

## IDENTIFYING CRITICAL FACTORS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF BANKING SECTOR IN THE ERA OF GLOBAL UNCERTAINTIES

Bhawana Bhardwaj\* and Dipanker Sharma\*\*

### Abstract

Organizational effectiveness can be referred to as the success of an organization to accomplish their mission and goals through their core competencies. Various approaches have been proposed by the research scholars to measure organization effectiveness. The present study has been conducted to point out the factors that can affect the success and effectiveness of the organization. The author has also tried to identify the important determinants of organizational effectiveness of banking industry. Some suggestions have been proposed to improve the effectiveness of the bank. It was identified that few factors like clarity of goals, employees' satisfaction, profit, customer satisfaction, latest technology, management style, collaboration of employees and management, size of the bank, external environment, low level of employee stress, motivation and sharing knowledge with other banks were critical for organizational success.

**Key Words:** Organizational Effectiveness, Banking, Employees Satisfaction, Goal Approach, Systems Approach, Organization

### Background

It has been stated that the effectiveness is the foundation of success. Therefore, organizational effectiveness is the measure of how successfully organizations accomplish their mission and goals through their core competencies. Organizations have been referred to as social entities, which comprise large and diverse group of people. Hence it is difficult to measure their effectiveness as they are large, diverse and fragmented. Definition of organizational effectiveness has been a matter of debate. The available literature on organizational effectiveness explores that the understanding about the concept of organizational effectiveness can vary with the nature of constructs.

---

\*Assistant Professor, Bahra University, Solan, HP , India

Phone Numbers: 9418556816(M), 01792-229137; E-mail: bhawnabhardwaj113@gmail.com

\*\* Research scholar, HPUBS, Summer Hill, Shimla.

Phone Number: 94180- 72849; E-mail: dipankershama@gmail.com

Economist and financial analysts define organizational effectiveness in terms of profit or return on investment while for a production manager it is the quality and quantity of the output. Gaertner & Ramnarayan (1987) defined organizational effectiveness as “ability of an organization to account successfully for its output and operations to its various internal and external constituencies”

### **Approaches to Measure Effectiveness**

Organizational effectiveness attracted the attention of research scholars and practitioners for the last few decades. The researchers are struggling to suggest an acceptance approach to measure the organizational effectiveness. They have proposed a number of models and approaches to be used as a measure for organizational effectiveness. These models as suggested by various scholars have been classified into four categories namely goal, systems, Internal process and multiple constituency approach. Goal Approach as suggested by David and Stanley (1999) and Steers (1977) emphasizes that effectiveness of an organization can be measured in terms of accomplishment of business goals or objectives. Systems Approach proposed by proposed by Evan (1976), Argyris (1964), Yutchman and Seashore (1967) and Pearson emphasizes that organizational effectiveness can be measured in terms of its ability to acquire inputs, process these inputs, channel the output, maintain stability and balance.

Internal Process as per the opinion of Rensis Likert (1950), Steers (1975) and Cameron (1981) can be used for measuring the organizational effectiveness. This approach emphasizes that internal variable like trust, teamwork, concern, leadership and communication are the various factors that affect organizational effectiveness and can be used for measuring organizational effectiveness. Multiple Constituency approach on the other hand, lays emphasis on degree to which an organization responds to demand and expectations of its strategic constituencies or its stakeholders as criteria of effectiveness. Various scholars who have contributed towards this approach are Conolly, Pennings and Goodman, Zammuto (1982) Laxmi, Roy and Yadav (1982).

Likert (1967) is of the opinion that there are three variables that determine the effectiveness of organization. These are casual variables, intervening variable and output or end result variables. Casual variables are those factors that influence the course of development within organization. These include leadership strategies, skills, and behavior and management decisions. Since these are the internal variable, hence, management can alter these. Intervening variables represent commitment to objective, motivation and morale

of its members. These manifest the current conditions of the internal state of the organizations. Whereas output or end result are the dependent variable that reflects the achievement of the organization. Majority of the managers evaluate the effectiveness of organization in term of output alone. Thus the effectiveness of business managers is often determined by net profits. Fiedler and Reddin have echoed the similar view points. However, factors like leader's effectiveness (Fiedler, 1967) in terms of group performance. Reddin argued that the effectiveness of a manager can be measured objectively by his profit centre performance.

