ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND PRODUCTIVITY OF DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS' STAFF IN PORT HARCOURT

CHUKWUMA, Nnenna Nancy
Department of business Administration
Faculty of Management Sciences
National Open University of Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between organizational change and staff productivity of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The objectives of the study were to determine how aspects of organizational change (technological change and structural change) relate to productivity of deposit money banks' performance in terms of effective efficiency and staff engagement. The study employed cross-sectional research design. The population of the study consist 21 deposit money banks. Primary data was collected from 202 management level staff using a five-point scaled questionnaire. The Spearman's Rank Order correlation served as the test statistic. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 was relied upon for all data analyses. The study found a strong connection between organizational change (represented as technological change and structural change) and staff productivity (represented as effective efficiency and staff engagement) of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The study therefore concludes that productivity of deposit money banks' employees can be improved through organizational change, and recommends that management deposit money banks' that desire improved productivity of employees should design and implement organizational change.

Keywords: Change, technological change, structural change, staff effectiveness, staff engagement

INTRODUCTION

Deposit money Banks are financial institutions that intermediates finances connecting surplus economic units and deficit ones that make up the economic system; and channelling financial resources to profitable investments. They also enhance the progress of efficient payment systems. A profitable, efficient and well managed banking system contributes to the firmness of a country's economic and financial system and protects its citizens and businesses from undesirable economic and financial crisis (Athanasoglu et al., 2005; Aburime, 2008; Ramlall, 2009). Nigeria's banking sector has been transformed, as the unpredictable business environment characterized by deregulation by the Central Bank of Nigeria, product innovation, globalization, advances in technology and fierce competition rewrite the rules of the game. The rapid intensification of the economic environment as well as the emergence of the ICT made global communication easier. This has in turn, changed the business environment and business operations and has made the marketspace more competitive (Friedman, 2007). In order to remain afloat, organizations seek newer better ways to determine customers' changing needs, and strive to create new solutions to existing problems, as well as emerging ones (Ateke et al., 2016). They must offer better quality products at lower prices, employ strategies that adequately equip their operations to adapt to current and emerging trends and face the rapidly changing environment with flexibility and uniqueness.

The recent COVID-19 pandemic necessitated the closure of business operations and altered social and economic lives worldwide. Allen et al. (2020, as cited in Ateke, 2021) affirm that the Covid-19 pandemic shattered the world, with far-reaching effects; the true range of which can only be imagined. Ateke (2021) contends that “just as the pandemic upended lives, markets and lay bare, the competence or otherwise of organizations and governments; it also led to long-term political and economic power-shifts in several ways, most of which will be noticed much later.” For now, it is obvious that competition has further intensified; and the value of most futuristic businesses improved. Most organizations are frantically adjusting their operations and structures to remain fit for purpose, despite the pandemic; and this has challenged their approach to changing the way they operate. It is no longer sufficient for firm to adjust one aspect of operations to compensate another; rather, they must handle several challenges of change simultaneously. These challenges of change at the organizational level have elevated the importance of managing change and employees’ change experiences (Brown & Harvey, 2006).

To endure in business and maintain competitive edge in a changing environment, organizational change needs to be a core competency in which management are skilled. This is because colossal change impacts all facets of organizational staff as it builds new dimensions of greater uncertainty (Brown & Harvey, 2006). Today, deposit money banks are find it challenging to make organizational changes required to support digital initiatives than to adopt the technologies available to support them. Therefore, despite a flurry of effort, most deposit money banks are falling short of their digital goals, for which out-dated structures and processes are often the culprit. While customers expect consistent, fluid processes they experience in other industries, banks are segregated by channels, products and geographies.

Change management challenges firms to place employees at the heart of their strategy. Typically, the concept of organizational change does not emphasize adding new staff or modifying programmes; but emphasizes change in mission, restructuring operations, new technologies advancement, mergers and acquisitions, major collaborations, rightsizing, new programmes, re-engineering, etc. (Alkaya & Hepaktan, 2003). It is evident that organizational survival and robustness requires proactive change management approaches at all levels. It is necessary to consider what the causes of change are and what actually needs changing or to be done.

Several studies on organizational change exists (Karanja, 2015; Khosa et al., 2015). Khosa et al. (2015) report that organizational change has positive and statistically significant impact on employee performance; while Tefera and Mutambara (2014) observe that participation in organizational change boosts employee motivation. So, if employees perceive organisational change as something that should be feared, it is likely that their motivation will reduce, and this may be counterproductive to the change process goal (Jones, 2010). Contartesi (2010) found a positive relationship between leadership change and employee performance. In addition, Nicolaidis and Katsaros (2011) found a positive relationship between tolerance to change and employees’ performance; while Dulger (2009) expressed that the extent of tolerance and employee commitment toward change has important implications for employees’ performance.

