

Models of Organizational Effectiveness for Higher Educational Institutions

Ahmad Mohmad Albassami^a, Rana Tahir Naveed^b, Sara Sabir^c, Amer Hamzah Bin Jantan^d, ^aUniversity Putra Malaysia (UPM), ^bDepartment of Business administration, Art & Social Sciences Division, University of Education, Lahore, ^cVisiting lecturer, University of Education Lahore, Multan, Pakistan, ^dFaculty of Economics and Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Email: ^aAlbassami@gmail.com, ^btahinaveed@ue.edu.pk, ^comairbucha@gmail.com, ^damerham24@upm.edu.my

The phenomenon of organizational effectiveness has been under the limelight for investigation for many decades. Organizational effectiveness is multi-dimensional since researchers have come forward with varying definitions of the construct. When it comes to the issues pertaining to the education sector, different criteria to measure the effectiveness have been identified by research scholars, who have proposed them in the form of various models for organizational effectiveness specifically for higher education institutions. The most accepted of these are the Cameron's model (1978) and Competing Values Framework by Solanki (2014) based on the works of Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1983). Theoretically, this study has implications as it integrates the literature about the definitions and models of organizational effectiveness, in the context of higher education. Practically, this paper has immense benefits for the academic and non-academic leaders, faculty, students and their parents who are the stakeholders of higher education institutes, who will be able to achieve their academic and professional goals, leading to an overall improvement of effectiveness of their institutions.

Key words: Organizational effectiveness, Cameron's model, higher education institutes



Introduction

The conditions of any country's economy can be improved by ensuring high quality education through high performance of its academic institution. It is seen that higher education organizations are not static in nature; they keep on changing over different periods of time. That is why the academic leaders face issues regarding the understanding and measuring of performance of those institutions and this leads to poor performance and unhealthy institutions in countries. In addition to the academic leaders of higher education institutions have many other stakeholders; administrators, policy makers, funding agencies, faculties, students and their parents. They all must understand and evaluate the issues and challenges faced by the authorities of institutes so they can provide valuable contributions to solving these issues. When these issues are addressed, this can lead to overall improvement of organizational effectiveness (Solanki, 2014).

Organizational effectiveness has been an extensively researched topic since the 1930's, which later expanded in the form of several theories in the 1970's. It still is considered a complex phenomenon since the measurement of Organizational effectiveness varies from organization to organization as a single criterion cannot be applied to all (Solanki, 2014). It is utilized for the measurement of different phenomenon in an organization, like leadership, employee performance or productivity (Anderson & Adams, 2015, Namita & Baby Shari, 2013).

This study will prove beneficial to the stakeholders of higher education institutes as it will bring new information that can assist the authorities in planning and devising new strategies to manage efficiently the resource allocations, while generating internal revenues and external funding, providing necessary infrastructure and technology for desirable results.

Theoretically, this study will contribute towards the higher education sector as it integrates literature on models of organizational effectiveness and describes their linkages in the context of higher education. There seems to be insufficient research on this concept, specifically on the models of organizational effectiveness in higher education (Paharia & Singh, 2018; Solanki, 2014; Ashraf & Kadir, 2012; Karagiz & Oz, 2008). This study attempts to fill in this gap in literature.

Review of literature

Definitions of Organizational Effectiveness

Many decades of research involved understanding the meaning of effectiveness in organizational theory. Organizational effectiveness has been defined by various research scholars as:

1. “An Organization is considered as effective when it is able to successfully fulfill its purpose using effective strategies (Mc Cann, 2004).
2. “Organizational effectiveness is related to its ability to utilize resources for the achievement of organizational aims” (Federman, 2006).
3. “The process by which organizations achieve their goals is organizational effectiveness” Malik et al. (2011).

In the educational sector, organizational effectiveness can be defined as:

1. “A measure of the teacher, the student and the parent satisfaction, since converting the students into responsible citizens and making them worthy of good and successful careers” (Gun & Holdaway, 1986).
2. “Organization effectiveness is the satisfaction of students and which makes them work harder for effectiveness of the institution” (Paharia & Singh, 2018).
3. It can be defined as “the extent to which post-graduate education achieves the goals of superior perceptions gains from post-graduate education” (Solanki, 2014).