### **Review of Literature**

Various studies has been undertaken to find out the factors of organizational effectiveness. It has been highlighted that participative management (Angermeier et al, 2009), organizational structure (Santra and Giri, 2008), organizational culture (Shiva & Roy, 2008), team work (Chau, 2008), behaviour of leaders (Erkutlu, 2008), customer satisfaction (Usha et al, 2006), and human resource management (Hansberry, 2005) are some of the important determinants of organizational effectiveness. Kashefi (1972) established a relationship between value system and organizational effectiveness. Cameron (1978) strongly emphasized that four independent variables leadership style, technology; strategic planning and human resource development affect organizational effectiveness. He strongly argued that leadership style has a high relationship with organizational effectiveness however other three factors also play a role in making organization effective.

### **Objectives of the Study:**

1. To point out the factors essential for organizational effectiveness.
2. To find out the most important determinant of effectiveness in banking industry.
3. To suggest the factors which should be taken into consideration for improving organizational success

### **Research Methodology**

The present study is an attempt to know the parameters of organizational effectiveness of banking industry in the changing global environment. In order to meet the above mentioned objectives the present study was based on both primary and secondary data. The primary data was collected with the help of a questionnaire through a survey conducted in the banks situated in Shimla city In order to determine the factors that determine

organizational effectiveness primary data was collected from the senior level managers, middle level managers and employees through a structured questionnaire. In order to identify factors affecting organizational effectiveness primary data was collected from the employees of the banks. Both managerial and non-managerial level employees were taken as a source of primary data. However, research papers, agenda papers of the banks and journals were referred to collect secondary data.

Both managerial and non-managerial employees filled up the second questionnaire. Quota sampling was used for the purpose of selecting the respondents as representatives of employees and managers of the banks. The Quota of the population which consisted of 35 percent employees, 35 percent lower and middle level managers and 30 percent senior level managers so that each level of employees could participate and respond to the questionnaire. A sample size of 300 respondents was taken as representative for the entire population.

### **Findings of the Study**

The data collected through questionnaire was analyzed through various statistical tools like simple average, percentage, mean, tables etc. Principal component analysis was used to reduce the number of variables and to identify important factors of organization effectiveness. The perception of employees was assessed on a 5-point scale to find out the important factors of organizational effectiveness. Various factors essential for organizational effectiveness have been identified through review of literature and research work done by various scholars in this field. Table 1 records the mean score of each indicator of effectiveness of the banks. 19 variables were identified as the predictor of organizational effectiveness with the help of previous researches, expert's opinion and literature in the field.

However, it is clear that some factors like clarity of goals, employee satisfaction, profit, public image and goodwill, customer satisfaction, recruitment and selection, responsiveness and accountability of bank towards its customers, motivation of employees, internal communication were rated high by the managers while new and latest technology, sufficient number of employees in the bank, external environment, size of the a bank, age of the bank, low level of stress were considered less important by the managers.

This indicates that if banks want to perform well they should focus more on employees' satisfaction, profitability and goal achievement followed by customer satisfaction and good image in the mind of customers. However, other factors like external environment and stress level of the employee are also important and can't be neglected. Thus from the information available in the table and as proved through previous studies also, it can be

concluded that organizational effectiveness of the bank is not decided by a single factor. There are various predictors of effectiveness and none of the factors can be ignored, though few factors play a more important role in making banks effective as compared to other factors.

In order to reduce the number of variables identified and to find out the most important factors essential for organizational effectiveness the variables were subjected to principal component analysis was done. Measures of Sample Adequacy such as correlation matrix, Bartlett's test of sphericity and KMO value showed that data was fit for factor analysis. It was observed that the ration of number of respondents to number of variables was more than 5:1 which inferred that data was adequate for factor analysis as per the criteria of the analysis. Table 2 shows that there were 28 correlations in the matrix having value greater than 0.30, satisfying the requirement of factor analysis which says that there should be some correlation values greater than .30. In addition, Table 3 shows that the overall MSA (Measures of Sample Adequacy) for the set of variables included in the analysis was 0.796, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 0.50.

