corporate restructuring, 70 per cent make a definitive proposal to sell either all or part of the company while 30 per cent taking route to be out of play or declaring bankruptcy. The estimate per cent where the corporation was able to have full value of the restructuring is only 7.5 per cent and the firms that had an average gain from the restructuring was only 5 per cent. This indicates that the current methodology of restructuring has not significantly contributed to upside impact to the organizations.

In an effort to better understand the multidimensional nature of satisfaction, it is explained in the context to organizational restructuring. This context allows the test of a conceptual model that includes antecedents, component of work related satisfaction, overall satisfaction and satisfaction with life. The finding supports the nation that (1) organizational restructuring has demonstrable implications for employees' satisfaction and (2) work-related satisfaction is the major the component satisfaction with life. In the year 2007 in Kenya during the wake of a stiff competition in the mobile telephony and the banking sectors, companies embarked on aggressive recruitment and talent search to mob-up the top management as a strategy to remain competitive and capture requisite market share. This was characterized by unprecedented 'poaching of 'talent and professionals from competitor firms. The firms' over-valued talent and offered astronomical perks to management staff. Realizing that high salaries offered to bloated management terms cannot be sustained, companies have embarked on a restructuring process to trim the management teams and cut down on huge salary budget for the executives as overpaid managers have eating into returns (Perkins & Hendry, 2005)

Organizational restructuring is a common occurrence in the current economic conditions. It can happen due to many reasons new business acquisitions, low business performance, market conditions or simply to stay relevant, to name a few. Regardless of the cause of restructures, the process of restructuring is complex, and can make or break a company. According to Snell and Bohlander (2015), HR plays a critical role in this process; as it is the one department that both management and employees rely on to manage the issues that arise from restructures. Restructures bring out anxiety in both employees and management, so it is important to ensure constant communication to these stakeholders. HR's role is to communicate with management and any external stakeholders on the direction and progress of the restructure.

II.RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

(i) Effects of restructuring of operations and systems on job satisfaction in Oserian Development Company.

III.RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The study tested the following hypothesis:

(i) **H_{01}:** Restructuring of operations has no significant influence on job satisfaction at Oserian Development Company.

(ii) **H_{02}:** Restructuring of systems has no significant influence on job satisfaction at Oserian Development Company.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

Operations Restructuring and Job Satisfaction

Limited research has been done to relate Organizational restructuring and its influence on job satisfaction. Much of the already done research has focused on the relationship between restructuring and financial performance. For instance, (Laddha et al, 2014) studied the impact of restructuring on the financial performance of organization. Job satisfaction has been defined as pleasurable emotional state resulting from appraisal of one's (Weiss, 2002). Organization restructuring and downsizing, negatively affect employees job security and job satisfaction. Employees who survive the restructuring and downsizing process are mostly know to have problems with physiological well-being, perception of time pressures and also have increased turnover intentions

According to Smart & Waldfogel (1994), a growing body of research indicates that corporate restructuring generates values for stockholders, and recent empirical evidence points to improvements in operating performance as a primary source of these gains. Kaplan and Kaplan (1989) study on firms taken private in management buyouts (MBOs) and find that both financial (sales, income etc) and real factor productivity performance measures improve after buyout. Healy, Palepu & Ruback (1992), also discovered asset productivity improvements in a sample of merged firms.

The effect of restructuring is thus measured as a "difference in differences", or as the change in performance at the restructuring firm, minus the simultaneous change in performance at the control firm. The chief shortcoming of this approach lies in its assumption that, if not for the restructuring, the reorganizing firm would have experienced the same change in performance as its competitors. If individual firms have their own dynamic performance patterns, it may be unreasonable to assume that expect when organizational structure changes, the performance measures of the firms in the same industry move together. An accurate measure of the effect of restructuring on firm performance is important because it sheds light on organizational efficiency. In addition, the influence of corporate control events on private sector productivity is directly linked with a number of public policy concerns. For example, corporate restructuring affects the tax revenue collected from corporations. When companies privatize, they typically replace equity with debt. While the cash flow previously paid to equity holders faced corporate income taxation, the interest payments paid to post-buyout debt holders escape corporate level taxation. Kaplan (1989) estimate that the U.S. Treasury has actually gained from management buyouts (MBOs) because the tax revenues generated from improved corporate cash flows have been large enough to offset corporate tax losses associated with the increased usage of debt.