Furthermore, Ebongkeng (2018) notes that deficiencies of employee performance can be remedied by effective leadership change, communication change, and tolerance to change, procedural justice and organizational culture. Meanwhile, Malatjie and Montana (2019), Muzanenhamo et al. (2016), and Osei-Bonsu (2014) opined that change does not only lead to increased organisational effectiveness, but also to employee satisfaction. However, the bulk of studies were concentrated on bank performance with little or no studies that focused on the empirical link between organisational change and bank staff productivity. This study thus opts to contribute to knowledge by examining the relationship between each of the two basic organisational change constructs namely: structural change; and technological change on the productivity of deposit money banks' staff in Rivers State.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) is the theory upon which this study is anchored. Freeman (1984) defined stakeholders as "those groups who are vital to the survival and success of the corporation." Stakeholder theory is an instrument to identify critical stakeholders in the environment of the organizational in order to define developments for strategy (Freeman, 2004). Notwithstanding, in the contexts of business ethic and corporate social responsibility, stakeholder analysis has been used to identify important areas of concern by the organization. Using a range of influencing mechanisms, organizations in financial sector may be able to take advantage of their position as high-saliency stakeholders to influence corporate managers and investment funds. Williamson (1993) argued that direct principal-agent relationship between owners and managers is distorted with the addition of other stakeholders to the equation. Lewis (1958) suggests that stakeholder theory is intrinsically incompatible with all legitimate business objectives and undermines basic property rights and corporate responsiveness. Nonetheless, stakeholder theory provides important insights into the ways in which firms and their managers interact with employees, customers, governments and other actors.

Concept of Organizational Change

Morgan et al. (2009, cited in Ateke & Nwulu, 2021) states that the surest and most sustainable route to organizational competitiveness in the continually evolving operating environment is in firms' nearness, and ability to obtain, combine, and deploy resources in ways that augment their operating environment. This suggests that achieving competitiveness of organizations in today's business world derives from intentional organizational change. Organizational change is defined as "a relevant environmental shift that demands intentional organizational responses to contain new procedures, rules, values, processes, and personnel belief system" (Seeger et al., 2005; Porras & Silvers, 1991). It involves change in a firm's strategic intents, human resource, leadership, processes, structure, culture with effect at both individual and organization levels. Rodrik (2013) sees organisational change as any initiative or set of actions that result in a shift in direction that influences how the organisation does business.

This phenomenon of organizational change is multi-faceted. It can be discontinuous and radical, catastrophic or evolutionary, continuous and incremental, positive or negative, planned or unplanned, strong or weak, internally or externally stimulated, and slow or rapid (Naveed et al., 2017). Recognition of change in an organisation is depended on essentiality. Organizations embrace changes if they consider them as important and quickly adapt their behaviours in a desired new direction. But if change is considered unnecessary, organizations do not adapt to it (Bejinariu et al., 2017). Organizational change challenges the way things are done and as a result individuals experience uncertainty and start having fears about the potential failure in coping with success (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005).

Andron (2013) provides that organizations need to develop situation awareness since change is inevitable in the business environment; and that change must also happen inside the firm, if survival and success must be achieved. Organization change occurs in response to business and economic circumstances and to processes of managerial perception, choice and actions (Daft, 1983). Change has always been a concern to organization, just as it has been a common uniqueness of human life. Change is hard for humans to acknowledge as it is something that pulls individuals out of their comfort zones, and forces them to change established routines and behaviours (Lorenzoni et al., 2007).

Scholars suggest that organisational change may be intentional exertion by the organisation to make things better towards success (Cawsey, 2012; Kwizera et al., 2019; Vemeuleu et al., 2012). In the view Rodrik (2013) organizational change may be on mission and intended by the management of an organisation, or can come from the organisation's uncontrollable external environment. Schmid (2010) cited in Packard (2013) argues that change occurs in human organisations as a result of external forces imposed on it or as a result of internal pressures that cause alterations and modifications in its core activity, goals, strategies, structures, and programmes." Organizational change thus frequently involves leadership and deployment of staff in such adjustments and modifications to position the organization to a craved future state using change processes that involve technical and structural aspects of the organization (Packard (2013). Hence, this study decomposes organizational change into technological change and structural change.

Technological change

Financial institutions are in the throes of organizational change caused by increasing globalization and deregulation. Technological change such as those available in ATMs, mobile phone banking, Internet banking and smartcard applications are taking place at an overwhelmingly fast pace in the global banking industry. Massive and rapid technological change has triggered innovations that have replaced traditional banking processes and practices. With greater competition brought by deregulation, globalization and widespread mergers and acquisitions taking place in the banking sector in Nigeria, more branches are being closed down and replaced by self-serviced banking (SSB) facilities like ATMs as part of a larger rationalization exercise.