Table 4 represents the communalities value which represents the proportion of the variance in the original variables explained by the factor solution. The factor solution should explain at least half of each original variable's variance, so the communality value for each variable should be 0.50 or higher. Table 5 shows the factors with Eigen value >1 that were retained in initial extraction. Six factors were extracted satisfying the criteria. Six factors thus extracted accounted for 65.60 percent of variance in the data. The final extraction of factors was done by subjecting the factors to orthogonal rotation with varimax. All the factors loading more than .03(ignoring the sign) were retained. Variable having loading of more than .30 on more than two factors was discarded as per the procedure of the analysis. Table 6 shows rotated component matrix while Table 7 shows the final factors and variables retained after the complete process of principal component analysis. 12 variables falling under 4 factors were finally retained and considered as important factors and variables for organizational effectiveness. Thus through principal component analysis the factor that were retained and considered to be important determinants of effectiveness of the bank were clarity of goals, employees satisfaction, profit, customer satisfaction, latest technology, management style, collaboration of employees and management, size of the bank, external environment, low level of employee stress, motivation and sharing knowledge with other banks.

**Suggestions**

1. In this competitive era every organization is focusing on achieving efficiency to provide better product and services at lower cost. Use of latest technology plays a significant role in organizational performance. Banks are no exceptions to this. Therefore to survive in tough competition and to outperform the competitors it is necessary that new and latest technology should be adopted.
2. It is an admitted fact that satisfied employees are productive employees. Now a days many organizations are using their employees as competitive advantage. If employees are satisfied they will perform for the upliftment of their organization. Hence we can suggest that importance should be given to the welfare and upliftment of the employees. Various monetary and non-monetary benefits can be offered by the banks to their employees to improve their satisfaction level with the banks.
3. The present study has proposed that external environment plays an important role in organizational effectiveness. Therefore, it is important to keep knowledge about the latest happenings and changes of the external environment. The organizations that are flexible to the changes in the external environment and adjust themselves according to these changes achieve success. Thus, it can be suggested that the banks should keep knowledge of the external environment to take strategic decisions related to various functions of the banks.
4. It is evident from the findings of the study that management style is one of the important factors that affect the performance and efficiency of the banks. Behaviour of the managers affects the satisfaction level of the employees which in turn affect performance of the employees and the banks. Therefore, leadership style of the management should be participative and employees friendly.
5. Motivation is the willingness of an individual to exert efforts for the achievement of specific goals. We have proved through our study that motivation of employees can lead to success of the banks. Motivation of the employees is very important and significant predictor of organizational effectiveness. So it is suggested that banks should adopt strategies and policies to keep employees motivated.
6. Every organization work in this business environment with some goals and objectives. It is evident from the present study that achievement of goals is critical for organizational success. Management and employees of the banks should focus on achievement of goals. However, employees can contribute in the achievement of goals only if they are aware of them. Therefore organizations should ensure that each employee and department should be kept informed about the goals and

**Conclusion**

Organizational effectiveness refers to the achievement of goals, however it also involves various other dimensions .the study tried to identify important dimensions of organizational effectiveness. The study indicated that factors like clarity of goals, employee satisfaction, profit, customer satisfaction, latest technology, management style, collaboration of employees and management, size of the bank, external environment, low level of employee stress, motivation and sharing knowledge with other banks are critical for organizational success. Hence it can be suggested that organization should focus on theses aspect to maximize their effectiveness.

**TABLE 1****Mean Score of the Variables as a Predictor of Organizational Effectiveness**

<b>S. NO.</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>
1	Clarity of goals and proper mission statement (Q1)	4.29
2	Employee satisfaction (Q2)	4.39
3	Profit (Q3)	4.33
4	Public image and goodwill (Q4)	4.1
5	Customer satisfaction (Q5)	4.1
6	Behavior and management style (Q6)	3.97
7	New and latest technology(Q7)	3.99
8	Recruitment and selection (Q8)	4.09
9	Responsiveness and accountability(Q9)	4.11
10	Sufficient number of employees (Q10)	3.89
11	Internal communication (Q11)	4.06
12	Collaboration and coordination (Q12)	3.97
13	External environment (Q13)	3.75
14	Size of the a Bank (Q14)	3.47
15	Age of the bank( Q15)	3.6
16	Sharing its skills , knowledge and techniques with other banks (Q16)	3.22
17	Low level of stress (Q17)	3.64
18	Motivation of employees (Q18)	4.25
19	Achievement of business goal (Q19)	3.8