The impact of restructuring on staff is not necessarily accounted for in the process of change, which is unfortunate, as the pressures of cost containment usually lead to an emphasis on work redesign to deliver care in more efficient and cost effective ways. However as hospitals undergo restructuring there is a little evidence that efficiency or outcomes actually improve (Crawford et al 2002). Despite this, restructuring can have significant implications for patients and the nursing workforce. Health care administrators have been pressured to undertake almost constant organizational restructuring due to a range of dynamic external factors including: increasingly scarce resources, rapidly developing and costly technology, shifting consumer expectations, a changing workforce, new regulations and competition and demand for greater efficiency (Porter & Van der Linde, 1995). In addition, as with other public sector organizations, governments' adoption of a market-based model has reinforced the need for more efficient ways of organizing.

It is also important to ensure that professional links are maintained to prevent the individual loss of professional identity that can occur through restructuring (Wynn 1997). Furthermore, research suggests that nurses have improved job satisfaction when staffing levels remain high enough for reasonable time to be spent with their patient (Landsbergis et al 1999). Job control is not limited, otherwise high physiological stress can result and upper management and medical staff are strong enough to implement changes. There is some evidence that hospitals are returning to previous structures where divisions have disappeared, there are no sub structures and the nurse executive is responsible for all nursing activity. In the UK the role of 'modern matron' was 'reconstituted' in 2001 under the government's NHS plan to provide strong clinical leadership at the ward level. This position has the authority and organizational support to resolve clinical issues and ensure that the standards of care met if not exceeded (Ferlie & Shortell 2001). Evaluation has indicated that these new matron shave a positive impact on improving standards of nursing care, the environment, skill mix and staff retention, encouraging staff development and reducing the number of formal complaints from, the potential to make a positive contribution (Keeley et al 2005).

Corporate Restructuring has not much contributed toward constructive impact to the organizations, employees' national economic due to divestures, retrenchment or bankruptcy action. It has also not able to induce a positive long-term effect to those remaining employees after restructuring (Draai & Elizabeth, 2008).In most cases the percentage of companies that survived and able to engaged on profitability and sustainability is minimal and yet end up with divesting a portion or all of the company and even proposed for bankruptcy. For that we can conclude that research need to be done in developing a new restructuring model in ensuring a more justifiable process and effect corporate restructuring for a better corporate sustainability and more equitable economy. It is important to note that any negative impact to employees will induce a back to back impact to a decline in organizational profitability, efficiency, local and regional economy. On the other hand for companies with high number of employees will contribute a more prominent effect even to national and global effects due to divestures, retrenchments and even bankruptcy (Draai & Elizabeth, 2008).

Restructuring might finally ends up with upside impact to remaining employees. However, studies made in Sweden that despite of all the possibilities in having the positive implications, there are negative impact not only to the victims but also to the survivors, on displaced workers. The effects on health, earning for remaining, uncertainty, working environment, even work stress for remaining after redistributive restructuring may hinder performance (Bergstrom, 2005).

Systems Restructuring and Job Satisfaction

How employees react to a change is important to consider, since successful organizational change is dependent on employee support for the changes, not just employee compliance (Piderit, 2000). How open and positive employees are to change, depends on such things as the scale of the change perceived favourability of outcomes and fairness of outcomes (Weiss, 2002). Even though research has found that employees often respond negatively towards change due to increased work pressure and stress, according to Lai et. al., (2004) planning by management tends to enhance employees' change efforts and psychological well-being. This implies that the more efforts are made to plan change in advance, the more the change becomes predictable for employees (Lazarus & Folkman 1989).

For instance, there is evidence to show that when explanation is provided for a decision, it increases perceptions of justice and leads to more favourable reactions toward the organization. Research has examined the effects of a variety of information-related constructs on employee adjustment. In one such study, Schweiger and DeNisi (1991) observed that providing employees with realistic communication about an impending merger reduced the dysfunctional outcomes associated with the organizational change program. In addition, these findings have been corroborated in a recent study by Goris (2007) who found that employees who report higher levels of communication satisfaction tend to be more satisfied with their employment situation and that other factors such as personal feedback and communication climate are also strongly related to job satisfaction.