Technological change has been acknowledged as a necessary forecaster of organizational growth and effectiveness (Solow, 1957). However, business dynamics, comprising entrance and exit of organizations, effective reallocation of labour through development and destruction of jobs in diverse firms are other known factors that influence growth and success of organizations. Klette and Kortum (2004) aver that technological change and business dynamics are interdependent and its entrance into any market is usually through entrepreneurial firms. Technological change increases the efficiency of products or processes and results in increased output, without an increase in input (Bauer & Bender, 2004).

The technology needs of a small establishment exist in an almost constant state of flux, adapting and changing based on business demands and advancements in the industry. Generally, the desire to amplify productivity initiates upgrades to technology within an organisation, which influence a company's operations considerably (Cascio & Montealegre, 2016). Archer (2016) states that progression in computers and technology enhances efficiency in business. Studies on technological change show that new technologies in technologically endowed countries diffuse to technologically less advanced countries (Keller, 2004; Di Maria & Sjak, 2004; Popp, 2004).

Structural change

Structural changes are those made to the organization's structure that might originate from internal or external factors (Rodrik, 2013). Structural change includes the organization's hierarchy, chain of command, management systems, and administrative procedures. Conditions that call for structural changes include mergers and acquisitions, changes in the market, job duplication, and policy changes. According to Lozano *et al*. (2016), structural change within an organisation might be initiated by factors internal or external to the organisation. Competent change management calls for the ability to recognize what causes structural change within an organisation. The aptitude to identify signs of organizational change helps management to prepare for the change and employ policies that keep the company on the path to growth (Lin & Liu, 2012). According to Aggarwal (2015), mergers and acquisitions have profound effect on organisation structure.

McMillan (2017 as cited in Kwizera et al., 2019) argues that several managers within an organisation may create the need for change. Employees can either become aggravated with trying to please more than one manager, or employees may find ways to use opposing views by multiple managers to get what they need. When employees are faced with duplicate management positions, the structure of the organisation needs to be adjusted to eradicate the excess positions. McLagan (2002 cited in Meareg, 2020) provides that structural changes may be are transactional, transitional or transformational. Transactional changes only need minor interventions, for example, training or changing the incentive system, switching software. Transitional change is more complex and require change in roles/responsibilities, power bases and systems; while transformational change involves completely reshaping a firm's strategies and processes in response to environmental shifts.

Concept of Staff Productivity

Productivity is a relationship between outputs and inputs. It rises when an increase in output occurs with less than proportionate increase in inputs, or when the same output is produced with fewer inputs (ILO, 2005). Productivity can also be considered in monetary terms. If the price received for an output rises with no increase in the cost of inputs, this is also seen as an increase in productivity. Productivity improvements can be understood at different levels. Staff productivity may be reflected in employment rates, wage rates, stability of employment, job satisfaction or employability across jobs or industries. Productivity of enterprises, in addition to output per worker, may be measured in terms of market share and export performance. The benefits to societies from higher individual and enterprise productivity may be evident in increased competitiveness and employment or in a shift of employment from low to higher productivity sectors.

Staff productivity can be referred to as the quantity of work that is attained in a unit of time by means of the factors of production by the worker at the end of a given task or fiscal year (Bhatti, 2007). Okochi and Ateke (2021) construe staff productivity as employees' efforts, demonstrated in the outcome of goods and services they produced and how these conform to standards, are free of errors, less wasteful and does not require rework. Qureshi (2007) viewed staff productivity as a measure of performance that encompasses both efficiency and effectiveness. Staff productivity can also be referred to as the ratio of output capacity of employees in an organization. The performance of a business which determines its continued existence and development is largely dependent on the degree of productivity of its workers. Jennifer and George (2006) argued that staff productivity contribute directly to organizational effectiveness and efficiency. The failure of a corporation to motivate employees has a negative influence on it effectiveness and efficiency through reduced employees' productivity. In this study, staff productivity is measured in terms of staff effectiveness/efficiency and staff engagement.

Staff effectiveness/efficiency

The term efficiency refers to the process of maximizing outputs in such a way that input resources are least utilized. It is the difference between observed quality of input and output variables with respect to optimal quality of input and output variables (Ping-wen, 2002). In a general sense, efficiency implies the degree of achieving the desired goals with as little resources as possible. Hence, a manufacturer would be efficient when it can attain its intended goals (Forster, 2005) without wasting resources. Staff efficiency is the ability of staff to produce desired outcomes by using as minimal resource as possible while effectiveness is the capability of staff to meet the desired targets. Effectiveness on the other hand is the degree to which set objectives are accomplished and policies achieve what they were designed to achieve. A programme is said to be effective if it is able to accomplish set objectives. As regards to staff, it is a measure of how well employees productivity levels meet set objectives of the firm (Yesufu, 2000). Therefore staff is said to be effective when they are able to achieve desired results in line with organizational objectives. Efficiency on the other hand is productivity of estimated effects; specifically productivity without any form of waste. This has to do with employees' abilities to work productively with minimum waste in terms of energy, time and cost.