**TABLE 2 (A)**  
**Correlation Matrix**

	label	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19
	Q1	1.000																		
correlation	Q2	.491	1.000																	
	Q3	.568	.550	1.000																
	Q4	.274	.406	.312	1.000															
	Q5	.425	.393	.477	.226	1.000														
	Q6	.217	.192	.203	.331	.274	1.000													
	Q7	.105	.291	.299	.302	.255	.331	1.000												
	Q8	.496	.275	.287	.262	.480	.208	.287	1.000											
	Q9	.190	.204	.154	.334	.196	.341	.253	.392	1.000										
	Q10	.322	.247	.245	.050	.219	.299	.309	.367	.099	1.000									
	Q11	.268	.265	.188	.174	.291	.256	.272	.582	.423	.476	1.000								
	Q12	.077	.005	.093	.182	.041	.211	.236	.379	.542	.245	.491	1.000							
	Q13	.138	.064	.170	.198	.141	.223	.286	.225	.420	.201	.335	.448	1.000						
	Q14	.155	.150	.238	.471	.185	.355	.400	.226	.192	.215	.237	.345	.435	1.000					
	Q15	.238	.280	.175	.274	.138	.289	.268	.209	.319	.277	.201	.250	.261	.365	1.000				
	Q16	.126	.079	.124	.334	.048	.257	.212	.238	.450	.153	.246	.444	.485	.552	.378	1.000			
	Q17	.093	.172	.045	.110	.125	.093	.243	.062	.125	.179	.049	.153	.143	.175	.301	.136	1.000		
	Q18	.257	.143	.041	.119	.187	.317	.142	.184	.204	.204	.191	.204	.224	.061	.142	.138	.304	1.000	
	Q19	.238	.247	.187	.117	.190	.147	.194	.224	.220	.287	.151	.142	.220	.150	.334	.302	.272	.222	1.000