Studies have shown that trust in leaders is an important element of organizational change, either as an antecedent or consequence of relationships at work (Saunders & Thornhill, 2003). According to Mollering (2001), trust develops from favourable expectations based on interpretations of reality aided by a suspension of disbelief and a leap of an individual’s faith. Research has also suggested that key attributes of employee participation, such as open communication, expressing new ideas, shared vision and common direction, as well as mutual respect, are key elements in fostering trust and managing organizational change (Nyhan, 2000). In addition, inclusion and participation of employees into decision-making processes also indicates both the organization’s and management’s trust in their employees. Similarly, studies have revealed that among others, one of the antecedents of perceptions of trust in the organization is contributions from employees (Husted & Michailova, 2002). This implies that employees may develop a certain trust for management and the organization when they feel they are valued, as well as partakers and contributors to organizational decisions. In effect, their trust in management may be affected should they experience non-involvement or perceive that their contributions don’t matter. They further discovered that trust in management increases through participation in decision-making but decreased when employees experienced emotional strain. It must be pointed out that the issue of trust is linked to the perception of fairness and a strong relation between perception of fairness and trust in immediate supervisor and higher-level management. As a result of these findings, it is expected that in managerial decisions regarding change, consideration would be given to the effect on employees and not only how it affects the organization’s performance.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction or employee satisfaction has been defined in many different ways. Some people define it as simply how satisfied one is with their job while others believe it is not as simplistic as this definition suggests and instead that multidimensional psychological responses to one’s job are involved. Researchers have also noted that job satisfaction measures vary in the extent to which they measure feelings about the job (affective job satisfaction) or cognitions about the job (cognitive job satisfaction) (Cole & Cole, 2005).

Through the history of organizational and behavioural study, the question of employee satisfaction has drawn a lot of empirical examination, resulting in various definitions. For instance, Price (2001) describes employee satisfaction as the effective alignment an employee has towards their work. It can be seen as the persons view and assessment of the general work atmosphere Sempane, et al (2002) describes employee satisfaction as a universal sense about one’s job or an associated collection of attitudes on numerous planes of the work environment. Employee satisfaction can be seen as a `affirmative emotive state ensuing from the evaluation of one’s job or job practices’ (Islam & Siengthai, 2009). A shared aspect that joins these meanings is that employee satisfaction revolves around what individuals in an organization feel about their general job.

According to Schulte et al. (2006), there is a positive relationship between satisfaction and performance, job satisfaction and performance are closely related to one another. If a person is highly satisfied with his or her job this would lead the person to want to do well and perform well. Employee's performance may not be viewed as a behaviour that are relevant to the organization goal and which are measureable as per individual employees contribution but as an activity or job function during a specified period. According to Wright, Gardner, Moyniham and Allen (2005), for someone to increase worker satisfaction, it is imperious to quantify and launch the current levels first. However, due to its multi-faceted nature, the dimension of employee satisfaction differs from one organization to another. Some organizations use anonymous employee contentment surveys, which are run occasionally to quantify the levels of employee satisfaction (Deshpande, Arekar, Sharma & Somaiya, 2012).

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The target population of the study comprised the 6000 employees drawn from all aspects of job levels. A sample size of 99 employees was used and a response rate of 71.7% achieved. The study used a pre-tested, structured, self-administered questionnaire with a computed Cronbach's alpha of 81.1%. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages and Pearson`s correlation as well as inferential statistics in form of regression analysis.

