



ORGANIZATIONAL INITIATIVES: A STRATEGY FOR ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Chandra Reddy Kurri¹, Dr.V.Tulasi Das²

¹Research Scholar, Dept. of HRM, Acharya Nagarjuna University.

²Associate Professor & HOD, Dept. of HRM, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur-522510, A.P

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra13814>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra13814

ABSTRACT

In today's rapidly changing business environment, organizations need to be adaptable and responsive to change. They should have systems in place to monitor external trends, identify potential risks and opportunities and effectively manage change initiatives. The organizations in the present business landscape are required to establish a very supportive environment where workers may perform their tasks efficiently without being vulnerable to any outside forces that might prevent them from achieving their own or the organization's goals. As a result, every organisation must focus on organisational performance, which encompasses client and customer happiness as well as work-life balance. Organisational innovation has a beneficial effect on organisational success because of factors including global competitiveness, rapid technological development, and staff understanding of how to adapt into the new way of doing things. Keeping this in view, a survey was conducted from the employees of Life Insurance Industry to empirically explore the organizational effectiveness in Andhra Pradesh.

KEY WORDS: Supportive Environment, Effectiveness, Performance, Explore, Competition

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing business environment, organizations need to be adaptable and responsive to change. They should have systems in place to monitor external trends, identify potential risks and opportunities, and effectively manage change initiatives. Clear and open communication is essential for organizational effectiveness. Employees need to understand the organization's goals, receive feedback on their performance, and have access to information necessary to perform their jobs effectively. Effective communication also promotes collaboration and coordination among teams and departments.

Organizational effectiveness refers to the ability of an organization to achieve its goals and objectives efficiently and successfully. It involves maximizing the organization's resources, processes, and people to produce desired outcomes and meet stakeholder expectations. An effective organization aligns its goals and objectives with its overall mission and vision. This ensures that everyone in the organization is working towards a common purpose and that efforts are focused on strategic priorities. Organizations need a clear and well-defined strategy to guide their actions. This includes developing a strategic plan that outlines the organization's direction, identifies key initiatives, and sets measurable objectives.

Strong leadership is crucial for organizational effectiveness. Leaders should provide a clear vision, set expectations, and inspire and motivate employees. They should also promote a positive organizational culture and create an environment that fosters innovation, collaboration, and continuous learning, it establishes performance metrics and regularly measure progress towards goals. Engaged and skilled employees contribute to organizational effectiveness. Organizations should invest in employee development programs, provide opportunities for growth and advancement, and create a positive work environment that fosters employee satisfaction and commitment.

Organizations should strive to meet the needs and expectations of their stakeholders, including customers, employees, shareholders, and the community. By delivering value and maintaining positive relationships with



stakeholders, organizations can enhance their reputation and long-term success. Organizational effectiveness is an ongoing process. Effective organizations embrace a culture of continuous improvement, seeking feedback, learning from mistakes, and adapting their strategies and practices to stay ahead in a competitive environment.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Akpa, Victoria O., Asikhia, Olalekan U., Nneji, Ngozi Evangeline (2022) they explain Employee commitment and shared values with the organisation may lead to improved performance in attaining the overall objectives of the organisation. The contribution of organisational culture to improving output and performance within the company. Their findings demonstrate that an organization's employees adhere to clear work ethics, are like-minded and share common beliefs and values, and are supported by values such as consistency, adaptability, and an efficient communication system. This sense of identity increases employees' commitment to their jobs and, in turn, improves performance.

Al Halbusi, H. (2022) He states that numerous research on corporate justice and employee ethical behaviour have connections to the growth of organisations. He discovers a strong warning for managers, saying that "failing to ensure that their employees perceive organisational justice" may weaken every effort made by them to improve their organizations' ethical eminence.

Tumbali et al. (2021)

He discussed important factors that influence organisational effectiveness, including administration and management, the work environment and resources, compensation and benefits, interpersonal interactions, and success and recognition.