Models of Organizational effectiveness

Various models have been researched by scholars keeping in regard the organizational effectiveness of higher educational institutions, the most comprehensive and widely accepted being Cameron’s model and Competing Values Model.

Anti and Cuthbert (1976) gave a multi-dimensional and quantitative model to measure the organizational effectiveness of institutions using nine critical success factors. These parameters are closely knit with each other as the failure of one parameter may lead to reduced levels of the other. These nine parameters are related to responsibility, facilities, student relations, cost effectiveness and growth of human capital. Together these factors serve as road to growth and success for an organization. However, it is important that these factors are carefully identified and emphasized by the higher education institutions.

Kleeman and Richardson (1985) used “Effectiveness Field Criteria” to measure the effectiveness of an organization. A survey method was employed to measure the students’ effectiveness perceptions in three institutions of Arizona, for which the entire student population in these universities was 3308. In this procedure, ten categories related to graduate

programs, cultural activities, sports, research workshops and publications and quality of teaching was proposed.

Pounder (1999) introduced nine factors to evaluate organizational effectiveness using a sample of administrative and academic staff from seven institutions in Hong Kong. The nine dimensions are related to quality, efficiency, communication, growth, HRD and goals. The result of his study revealed that these dimensions greatly improved the organizational effectiveness in higher education sector of Hong Kong.

An, Yom and Ruggiero (2011) proposed two dimensions of involvement and satisfaction to assess the organizational effectiveness. They employed questionnaire method to be completed by sample of nurses working in Korean University Hospitals. The result of their study indicated that these dimensions necessarily boost organizational effectiveness.

Cameron's Model

Cameron's (1978) proposed nine dimensions to measure the organizational effectiveness using a sample of 41 institutions and a questionnaire comprising of 57 items which proved its validity and internal consistency reliability. This questionnaire rightly measured organizational effectiveness at institutes of higher education. These items recorded the perceptions of organizational members regarding the effectiveness of their respective institutions in the form of scores obtained on a 7- point likert scale. Cameron conducted a careful and in- depth study to analyze the criteria of effectiveness for these institutions and the results showed that these dimensions did measure the effectiveness of organizations (Cameron, 1978). These nine dimensions are as follows:

- 1) *Educational satisfaction*: relates to the students as they feel satisfied with their education in the institution they are studying.
- 2) *Academic development*: relates to process of achievement felt by the students.
- 3) *Career development*: measures student progress related to their careers and the opportunities available in order to develop academically.
- 4) *Personal development*: measures the extent of student progress in areas other than career or academics and the opportunities available to them on part of their institution. This progress is based on their social, cultural and emotional interactions.
- 5) *Employee satisfaction*: relates to satisfaction possessed by the institution members at workplace.
- 6) *Professional development*: This dimension is related to the extent of professional achievement and the level of motivation felt by teachers.
- 7) *Community interaction*: refers to the extent of interaction with institution's environment and ways to adapt to it.



8) *Resources*: refers to the ability to gather resources needed by the organization from outside.

9) *Organizational health*: refers to extent proper working of the process and operations of the organization (Cameron, 1978).

The Cameron (1978)'s model has proposed four categories of organizational effectiveness. They are as follows:

1) *Academic field*: concerns the progress of students academically and development of the faculty professionally.

2) *Moral field*: concerns with overall organizational health of the institution.

3) *Community field*: concerns with career opportunities available to students while interacting with community.

4) *Extracurricular field*: concerns personal development of students outside the educational field (Cameron, 1978).

Cameron's model supports the notion that organizational effectiveness is a multi-dimensional field and hence a single criteria cannot measure it, rather it is best explained with the combination of organizational effectiveness models, thus giving rise to the Competing Values Framework given by Solanki (2014), which is based on Model proposed by Quinn (1983).

Competing Values Framework

The competing values framework, like Cameron's model, is multi-dimensional and incorporates ten criterion into a single framework to measure the organizational effectiveness, keeping in mind the diverse goals of multiple stakeholders. This framework is based on the following four models (Solanki, 2014).