VI.RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The following section presents the research findings of the study and discussions:

Restructuring of operations at Oserian Development Company

Table 1 indicates the responses concerning restructuring of operations at Oserian Development Company. The findings in Table 1 show that a high of 49.3% of the respondents (χ^2 = 45.831, P<0.0001) were neutral on the fact that HR executives are fully aware of the business needs and strategies pertaining to restructuring. According to Mollering (2001, p.412), trust develops from favourable expectations based on interpretations of reality aided by a suspension of disbelief and a leap of an individual's faith. Fulop et al (2002) did a study in hospitals and found that as hospitals undergo restructuring there is little evidences that efficiency or outcomes actually improving; despite this, restructuring can have significant implications for patients and the nursing workforce. In line with this finding the study found that 45.1% (χ^2 =33.859, P<0.0001) of the population agreed that restructuring improved effectiveness and efficiencies of their jobs. In support of the above finding, also 50.7% (χ^2 =48.789, P<0.0001) of the population agreed that operational changes that have taken place had no influence on the organization. Draai, (2008) found that Corporate Restructuring had not much contributed toward constructive impact to the organizations, employees' national economic due to divestures, retrenchment or bankruptcy action. It has also not been able to induce a positive long-term effect to those remaining employees after restructuring; this finding by Draai (2008) conforms to this study's finding which noted that a high of 43.7% (χ^2 =31.746, P<0.0001) of the respondents felt that operational restructuring in their organization were unnecessary.

Table 1: Restructuring of Operations

Restructuring of operations	S.D Freq (%)	D Freq (%)	N Freq (%)	A Freq (%)	S.A Freq (%)	X^2	P>CHSQ
Company HR executives are fully aware of the business needs pertaining to the restructuring	7 (9.9%)	18 (25.4%)	35 (49.3%)	6 (8.5%)	5 (7%)	45.831	<0.0001
Operational Changes that have taken place have no influence on the organization	2 (2.8%)	8 (11.3%)	9 (12.7%)	36 (50.7%)	16 (22.5%)	48.789	<0.0001
Restructuring has improved effectiveness and efficiencies of my job	3 (4.2%)	8 (11.3%)	14 (19.7%)	32 (45.1%)	14 (19.7%)	33.859	<0.0001
The changes do not influence me directly	3 (4.2%)	10 (14.1%)	13 (18.3%)	33 (46.5%)	12 (16.9%)	35.408	<0.0001
I feel that the changes which already have taken place were unnecessary.	3 (4.2%)	8 (11.3%)	13 (18.3%)	31 (43.7%)	16 (22.5%)	31.746	<0.0001
I make it a point to know what changes are taking place and how this will affect me personally.	4 (5.6%)	4 (5.6%)	8 (11.3%)	37 (51.2%)	18 (25.4%)	54.986	<0.0001
Appropriate plans are formulated for satisfying the requirements after restructuring	2 (2.8%)	7 (9.9%)	13 (18.3%)	31 (43.7%)	18 (25.4%)	35.127	<0.0001

Restructuring of systems at Oserian Development Company

Table 2 indicates the responses concerning restructuring of systems at Oserian Development Company. Piderit, (2000) notes that how employees react to a change is important to consider, since successful organizational change is dependent on employee support for the changes and not just employee compliance. Lazarus and Folkman (1989) noted that planning by management tends to enhance employees' change efforts and psychological well-being. This implies that the more efforts are made to plan change in advance, the more the change becomes predictable for employees. In addition, research indicates that effectively managing employees' psychological transition is vital to achieving organizational change since poor management of the transition is associated with feelings of threat, frustration and anxiety (Nielsen et al., 2007). These two findings reflects on what the researcher found that 35.2% (χ^2 = 10.479, P<0.0001) of the respondents agreed that they were fully informed of the newly defined action plans of the organization and 42.3% (χ^2 =37.239, P<0.0001) of the respondent also agreed that the Management does discussion on any changes with them.