Prowell (2021) gets the attention it deserves. According to their PhD dissertation, the effectiveness of women-owned small businesses in the military industry was investigated using qualitative methodologies, or the case study methodology. The OE specifically looked at the function of human capital. They discovered that while skills could contribute to human capital, knowledge accounted for the majority of it. Additionally, contractor performance assessment reports, retention rates, and annual audits were reported as the key indicators or OE in the small business owned and operated by women.

Verghese (2020) Leadership can better align and engage organisational personnel' strengths and skills by understanding organisational cultural behaviours for promote the Organizational effectiveness.

Sharma and Singh, (2019)

"Goal model, system resource model, process model, and ecological or participant satisfaction model" are given to them. According to their justification for the goal model, "effectiveness is the extent to which an organisation achieves its goals or targets." The output is the main focus of this paradigm. This model received criticism for two main reasons.

First, an organisation could be evaluated based on its performance in areas unrelated to its stated objective. Second, even if the declared goals are accomplished, organisations may still not be effective if they are too modest, destructive, or replaced. Effectiveness for the resource model is defined as the capacity to obtain valuable and scarce resources, showing that the input is the main area of focus.

Budhiraja and Malhotra (2017) they specified that "OE emphasises the role of key stakeholders and their leadership style." But this fourth most recent However, this fourth most popular model was limited in scope. Firstly, organizations may ignore key stakeholders' inputs and achieve effectiveness despite conflicting or differing expectations.

Amin & Shila, (2015). Effectiveness is sometimes used to replicate all-inclusive performance of an organization because it is broader compared to other concepts of organizational performance. Ability to execute a function with optimal levels of input and out determines the effectiveness of any organization business environment is highly dynamic and ever changing due to globalization, any organization that wants to be relevant and gain competitive advantage must enhance their organizational effectiveness.



Sparrow and Cooper (2014) they stated it is more encompassing than other notions of organisational performance, effectiveness is sometimes used to emulate the entire performance of an organisation. The efficacy of any organisation is determined by its capacity to carry out a task with optimal levels of input and output. Due to the globalised and highly dynamic nature of the business world, any organisation that wishes to remain relevant and achieve a competitive advantage must increase organisational effectiveness.

When systems models replaced more goal-based methods of thinking about it in the late 1950s and 1960s, organisational effectiveness became more fundamental to organisation theory. While describing the retrospective perspective of OE, further. The solution to the question of whose perspective the efficacy must be examined was highlighted in four different ways. First of all, it was stressed that the The evaluation of organizational effectiveness (OE) should consider important stakeholders, their relation power to negotiate and control strategic resources, and their social justice perspective. Assessment should focus on equal distribution of resources, embracing opportunities, income, and wealth to minimize workplace regrets. The evolutionary perspective emphasizes consistency in effectiveness of assessed parameters, while adaptability is crucial for maintaining organizational performance on a continuum over time.

Basol and Dogerlioglu (2014) the study identified structural determinants of organizational aging (OE) that include organizational age, size, formalization, specialization, and centralization. Older organizations are more likely to be wealthy and prominent. However, not all organizations can sustain growth and survive in a changing environment. Organizational age and performance are interlinked and considered representative of OE

.Zheng, Yang and McLean (2010), Organizational effectiveness is one of the measures of performance that is used to assess how outputs interact with the economic and social environment. He opined that effectiveness generally determines the policy objectives of the organization or the extent to which organizational goals are realized.

According to Claire M. Mason, Artemis C. F. Chang, Mark A. Griffin, (2005) According to their studies to improve organisational effectiveness, it is essential to integrate employee opinion surveys with other data systems. This can enhance strategic planning by linking survey data to sales, absenteeism, and client service ratings. The goal is to determine the relationship between work environment factors assessed by employee surveys and organizational outcomes.