**TABLE 2 (B)**  
**Anti-Image Correlation Matrix**

	label	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19
Anti-Image Correlation	Q1	.755 <sup>a</sup>	-.178	-.410	-.026	.025	-.026	.272	-.383	-.010	-.122	.075	.130	-.032	-.020	-.085	.019	.002	-.216	-.010
	Q2	-.178	.803 <sup>a</sup>	-.298	-.278	-.078	.080	-.117	.110	-.070	-.026	-.200	.157	.104	.083	-.130	.046	-.083	-.025	-.087
	Q3	-.410	-.298	.749 <sup>a</sup>	-.038	-.294	.004	-.182	.154	.044	-.046	.086	-.143	-.068	-.021	.072	-.013	.103	.187	-.019
	Q4	-.026	-.278	-.038	.820 <sup>a</sup>	.057	-.120	-.043	-.095	-.169	.161	.058	.046	.079	-.331	-.002	-.052	.012	-.036	.057
	Q5	.025	-.078	-.294	.057	.799 <sup>a</sup>	-.145	.015	-.349	-.047	.073	-.049	.196	-.042	-.089	.044	.120	-.094	-.082	-.041
	Q6	-.026	.080	.004	-.120	-.145	.800 <sup>a</sup>	-.124	.133	-.233	-.201	-.014	.061	.085	-.179	-.090	.018	.133	-.259	.043
	Q7	.272	-.117	-.182	-.043	.015	-.124	.827 <sup>a</sup>	-.165	-.066	-.137	.023	.030	-.091	-.197	-.021	.109	-.142	-.023	-.020
	Q8	-.383	.110	.154	-.095	-.349	.133	-.165	.779 <sup>a</sup>	-.098	-.069	-.329	-.166	.112	.018	.021	-.042	.087	.048	-.061
	Q9	-.010	-.070	.044	-.169	-.047	-.233	-.066	-.098	.765 <sup>a</sup>	.240	-.142	-.334	-.190	.335	-.122	-.236	-.020	.057	-.041
	Q10	-.122	-.026	-.046	.161	.073	-.201	-.137	-.069	.240	.790 <sup>a</sup>	-.334	-.060	-.010	.003	-.109	.005	-.076	-.005	-.156
	Q11	.075	-.200	.086	.058	-.049	-.014	.023	-.329	-.142	-.334	.817 <sup>a</sup>	-.233	-.112	-.033	.050	.047	.107	-.016	.085
	Q12	.130	.157	-.143	.046	.196	.061	.030	-.166	-.334	-.060	-.233	.807 <sup>a</sup>	-.104	-.150	-.016	-.086	-.094	-.118	.057
	Q13	-.032	.104	-.068	.079	-.042	.085	-.091	.112	-.190	-.010	-.112	-.104	.872 <sup>a</sup>	-.217	.004	-.171	.022	-.139	-.053
	Q14	-.020	.083	-.021	-.331	-.089	-.179	-.197	.018	.335	.003	-.033	-.150	-.217	.738 <sup>a</sup>	-.131	-.382	-.076	.162	.081
	Q15	-.085	-.130	.072	-.002	.044	-.090	-.021	.021	-.122	-.109	.050	-.016	.004	-.131	.894 <sup>a</sup>	-.108	-.175	.077	-.144
	Q16	.019	.046	-.013	-.052	.120	.018	.109	-.042	-.236	.005	.047	-.086	-.171	-.382	-.108	.830 <sup>a</sup>	.045	-.023	-.202
	Q17	.002	-.083	.103	.012	-.094	.133	-.142	.087	-.020	-.076	.107	-.094	.022	-.076	-.175	.045	.716 <sup>a</sup>	-.245	-.131
	Q18	-.216	-.025	.187	-.036	-.082	-.259	-.023	.048	.057	-.005	-.016	-.118	-.139	.162	.077	-.023	-.245	.699 <sup>a</sup>	-.084
	Q19	-.010	-.087	-.019	.057	-.041	.043	-.020	-.061	-.041	-.156	.085	.057	-.053	.081	-.144	-.202	-.131	-.084	.854 <sup>a</sup>

**TABLE (3)**  
**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.796
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	984.126
	df	171
	Sig.	.000

Source: Calculated by Researcher

**TABLE 4**  
**Communalities**

	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Extraction</b>
<b>Q1</b>	1.000	.682
<b>Q2</b>	1.000	.642
<b>Q3</b>	1.000	.672
<b>Q4</b>	1.000	.671
<b>Q5</b>	1.000	.549
<b>Q6</b>	1.000	.634
<b>Q7</b>	1.000	.609
<b>Q8</b>	1.000	.684
<b>Q9</b>	1.000	.692
<b>Q10</b>	1.000	.751
<b>Q11</b>	1.000	.738
<b>Q12</b>	1.000	.684
<b>Q13</b>	1.000	.505
<b>Q14</b>	1.000	.730
<b>Q15</b>	1.000	.529
<b>Q16</b>	1.000	.702
<b>Q17</b>	1.000	.592
<b>Q18</b>	1.000	.775
<b>Q19</b>	1.000	.624
<b>Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.</b>		

Source: Calculated by Researcher

**TABLE 5**  
**Total Variance Explained**

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.543	29.171	29.171	5.543	29.171	29.171	2.944	15.492	15.492
2	2.093	11.015	40.186	2.093	11.015	40.186	2.891	15.214	30.706
3	1.447	7.617	47.803	1.447	7.617	47.803	1.989	10.469	41.176
4	1.357	7.141	54.945	1.357	7.141	54.945	1.691	8.898	50.073
5	1.020	5.369	60.314	1.020	5.369	60.314	1.660	8.737	58.810
6	1.004	5.286	65.600	1.004	5.286	65.600	1.290	6.789	65.600
7	.835	4.395	69.995						
8	.800	4.211	74.206						
9	.710	3.735	77.940						
10	.678	3.567	81.508						
11	.615	3.237	84.745						
12	.507	2.671	87.416						
13	.492	2.588	90.004						
14	.418	2.202	92.206						
15	.397	2.087	94.293						
16	.343	1.808	96.101						
17	.279	1.470	97.571						
18	.249	1.309	98.880						
19	.213	1.120	100.000						