Staff engagement

Staff engagement is integral to driving successful organisations. Engaged staff are satisfied and feel a sense of attachment to their job and employer. They promote the very best in the organisation to their friends and family and work towards its success. Kahn (1990) defined staff engagement as the harnessing of organisation members' selves to their work roles. In engagement, organizational members employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. Modern organizations, especially those in the service sector, need organizational members who are engaged in their work, who are more proactive, more inventive and provide best quality service to customers (Bakker & Leiter, 2010). Staff engagement depends on staff's willingness to go beyond their job description.

Staff engagement may be cognitive, emotional or physical. Cognitive engagement concerns employees' beliefs about the organisation, its leaders and working conditions. Emotional engagement concerns how organizational members feel about each of those three factors and whether they have positive or negative attitudes toward the organisation and its leaders; while physical engagement concerns the physical energies exerted by individuals to accomplish their roles. According to Kahn (1990), engagement means to be psychologically as well as physically present when occupying and performing an organisational role. Truss et al. (2006) define employee engagement simply as "passion for work."

Organizational Change and Staff Productivity

Several studies Karanja (2015), Khosa et al. (2015) have been conducted with respect to organizational change in Nigeria and abroad. Khosa et al. (2015) reported that organizational change has a positive significant impact on employees' performance. Tefera and Mutambara (2014) believe that employees' participation in organizational change boost their motivation. Contartesi (2010) found that a positive relationship exists between leader communication and employee performance. Nicolaidis and Katsaros (2011) on their part found that there is positive relationship between tolerance to organizational change and employees' performance; while Dulger (2009) posits that the extent of tolerance and employee commitment toward change has important implications for employees' performance.

Similarly, Ebongkeng (2018) noted that deficiencies in employee performance can be remedied by effective leadership, communication, tolerance to change, procedural justice and organizational culture. A change in an organization's strategy results in change in the operations of the organization (Neba, 2016). Change without exception, is experienced as stressful and will result in a variety of undesirable outcomes which to a large extent, is a function of the manner in which it was implemented (Tonder, 2004). The most commonly indicated consequences of organisational change for the individual employee according to Tonder (2004) include lowered of morale, stress, lowered self-esteem, disorientation, increased mistrust, loss of focus, anxiety, uncertainty, insecurity, outrage, sadness, turnover and lack of commitment.

Technological Change and Staff Productivity

Organizational performance is determined by the systematic application of working tools or technology. Working tools here could be in the form of equipment, machine, or other devices of information and communication technology (ICT), software, surveillance camera, computers, vehicles etc. which enable task accomplishment in work or security organizations (Khalil, 2000). Dauda and Akingbade (2020) observe that employees of various categories have benefited from internet and multimedia working tools which provide technical solution to their individual and organizational problems as well as increase their effectiveness and efficiency. They also observe that the level of technology utilized in an organization greatly influence the quality and quantity of its output. According to Klette and Kortum (2004), technological changes and business dynamics are inter-dependent and its entrance into any market is usually from an entrepreneurial firms.

Dauda and Akingbade (2020) reports that technology leads to increased productivity when effectively combined with other resources by staff. Employee can more rapidly acquire new knowledge and further advancement competencies through training. Ebere and Ateke (2019) observe that a very strong and statistically significant connection exists between technological options and competitiveness of firms through differentiation and cost advantage. This report can however be justified only to the extent that technology enables employees to perform their jobs more effectively and efficiently. Machuki and Aosa (2011) examined the issue of the existence of threshold effects in the relationship between technology change and employee performance using a new econometric technique that allows for appropriate estimation procedures and inference. They found that changes in technology and physical setting significantly affect employee performance. Consequently, the following hypotheses were formulated:

Ho_1: There is no significant relationship between technological change and staff efficiency/effectiveness of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

Ho_2: There is no significant relationship between technological change and staff engagement of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

Structural Change and Staff Productivity

Gibbert (2006) argued that the broader the change, the more employees exposed to change and the more their performance is affected. Broader and more extensive changes could generate greater feedback effects as well as feelings of unfairness and injustice, which are harder to overcome for both employees and organizations. The broader the change, the more significant the perception of change is likely to be and hence the greater the impact on employee performance. Changes that are introduced in an organisational restructuring affect socio-psychological well-being of organisation members given the potential for uncertainty that may accompany such changes. Hence, there is need to better understand the consequences of organisational restructuring and consider its potential side effects on the work environment. In support of Lee (2005), Kuokkanen et al. (2009) argue that changes that occur in a work environment have negative impact on the psychological well-being of the organisation's personnel. Changes perceived as threatening negatively relate to job satisfaction; changes experienced as challenging positively relate to job satisfaction but had no impact on distress and sickness absence.