Table 2: Restructuring of Systems

Restructuring of systems	S.D Freq (%)	D Freq (%)	N Freq (%)	A Freq (%)	S.A Freq (%)	X^2	P>CHSQ
I am fully informed of the newly defined action plans of the organization	11 (15.5 %)	13 (18.3 %)	11 (15.5%)	25 (35.2%)	11 (15.5%)	10.479	<0.0001
Management does discussion on any changes with me.	4 (5.6%)	2 (2.8%)	19 (26.8%)	30 (42.3%)	16 (22.5%)	37.239	<0.0001
I feel that the changes pose a threat to my career within the organization.	3 (4.2%)	2 (2.8%)	17 (23.9%)	32 (45.1%)	17 (23.9%)	42.732	<0.0001
During the last couple of months, I have experienced less conflict with management	2 (2.8%)	3 (4.2%)	16 (22.5%)	32 (45.1%)	18 (25.4%)	42.873	<0.0001
The impact of these changes on my career has been discussed with my manager.	7 (9.9%)	7 (9.9%)	18 (25.4%)	19 (26.8%)	20 (28.2%)	12.310	<0.0001
The new system enables management to recognize my roles/award my outputs	4 (5.6%)	15 (21.1 %)	17 (23.9%)	25 (35.2%)	10 (14.1%)	17.380	<0.0001
There is an effective performance management system after the restructure	9 (12.7 %)	7 (9.9%)	12 (16.9%)	23 (32.4%)	20 (28.2%)	13.718	<0.0001

Shaw et al., (1993) found that open communications with others was correlated with job satisfaction for 110 employees about to experience the divestiture of AT & T into a series of independent companies. A follow-up one year later also revealed that open communications was predictive of employees' attitude towards the divestiture, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In addition, these findings have been corroborated in a recent study by Goris (2007) who found that employees who report higher levels of communication satisfaction tend to be more satisfied with their employment situation and that other factors such as personal feedback and communication climate are also strongly related to job satisfaction.

By extension, one could deduce that when employees express satisfaction with the level of communication during organizational change, they are likely not to react negatively, this finding conformed with of this study where the researcher notes that 28.2% (χ^2 =12.310, P<0.0001) of the respondent strongly agreed that the impact of changes in that organization where discussed with them by their managers, this led to reduction of conflicts since 45.1% (χ^2 =42.873, P<0.0001) of the respondent confessed to have experienced less tussles with the management.

Correlation Analysis

Table 3 below represents Pearson`s correlation which indicated the presence, significance and to what extent does variables co relate to each other. Correlation coefficient ("r") ranges from -1.0 to +1.0. The higher the r is towards the positive side the higher the correlation is positively and versa.

Table 3: Correlation Analysis

		Operation Restructuring	System Restructuring	Job Satisfaction
Operation Restructuring	Pearson Correlation	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N	71		
System Restructuring	Pearson Correlation	.807**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	71	71	
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.617**	.620**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	71	71	71

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the study, the researcher found a strong and significant positive relationship between System restructuring and job satisfaction ($r = 0.62$, $\alpha = 0.01$). This was closely followed by another strong and significant positive relation between operations restructuring and job satisfaction with a correlation coefficient of ($r =0.617$, $\alpha = 0.01$). However there existed a strong interrelationship amongst the two independent variables; that is operations restructuring and System restructuring standing at ($r =0.807$, $\alpha = 0.01$). These finding conform to that of Smart and Waldfogel (1994), who found out that a growing body of research indicates that corporate restructuring generates values for stockholders, and that recent empirical evidence pointed to improvements in operating performance as a primary source of these gains.

Regression Analysis

Table 4 below represents the overall summary of the percentage of the dependent variable that was explained by the joint efforts of the independent variable. The research data shows that 43.4% of the changes in job satisfaction were caused by System restructuring, Operations restructuring and Job redesign put together, the remaining 56.6% is explained by other factors i.e. the moderating variables which were Government Policies, Union Actions and Economic environment.

Table 4: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.677a	.459	.434	5.18140

a. Predictors: (Constant), System restructuring, Operations restructuring, Job redesign

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Regression

Analysis of variance was done on the variables and results shown in table 5 followed by regression analysis results on table 6.

Table 5: Analysis of Variance Table

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1524.439	3	508.146	18.928	.000[b]
Residual	1798.744	67	26.847		
Total	3323.183	70			

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
b. Predictors: System restructuring, Operations restructuring, Job redesign

The above ANOVA results had an overall significance of 0.000 which is below the alpha used (α = 0.01) meaning the overall model is significant.