/

Human Relations Model

Human resources are the bloodline of any organization, which has the largest contribution in achieving organizational effectiveness. The success of an organization depends on the working and commitment of its human resource. For effective employee management, various human resource functions such as training & development, performance appraisals, compensation, better working conditions and labour relations play an important role (Solanki, 2014; Sim 2002).

The human resource in a higher education setup is considered "mission-critical, which means that it depends on people who work on part of institutions and that they look forward to productive ways of doing things" (Archer, 2005). Training & development, for higher education, gives rise to the concept of "Organizational learning" (Mc Caffery, 2010). Staff remuneration has the ability to recruit skilled and competent faculty, which can mould the

institutional culture into the desired institutional values. For this, the remuneration must be set keeping in mind the institutional goals. It is important to see that the faculty is satisfied with the salary, allowances and fringe benefits and the form they are getting like hourly paid, total annual package or tenure track system. If the faculty is not satisfied, this can lead to an irregular school calendar and non-completion of course outlines. It should be ensured that the wages and incentives are not only aligned to the education, experience and working hours, but should be comparative internationally. A satisfied group of workers can have better campus relations away from strikes and burnouts (Solanki, 2014).

Open System Model

The open systems model focuses on the ability to acquire appropriate and sufficient resources, accreditation and infrastructure. As maintained by The World Bank (2010), the higher education institutions must provide adequate financing for gaining sound professional prospects for their students. For this, revenue can be internally generated through various means; online and distance learning or evening programmes (Ehrenberg, 2001). The World Bank (2010) argues that in order to employ income-generating activities, the higher education institutes must possess sufficient autonomy and transparency. This way they will be able to manage their budget according to their goals. Hence, for effective productivity, higher education institutes must have the capability to improve their financial reservoirs and build necessary and appropriate infrastructure.

Institutional Accreditation means operating, evaluating quality standards for qualifications and research publications of staff members (Kretovics, 2011). It is essential for higher education institutes as it enhances its image not only among students but also staff members. This way they are in a position to enter into competition with other prestigious institutions. The alumni feel proud of their old institutes and legal institutes are demarcated from illegal ones (Solanki, 2014).

Internal processes Model

The Internal processes model entails three criterions for higher education. One is accountability, which in the higher education context, means knowledge and skills (Stecher & Kirby, 2004). Accountability can be seen from the perspective of control, as said by Trow (1996). Salmi (2009) also supports that academic leaders must report their activities, results and performance. This way they will be able to maintain high integrity in their educational services and exercise honesty in their resources and financial dealings.



The second criteria in this model is the “Internal resource Allocation”. Massy (1996) has proposed the most important factor for effective resource allocation is the understanding of the incentive system that directs spending in higher education institutes. Another important criterion is the use of information technology that can significantly improve the effectiveness of the higher education institutes. Using Internet technology and blended learning programs can be designed to integrate face- to- face experience with online learning that will have many benefits. Technology has other benefits for higher education institutes such as digital libraries (Solanki, 2014). This way the learning environment will be transformed with a more creative and innovative approach.

Rational Goals Model

Under this model, the higher education institutes must develop strategic plans with long-term objectives that must guide and direct the academic departments, the faculty and other staff. The academic strategy can be about the academic goals entailing quality of teaching & research, which has nothing to be with the personal goals and vision of the department’s authorities (Solanki, 2014). In the context of higher education, strategic planning is how the higher authorities make strategies for effectiveness (Keller, 1983). Kotler and Murphy (1981) identified that strategic planning at higher education institutions takes place at three levels. The first level is the budgeting at the institutional level. Next level is the short term plans like curriculum and admissions. The last level involves the long term goals planning like assessment, both quantitative and qualitative, of the institution’s external environment to gain a better insight into the priorities.