Nwinyokpugi (2018) found that there is a statistically significant relationship between dimensions of organizational change management and employee productivity. Kuokkanen et al. (2009) emphasizes that structural changes in the healthcare sector have impact on working conditions of both personnel and patients. Khosa et al. (2015) examined the impact of organisational change on employee performance in the banking sector of Pakistan; and reports that organisational change in terms of leadership, communication, procedural justice, employee development, tolerance to change has a positive significant impact on employee's performance. In other studies, Kwizera et al. (2019) examined the effect of organizational change on employees' performance; and observed that structural change, strategic change, and technological change significantly affect employee performance; while Karanja (2015) examined how organizational change relates to employees' performance and found that employee performance is positively influenced by organizational change. Consequently, the following hypotheses were formulated:

Ho_3: There is no significant relationship between structural change and staff efficiency/effectiveness of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

Ho_4: There is no significant relationship between structural change and staff engagement of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

METHODOLOGY

This study examined the influence of organizational change on staff productivity in deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The study adopted a quasi-experimental research design. They researcher has no influence on the study elements. Cross-sectional survey was used to gather data from different point in order to draw logical conclusions. The population of the study comprised deposit money banks with operational presence in Port Harcourt. According to Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), there are twenty one (21) registered deposit money banks in Nigeria; and all of them have branches in Port Harcourt. Since the population of the study is relatively small, a census was taken. The unit of analysis in this study is top management and other staff of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. In this regard, ten (10) copies of structured questionnaire were hand delivered to respondents representing one hundred and fifty-two (152) branches of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. A total of two hundred and ten (210) copies of questionnaire were distributed. The instrument adopted a five-point scale which includes: SA=Strongly Agree (5), A=Agree (4), U=Undecided (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1). The Spearman's Rank Order Correlation was used to test the formulated hypotheses.

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS

This section represents data analysis and interpretation. The researcher relied heavily on data gotten through questionnaires distributed to respondents. Out of a total of two hundred and ten (210) copies of questionnaire distributed, two hundred and four (204) copies representing a response rate of 97% were retrieved and 6 which represent 3% were not retrieved. Out of the two hundred and four (204) retrieved, two hundred and two (202) which represent 99% were usable, and two (2) which represent 1% were not usable.

Table 1: Correlation between technological Change and measure of staff productivity

			Tech. Change	Staff Efficiency/Effectiveness	Staff Engagement
Spearman's rho	Tech. Change	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.918**	.911**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	202	202	202
	Staff Efficiency/Effectiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.918**	1.000	.912**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	202	202	202
	Staff Engagement	Correlation Coefficient	.911**	.912**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	202	202	202

Source: SPSS output of data analysis on organizational change and employee productivity (2022).

The result in Table 1 shows a significant relationship between technological change and staff effectiveness/efficiency of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The correlation coefficient of 0.918 confirmed the direction and strength of this relationship and it was significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represented a very high correlation indicative of a very strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected. Thus, there is a significant relationship between technological change and staff effectiveness/efficiency of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

Table 1 also shows a significant relationship between technological change and staff engagement of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The correlation coefficient of 0.911 confirm the direction and strength of this relationship and it was significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represented a positive and strong correlation between the variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant relationship between technological change and staff engagement of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

Table 2: Correlation between structural Change and measure of staff productivity

			Struct. Change	Staff Efficiency/Effectiveness	Staff Engagement
Spearman's rho	Struct. Change	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.900**	.915**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	202	202	202
	Staff Efficiency/Effectiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.900**	1.000	.912**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	202	202	202
	Staff Engagement	Correlation Coefficient	.915**	.912**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	202	202	202

Source: SPSS output of data analysis on organizational change and employee productivity (2022).

From the result in Table 2, the correlation coefficient (rho) showed that there is a significant relationship between structural change and staff effectiveness/efficiency of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The correlation coefficient of 0.900 confirmed the direction and magnitude of this relationship and it is significant at p $0.000<0.05$. The correlation coefficient represents a very high correlation indicative of a very strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant relationship between structural change and staff effectiveness/efficiency of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

The result in Table 2 also showed a significant relationship between structural change and staff engagement of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The correlation coefficient of 0.915 confirmed the direction and strength of this relationship and it is significant at p $0.000<0.05$. The correlation coefficient represents very strong positive correlation between the variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected. Thus, there is a significant relationship between structural change and staff engagement of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The evidence on the relationship between organizational change and staff productivity is observed to be significant; with technological change and structural change showing positive and statistically significant impact on all two measures of staff productivity. This means that organizational change has strong effects on staff productivity of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. Such that, intentional and systematic implementation of organizational change that attune the firm to environmental demands or management intentions will result in enhanced employee productivity in deposit money banks in Port Harcourt.