Source: Calculated by Researcher

**TABLE 6**  
**Rotated Component Matrix<sup>A</sup>**

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Q1	.783	.117	-.077	.150	.131	.103
Q2	.750	-.033	.171	.219	.011	.039
Q3	.771	.018	.222	.076	.068	-.135
Q4	.443	.309	.524	-.010	-.312	.084
Q5	.663	.025	.126	-.037	.215	.214
Q6	.174	.179	.552	-.051	.111	.502
Q7	.151	.063	.666	.143	.329	.100
Q8	.504	.435	-.029	-.056	.480	.086
Q9	.204	.766	.041	.030	-.015	.245
Q10	.175	.022	.205	.284	.771	.051
Q11	.244	.492	.056	-.089	.645	.096
Q12	-.072	.756	.102	.046	.294	.092
Q13	-.001	.623	.253	.192	.120	.038
Q14	.089	.372	.731	.169	.028	-.143
Q15	.168	.283	.295	.577	.036	-.018
Q16	.014	.698	.306	.314	-.095	-.112
Q17	-.023	-.032	.151	.656	.044	.366
Q18	.095	.150	-.024	.227	.067	.829
Q19	.225	.190	-.083	.718	.119	.023

Source: Calculated by Researcher

**TABLE 7**  
**Rotated Component Matrix<sup>A</sup>**

Factor	Construct	Label	Component			
			1	2	3	4
F1	Clarity of goals and proper mission statement	Q1	.800	.156	-.121	.097
	Employee satisfaction	Q2	.762	-.024	.167	.117
	Profit	Q3	.821	.077	.211	-.140
	Customer satisfaction	Q5	.697	.040	.124	.130
F2	New and latest technology	Q16	.011	.727	.336	-.046
	Behavior and style of management	Q9	.202	.766	-.074	.131
	Collaboration and coordination of employee and Mgt.	Q12	-.028	.787	.086	.125
	Size of the a Bank	Q13	.069	.697	.275	.082
F3	External environment	Q14	.113	.421	.722	-.082
	Sharing Its skills , knowledge and techniques with other bank	Q7	.236	.137	.712	.195
F4	Low level of stress	Q17	.017	-.007	.378	.769
	Motivation of employees	Q18	.172	.259	-.172	.770

Source: Calculated by Researcher

### References

- Camron, K. (1978). Organizational effectiveness: its measurement and prediction in higher education. *Doctoral dissertation*. Yale University.
- Chau, V. S. (2008). Relationship of strategic performance management to team strategy, companies performance and organizational effectiveness.
- Drucker, P.F. (1974). *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Erkultu, H. (2008). Impact of transformational leadership on organizational and leadership effectiveness. *Journal of management development*. 27(7), 708-726.
- Fiedler, F. Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gaertner, G.H. and Ramanarayan, S. (1983). Organizational effectiveness: an alternative perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(1),97-107.
- Hansberry, J.F. (2005). An exploration of collaboration and organizational effectiveness in Denver county human service organization. P.hD Thesis. The Faculty of graduate school of Public and International Affairs. University of Pittsburgh.
- Kashefi, Z. (1972). An empirical investigation of the relationship between value system and organizational effectiveness, *Dissertation Abstract International Michigan*. Vol.32(7), pp 3494-A.
- Laxmi, T.K.S., Roy, S. and Yadav, M.S. (1988).Context for educational management . *The Education Quaterly*, Winter, Ministry of Education and Culture, New Delhi.
- Likert, Rensis (1967). *The Human Organization*. McGraw Hill , NewYork.
- Santra, T. and Giri, V.N. (2008). Effect of organizational structure on organizational effectiveness through face-to-face communication. *The ICFAI Journal Of Organizational Behaviour*. 7(2), 28-38.
- Shiva and Roy, S. (2008). A conceptual model of transformational leadership, organizational culture and organizational effectiveness for NGO in the Indian context. *The Icfaian Journal of Management Research*, 6(4), 63-68.
- Usha, D.N., Bhargavi, V.R., and Chaya, R. (2006). Organizational effectiveness in IT companies: a case study.
- Zammuto, R.F. (1982). *Assessing organizational effectiveness*, Albany, State University of New York.