Conclusion

The framework presented in this paper shows various definitions and models specifically for higher education institutes to measure their organizational effectiveness. Based on extensive literature review, the agenda of this paper was to integrate and discuss the linkage of the Cameron’s Model and the competing values model for higher educational institutions to provide them with implications that can practically be employed by the academicians and education policy makers. This way they can serve their best to the interests of their students and the goals of their faculty who can be considered as the prime stakeholders of their institutions and make them more productive. The Educational policy makers must try to introduce such policies that provides recognition to academic leaders for their efforts in improving the academic position of faculties and professional & personal development of students. Policies to motivate academic leaders must be introduced by the higher authorities for retention and attraction of competent faculty to be hired for the institute. Such faculty members would prove highly committed to the institute and would also engage students in



better levels of learning and hence, contribute to improved quality of education and an overall effective organization.



REFERENCES

- Archer, W. (2005). *Mission critical? Modernizing human resource management in higher education*. Oxford, Higher Education policy Institute.
- An, J. Y., Yom, Y. H., & Ruggiero, J. S. (2011). Organizational culture, quality of work life and organizational effectiveness in Korean university hospitals. *Journal of Trans-cultural Nursing*, 22(1), 22-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1043659609360849>
- Anderson, R. J., Adams, B., & Adams, W. A. (2015). *Mastering leadership: An integrated framework for breakthrough performance and extraordinary business results*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Antia, J. M., & Cuthbert, R. E. (1976). Critical success factors in Polytechnic performance. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 5(14), 14-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/174114327600500103>
- Cameron, K. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 604-632. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2392582>
- Daft, R. (2010). *Organizational theory and Research*. 10th ed. Mason. South-western Cengage Learning.
- Ehrenberg, R. (2001). *Financial prospects for American Higher education in the first decade of the twenty-first century*, Cornell. Cornell University, ILR School.
- Gun, J.A., Holdaway, E.A. (1986). Perceptions of Effectiveness, Influence and Satisfaction of Senior High Schools' Principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22(2), 43-62.
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: the management revolution in American Higher education*. USA, The John Hopkins University Press.
- Kleeman, G. L., & Richardson Jr, R. C. (1985). Student characteristics and perceptions of university effectiveness. *Review of Higher Education*, 9(1), 5-20.
- Kotler, P. & Murphy, P. (1981). Strategic planning for higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education* 52(5), 470-489



- Kretovics, M. (2011). *Business practice in higher education: a guide for today's administrators*. New York, Routledge.
- Malik, M. E., Ghafoor, M. M., & Naseer, S. (2011). Organizational effectiveness: a case study of telecommunication and banking sector of Pakistan. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 2(1), 37-48.
- Massy, W. (1996). *Resource allocation in higher education*. Michigan. The University of Michigan press.
- McCaffery, P. (2010). *The Higher education Manager's handbook: Effective leadership and management in universities and colleges*. London routledge Farnel.
- Namitha Elizabeth Jacob & Baby Shari. 2013. Organisational Effectiveness in Educational Institutions. *International Journal for Educational Studies*. 6(1), 17-23.
- Pounder, J. (1999). Organizational effectiveness in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 27(4), 389-400
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0263211X990274006>
- Quinn, R. E. and J. Rohrbaugh (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science* 29: 363-377
- Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Essentials of organizational behavior*: Prentice Hall.
- Salmi, J. (2009). *The growing accountability agenda in tertiary institutions: progress or mixed blessing*. World Bank.
- Sims, R. (2002). *Organization success through effective human resource management*. Westport. Greenwood Publishing group. Inc.
- Stecher, B & Kirby, S. (2004). *Organizational improvement and accountability: Lessons from education to other sectors*. Santa Monica CA, RAND Corporation.
- Solanki, O. (2014). *Organizational Effectiveness in Higher education: a case study of selected polytechnic in Nigeria*. PhD Thesis University of Southampton Press.
- Trow, M. (1996). *Trusts, Market and Accountability in Higher education: A comparative perspective*. Research and Occasional paper series, centre for studies in Higher education, UC Berkley.
- World Bank. (2010). *Higher education: the lesson of experience*. World Bank



Yankey, J. A., & McClellan, A. (2007). The nonprofit board's role in planning and evaluation.
Book Seven of the BoardSource Governance Series. Quoted in. *Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness, Kronkosky Charitable Foundation, Research Brief January.*