The specific relationships examined shows that increase in technological change will lead to proportional change in staff productivity. This finding supports that of Methode et al. (2019) that technological change significantly affects employee performance. It was empirically proven that technological change significantly and positively contributes to the productivity of in deposit money banks; as well as that of Dauda and Akingbade (2020) that employees benefit from technological solution to individual and organizational problems, and increase their effectiveness and efficiency. Dauda and Akingbade (2020) further affirm that the level of technology utilized greatly influence quality and quantity of output.

The finding also aligns with the view that technology leads to increased productivity when effectively combined with other resources by staff (Dauda & Akingbade, 2020). The report of Ebere and Ateke (2019) that a very strong and statistically significant connection exists between technological options and competitiveness of firms through differentiation and cost advantage is also supported by the findings of the present study. However, technological options can lead to competitiveness only to the extent to which technology enables employees to perform their jobs with effective efficiency. In addition, our results cohere with that of Machuki and Aosa (2011) that changes in technology and physical setting significantly affect employee performance; these often arouse employees' morale and improve their performance levels.

Furthermore, our findings that structural change has strong positive and statistically significant relationship staff productivity through effective efficiency and staff engagement supports the finding of Wanza and Nkuraru (2016) that organizational structure positively influences employees' performance. The findings also align with that of Nwakoby et al. (2019) that structural change has positive effect on employee performance. This implies that managers could provoke improved employee productivity by instituting structural changes that are in tandem with the pulse of employees.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study focused on examining the connection between organizational change and productivity of staff of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. The results of the empirical analyses confirm that organizational change relates to productivity of bank employees. This however, is most likely when and where employees have high level of tolerance to change. This is because employees' tolerance to change matters, if the organization desires to achieve desirable change outcomes. This position indicates that management of banks play pivotal roles to curb or prevent low staff productivity due to organizational change. Structural change and technological change are key components of organizational change that must stay on the focus of firms that intent to institute or shape organizational change. Based on the empirical evidence that organizational change in terms of technological change and structural change strongly relates to staff productivity of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt, through effective efficiency and staff engagement, the current study concludes that organizational change contribute significantly towards achieving staff productivity of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt; and that staff productivity in terms of effective efficiency and staff engagement can be enhanced by implementing technological and structural changes that that improves employees' job performance and provide them reasons to become more engaged with the organization. Consequently, the study recommends that management of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt that desire improved employee productivity should implement technological and structural organizational changes that enable staff to perform their task more effectively and efficiently; and also propel find satisfaction in their job.

CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

This study has made impactful contribution to management practice literature. Deposit money banks could utilize the findings of the study to formulate and activate plans to induce technological change and structural change in their operations. Technological change and structural change as aspects of organizational change can enable deposit money banks in selecting employees to develop and facilitate extra role behaviour. Management can achieve this through their leadership acumen. The findings of this study opens vistas for new studies that will lead to the formation of new business focused and problem oriented models. The study contributes to the body of knowledge, and gives its identification of the unique influence of organizational change on staff productivity.

REFERENCES

Aburime, T.U. (2008). Determinants of bank profitability: Macroeconomics evidence from Nigeria". *Lagos Journal of Banking, Finance and Economics* Retrieved from http://ssrn.com/abstract=123106

Aggarwal, C. C. (2015). *Outlier analysis. In Data Mining* (Pp. 237-263). Springer, Cham.

Alkaya, A. & Hepaktan, E. (2003). Organizational change. *Yönet M Ve Ekonom, Cilt*, *10*(1), 1-28.

Andron, D. R. (2013). Changing managers for a changing economy. *The need for creativity and leadership,* 6, 186-193.

Ateke, B. W., Asiegbu, I. F., & Akekue-Alex, N. (2016). Value customization and relationship commitment of business-2-business buyers. *African Social and Educational Journal*, *5*(1), 178-197.

Ateke, B. W., & Nwulu, C. S. (2021). Dynamic marketing capabilities and adaptability of hospitality firms in Rivers State. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, *22*(1), 165-189.

Ateke, B. W. (2021). The changing shape of marketing amidst Covid-19 induced market disruptions. *Journal of Contemporary Marketing 6*(1), 1-4.

Athanasoglou, P. P., Brissimis, S. N. & Delis, M. D. (2005). Bank-specific, industry specific and macroeconomic determinants of bank profitability. *MPRA Paper,* No.153.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, A. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Management Psychology*, *22*(3).