Table 6: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Coefficients

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	3.621	4.332		.836	.406		
Operations restructuring	.517	.209	.380	2.471	.001	.341	2.932
System restructuring	.256	.203	.211	1.265	.210	.291	3.434

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The researcher regressed the data and found a significant effect between operations restructuring and job satisfaction ($\beta_3 = 0.325, t = 2.089,$ $p \leq 0.01$).

Hypotheses testing

The specific objectives of the study were tested and implications are as follows; Restructuring of operations (β = 0.517; p value = 0.001) was found to have a significant effect on job satisfaction according to the regression analysis, meaning that we reject the null hypothesis. Systems restructuring (β = 0.256; p value = 0.210) on the other hand had no significant effect on job satisfaction meaning that the research fails to reject the null hypothesis. Finally the researcher tested the effect of job redesign on job satisfaction and found a significant effect (β = 0.325; p value = 0.001) thus rejecting the null hypothesis.

VII.CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

Even though systems restructuring effect on job satisfaction turned out positive, its impact was insignificant (p = 0.210), this specific finding came in agreement with that of Bergstorm (2005), who noted that the intention of restructuring might not always be realized and he suggested that restructuring is insufficient to change the performance and or cost structure of firms. Bergstorm (2005) also added that, there is evidence that shows that restructuring causes negative effects on survivors. Operations restructuring acted as a significant contributor to job satisfaction on both the correlation and regression analysis. Therefore the study advices practitioners to focus on operations restructuring as a key driver of positive performance.

VIII.RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study recommends that industry players should consider running operation restructuring concurrently with systems restructuring in order to save on time and resources since correlation results places these two variable as the highly correlated; meaning the effect on either one is more or less the same to the other. These two variables took the key positions as influencer of job satisfaction with a significant output.

REFERENCES

1) Bergstrom, O. (2005). A Swedish point of View on Restructuring. Institute for Management of Innovation and Technology.
2) Boone, A. L., Field, L. C., Karpoff, J. M., & Raheja, C. G. (2007). The Determinants of Corporate Board Size and Composition: An Empirical Analysis. *Journal of Financial Economics, 85*(1), 66-101.
3) Chaekyu, P. (2003). The Effect of Corporate Restructuring on Workers' Health in Korea. *Development and Society, 32*(2), 21-33.
4) Cole,L.E.,& Cole , M.S.(2005). *Employee Satisfaction and Organizational Performance: A Summary of Key Findings from Applied Psychology*. Retrieved September 02, 2011, from http://www.Teammax.net/files/literatureReview.pdf
5) Crawford, M. J., Rutter, D., Manley, C., Weaver, T., Bhui, K., Fulop, N., & Tyrer, P. (2002). Systematic Review of Involving Patients in the Planning and Development of Health Care. *BMJ, 325*(7375), 1263.
6) Draai, E., & Elizabeth, P. (2008). Knowledge Driven South African Public Sector. The Future of Public Service: Striking the Right Balance.
7) Ellickson, M.C., & Logsdon, K. (2001). Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Municipal Government Employees. *State &Local Government Review, 33*(3), 173-184.
8) Ferlie, E. B., & Shortell, S. M. (2001). Improving the Quality of Health Care in the United Kingdom and the United States: A Framework for Change. *The Milbank Quarterly, 79*(2), 281-315.
9) Goris, J. R. (2007). Effects of Satisfaction with Communication on the Relationship between Individual-Job Congruence and Job Performance/Satisfaction. *Journal of Management Development, 26*(8), 737-752.
10) Healy, P. M., Palepu, K. G., & Ruback, R. S. (1992). Does Corporate Performance Improve After Mergers? *Journal of Financial Economics, 31*(2), 135-175.
11) Husted, K., & Michailova, S. (2002). Diagnosing and Fighting Knowledge-Sharing Hostility. *Organizational Dynamics, 31*(1), 60-73.
12) Islam, M.Z., & Siengthai, S. (2009). *Quality of Work Life and Organizational Performance: Empirical Evidence from Dhaka Export Processing Zone.* Paper Presented at the ILO Conference on Regulating for Decent Work, Held at the International Labour Office, Geneva, and July 8-10.
13) Kaplan, S. (1989). Management Buyouts: Evidence on Taxes as a Source of Value. *Journal of Finance, 44*(3), 611-632.
14) Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (1989). *The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Perspective*. CUP Archive.
15) Keeley, J. E., Fotheringham, C. J., & Baer-Keeley, M. (2005). Factors Affecting Plant Diversity during Post-Fire Recovery and Succession of Mediterranean-Climate Shrublands in California, USA. *Diversity and Distributions, 11*(6), 525-537.
16) Laddha, N. C., Dwivedi, M., Mansuri, M. S., Singh, M., Gani, A. R., Yeola, A. P., & Madhavan, S. E. (2014). Role of Oxidative Stress and Autoimmunity in Onset and Progression of Vitiligo. *Experimental Dermatology, 23*(5), 352-353.
17) Lai, F., Griffin, M., & Babin, B. J. (2009). How Quality, Value, Image, and Satisfaction Create Loyalty at a Chinese Telecom. *Journal of Business Research, 62*(10), 980-986.
18) Landsbergis, P. A., Cahill, J., & Schnall, P. (1999). The Impact of Lean Production and Related New Systems of Work Organization on Worker Health. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*(2), 108.
19) Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1989). *Manual for the Hassles and Uplifts Scales.* Consulting Psychologists Press.
20) Lowell, W. L. (2003). *Corporate Restructuring*. The Oxford Handbook of Work and Organization.
21) Mulherin ,A.L.(2001). Valuing the Process of Corporate Restructuring.
22) Möllering, G. (2001). The Nature of Trust: From Georg Simmel to a Theory of Expectation, Interpretation and Suspension. *Sociology, 35*(2), 403-420.