Bejinariu, A. C., Jitarel, A., Sarca, I., & Mocan, A. (2017). Organizational change management: concepts definitions and approaches inventory. International Conference on Technology, Innovation, and Industrial Management, Lublin, Poland.

Bhatti, K. K., (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research, 3*, 54-68.

Bothma, F. C., & Roodt, G. (2012). Work based identity and work engagement as potential antecedents of task performance and turnover intention: Unravelling a complex relationship. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *38*(1), 1-17.

Brown, D. R., & Harvey, D., (2006). *An experiential approach to organization development*. Pearson Education.

Cascio, W. F., & Montealegre, R. (2016). How technology is changing work and organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour, 3,* 349-375.

Cawsey, T., Deszea, G., & Ingols, C. (2012). *Organizational change: An action-oriented toolkit (2nd edition)*. Sage Publications.

Contartesi, R. A. (2010). School climate: A correlational analysis of superintendent leadership communication and employee performance. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Phoenix.

Daft, R. L. (1983). *Organization theory and design.*

Dauda, Y. A., & Akingbade, W. A. (2020). Technology innovation and Nigeria banks performance: The assessment of employee's and customer's responses. *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences, 2*(3), 329-340.

Di Maria, C., & Sjak, A.S. (2004). Trade pessimists vs technology optimists: Induced technical change and pollution havens. *Advances in Economic Analysis & Policy, 4*(2), 1-25.

Dulger, M. (2009). Human side of change: A conceptual model. *Journal of Economics, 3*(2), 1-28.

Ebere, I. N., & Ateke, B. W. (2019). Technological options and competitiveness of hotels in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Marketing Research and Management*, *8*(3), 32-39.

Ebongkeng, H. (2018). Organizational change and performance: Case study of African financial company. Unpublished Thesis: Centria University of Applied Sciences.

Forster, J. (2005), Bank efficiency ratios in Latin America. *Applied Economic Letters, 12*(9), 7-15.

Freeman, R. E. (2004). *A stakeholder theory of modern corporations.* Pitman

Friedman, B. A. (2007). Globalization implications for human resource management roles. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 19*(3), 157-171.

Gibbert, M. (2006). Generalizing about uniqueness: An essay on an apparent paradox in the resource-based view. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(14), 124-134.

International Labour Organization (2005). *Number of work related accidents and illnesses continues to increase,* ILO and WHO join in call for Prevention Strategies Press Release.

Jennifer, M., & George, G. R. (2006). *Contemporary management. Creating value in organizations.* McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Jones, G. R. (2010). *Organizational theory, design and change*. Pearson Education Ltd.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 692-724.

Karanja, A.W. (2015). Organizational change and employee performance: A case on the postal corporation of Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management, 7*(11), 232-241.

Keller, W. (2004). International technology diffusion. *Journal of Economic Literature, 42*(3), 752-782.

Khalil, T. (2000). *Management of technology. The key to competitiveness and wealth creation*. McGraw Hill.

Khan, H., Razi, A., Ali, S. A., & Asghar, A. (2013). A study on relationship between organizational job commitment, and its determinants among CSRS and managerial level employees of Pakistan Telecommunication Sector. *Interdisciplinary Journal Contemporary Review of Business*, *3*(11), 269-284.

Khosa, Z. A., Rehman, Z. U., Asad, A., Muhammad, A. B. & Hussain, N. (2015). The impact of organizational change on the employee's performance in the banking sector of Pakistan. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, *17*(3), 54-61.

Klette, J., & Kortum, S. (2004). Innovating firms and aggregate innovation. *Journal of Political Economy, 112*, 986-1018.

Kuokkanen, L., Suominen, T., Harkonen, E. & Kukkurainen, M. (2009). Effects of organisational change on work related empowerment, employee satisfaction and motivation. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, *33*(2), 116-124.

Kwizera, M., Olutayo, K.O, Irau, I., Wandiba, A., Patricia, A., & Bayo, I. (2019). Effect of Organizational Change on Employee's Performance among selected Commercial Banks in Bujumbura, Burundi. *East Africa Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and management*, *2*(4), 225-234.

Lee, D. (2013). Nokia: The rise and fall of a mobile giant. *BBC News*.

Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (2008). Re conceptualizing organizational change implementation as a communication problem: A review of literature and research agenda. In M. E. Roloff (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* 21, 93-151. Thousand Sage.

Lin, W. T., & Liu, Y. (2012). Successor characteristics, organisational slack, and change in the degree of firm internationalization. *International Business Review*, *21*(1), 89-101.

Lorenzoni, I., Nicholson-Cole, S., & Whitmarsh, L. (2007). Barriers perceived to engaging with climate change among the UK public and their policy implications. *Global environmental change*, *17*(3), 445-459.

Lozano, R., Nummert, B., & Ceulemans, K. (2016). Elucidating the relationship between sustainability reporting and organisational change management for sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *125*, 168-188.

Machuki, V. N., & Aosa, E. (2011). The influence of the external business environment on the performance of publicly quoted companies in Kenya. *Prime Journals*, *7*, 205-218.

Malatjie, I., & Montaña, A. (2019). *Job satisfaction and attitudes toward organisational change: A study at the national school of government. Psychology*, Available at: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Job-satisfaction-and-attitudes-toward-change-%3A-a-at-Malatjie-Monta%C3%B1a

Meareg, T. (2020). *Effect of organizational change on employee performance in case of Dashen bank.* Unpublished Thesis submitted to the Department of Business Administration, St. Mary's University, Ethiopia.

Muzanenhamo, G. N., Allen-Ile, C. O., Anthea Adams, A., & Iwu C. G. (2016). The relationship among change implementation, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior in the business process outsourcing industry in South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *14*(3-2), 473-482.

Naveed, R. T., Jantan, A. H., Saidu, M. B., & Bhatti, S. M. (2017). The validation of the organizational change construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *Cogent Business and Management*, *4*(1), 1-10.

Neba, P. N. (2016). Blue book of success. In H. Ebongkeng (Ed). *OC and performance: case study of African financial company*. Unpublished Thesis: Centria University of Applied Sciences.

Nicolaidis, C. & Katsaros, K. (2011). Tolerance to change of ambiguity and emotional attitudes in a changing business environment: A case of Greek IT CEOs. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, *4*(1), 44-61.

Nwinyokpugi, P. (2018). Organisational change management and employees' productivity in the Nigeria banking sector. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 20*(1), 11-20.

Okochi, K., & Ateke, B. W. (2021). Influence of employee empowerment on output quality: Evidence from Eni oil and gas industries, Nigeria. *POLAC International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences, 7*(1), 39-47.

Osei-Bonsu, N. (2014). The impact of change management on job satisfaction of employees in Ghana's banking sector. Problem of Management in the 21st Century.

Packard, T. (2013). Organizational change: A conceptual framework to advance the evidence base. *Journal of Human Behaviour in the Social Environment, 23*(1), 75-90.

Ping-Wen, L. (2005). An empirical analysis of bank mergers and cost efficiency in Taiwan. *Small Business Economics, 25*(3) 197-206.

Popp, D. (2004). Entice: endogenous technological change in the DICE model of global warming. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 48*(1), 742-768.

Popp, D. (2005). International innovation and diffusion of air pollution control technologies: The effects of NOx and SO2 regulation in the US, Japan, and Germany. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 51*(1), 46-71.

Porras, J. I., & Silvers, R. C. (1991). Organization development and transformation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 42*(1), 51-78.

Qureshi, T. M. (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research, 3*, 54-68.

Ramlall, I. (2009). Bank-specific, industry-specific and macroeconomic determinants of profitability in Taiwanese banking system: Under panel data estimation. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, 34*, 160-167.

Rodrik, D. (2013). Structural change, fundamentals and growth: An overview. *Institute for Advanced study.*

Schmid, H. (2010). Organizational change in human service organizations: Theories, boundaries, strategies, and implementation. In Y. Hasenfeld (Ed.), *Human services as complex organizations (2nd edition)*. Sage.

Seeger, M. W., Ulmer, R. R., Novak, J. M., & Sellnow, T. (2005). Post-crisis discourse and organizational change, failure and renewal. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 18*(1), 78-95.

SoIow, R. M. (1957). Technical change and the aggregate production function. *Review of Economics, 139*, 312-320.

Tefera, O. & Mutambara, E. (2014). Effect of OCs on employees' motivation at a Country Club in Kwazulu Natal: from the employees' participation perspectives. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 5*(1), 1-14.

Tefera, O. & Mutambara, E. (2016). Effect of organizational changes on employees' motivation at a Country Club in Kwazulu Natal: from the employees' participation perspectives. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 5*(1), 1-14.

Tonder, C. L. (2004). *Organisational change.* Van Schaik.

Truss, C., Soane, E., Edwards, C., Wisdom, K., Croll, A., & Burnett, J. (2006). Working life: employee attitudes and engagement. CIPD.

Vakola, M. & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organisation change: What is the role of employees 'stress and commitment? *Employee Relations, 27*(2), 160-174.

Vemeuleu, F. Puranam, P., & Gulati, R. (2012). Change for changes' sake. *Harvard Business Review, 88*(6), 71-76.

Williamson, O. E. (1993). Calculativeness, trust, and economic organization. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *36*(4), 453-86.

Yesufu, T. M. (2000). *The human factor in national development.*