23) Nyhan, R. C. (2000). Changing the Paradigm: Trust and Its Role in Public Sector Organizations. *The American Review of Public Administration, 30*(1), 87-109.
24) Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes toward an Organizational Change. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 783-794.
25) Perkins, S. J., & Hendry, C. (2005). Ordering Top Pay: Interpreting the Signals. *Journal of Management Studies, 42*(7), 1443-1468.
26) Porter, M., & Van der Linde, C. (1995). Green and Competitive: Ending the Stalemate. The Dynamics of the Eco-Efficient Economy. *Environmental Regulation and Competitive Advantage, 33*(1), 16-19.
27) Price, J. L. (2001). Reflections on the Determinants of Voluntary Turnover. *International Journal of Manpower, 22*(7), 600-624.
28) Saunders, M. N., & Thornhill, A. (2003). Organizational Justice, Trust and the Management of Change: An Exploration. *Personnel Review, 32*(3), 360-375.
29) Schulte, M., Ostroff, C., & Kinicki, A. J. (2006). Organizational Climate Systems and Psychological Climate Perceptions: A Cross-Level Study of Climate-Satisfaction Relationships. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79*(4), 645-671.
30) Sempane, M. E., Rieger, H., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job Satisfaction in Relation to Organizational Culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 28*(2), 23-30.
31) Smart, S. B., & Waldfogel, J. (1994). Measuring the Effect of Restructuring on Corporate Performance: The Case of Management Buyouts. *The Review of Economics and Statistics, 4*(2), 503-511.
32) Schweiger, D. M., & Denisi, A. S. (1991). Communication with Employees Following a Merger: A Longitudinal Field Experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(1), 110-135.
33) Snell, S., Morris, S., & Bohlander, G. W. (2015). Managing Human Resources. Nelson Education.
34) Weiss, H. M. (2002). Introductory Comments: Antecedents of Emotional Experiences at Work. *Motivation and Emotion, 26*(1), 1-2.
35) Wright, P. M., Gardner, T. M., Moynihan, L. M., & Allen, M. R. (2005). The Relationship between HR Practices and Firm Performance: Examining Causal Order. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 409-446.
36) Wynn, K. E. (1997). Embracing Change: Hospital Restructuring Revisited. *Pt-Alexandria, 5(1)*, 38-43.

How to Cite This Paper:

Koech, B. C., Sang, H., & Ragama, P. (2018). Effects of Restructuring of Operations and Systems on Job Satisfaction in Oserian Development Company in Naivasha, Kenya. *International Journal of Business Management and Processes (IJBMP)*, *4*(2), 89–100.