Ittner and Larcker (2003) reported that up to 23% of US companies used modelling procedures to link different types of performance data with organisational effectiveness. **Pegels et al., 2000; Pettus, 2001.** Another approach is to call upon Top management teams to develop effective ways so that organizations can innovate and adapt to the rapidly changing environment

Schneider, Ashworth & Higgs 1996; Wiley & Brooks 2000 according to them this information is used by organisations to determine how to select organisational development activities that achieve the greatest improvement in organisational effectiveness

Thibodeaux and Favilla (1996) they found that strategic management's role links OC and OE. They measured the OE on ten important aspects: "1) conflict, 2) customer, 3) flexibility or adaptation, 4) information management, 5) morale, 6) planning and goal setting, 7) productivity, 8) quality, 9) urgency, and 10) value of human resources."

Denison, D. R. (1990). Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness. Denison's research focuses on the relationship between corporate culture and organizational effectiveness. He argues that organizations with a strong culture that emphasizes adaptability, consistency, involvement, and mission achievement tend to perform better.

RESEARCH GAP

Various research studies focused on Organizational Effectiveness and they find number of approaches for improving Organizational Effectiveness and focusing on the impact of variables and knowledge on its effectiveness. The present study will be review under different contexts, both Indian International journals, books. Current research aims to examine the role of Organizational Effectiveness in the insurance sector, focusing on maximizing resources, processes, and people to meet stakeholder expectations.



OBJECTIVES

1. To study the extent of Management and Employee effectiveness
2. To study the impact of organizational initiatives on Organizational Effectiveness
3. To put forth certain suggestions based on findings of the study.

HYPOTHESIS

Hypothesis 1:

H0: The Organizational Initiatives does not have an impact on Organizational Effectiveness.

H1: The Organizational Initiatives does have an impact on Organizational Effectiveness.

Hypothesis 2:

Ho There is no difference in Management effectiveness and Employee effectiveness for Organizational Development

H1 There is a difference in Management Effectiveness and Employee Effectiveness for Organizational Development.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Primary Data: Primary data collected from Employees of Insurance sector in Andhra Pradesh by using a structured questionnaire. Convenience sampling technic is administered for selection of sample. Total 390 number of filled questionnaires are considered for the study. Secondary data is collected from academic source premier, Google scholar, SAGE journal, HBR Research JGATE plus.



Table No-1: Correlation Matrix of Organizational Effectiveness Factor

| | | Correlation Matrix ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| Correlation | OE01 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE02 | .897 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE03 | .837 | .841 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE04 | .822 | .837 | .866 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE05 | .709 | .736 | .776 | .763 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE06 | .811 | .847 | .874 | .855 | .757 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE07 | .841 | .828 | .883 | .865 | .754 | .811 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE08 | .594 | .578 | .610 | .582 | .523 | .596 | .567 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE09 | .552 | .549 | .581 | .553 | .476 | .533 | .519 | .862 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE10 | .588 | .571 | .598 | .565 | .495 | .565 | .550 | .835 | .762 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE11 | .588 | .573 | .596 | .559 | .503 | .563 | .558 | .887 | .826 | .892 | 1.000 | | | | | | | | |
| | OE12 | .531 | .536 | .544 | .531 | .441 | .503 | .522 | .752 | .689 | .750 | .848 | 1.000 | | | | | | | |
| | OE13 | .403 | .399 | .427 | .403 | .431 | .394 | .415 | .515 | .538 | .516 | .556 | .632 | 1.000 | | | | | | |
| | OE14 | .463 | .445 | .475 | .450 | .461 | .430 | .442 | .568 | .583 | .544 | .610 | .660 | .900 | 1.000 | | | | | |
| | OE15 | .347 | .338 | .343 | .352 | .349 | .321 | .293 | .538 | .539 | .503 | .546 | .568 | .679 | .670 | 1.000 | | | | |
| | OE16 | .388 | .400 | .410 | .405 | .406 | .383 | .388 | .513 | .537 | .471 | .525 | .526 | .737 | .787 | .732 | 1.000 | | | |
| | OE17 | .374 | .364 | .379 | .392 | .330 | .340 | .353 | .474 | .501 | .490 | .469 | .514 | .758 | .726 | .766 | .802 | 1.000 | | |
| | OE18 | .372 | .388 | .396 | .394 | .393 | .381 | .367 | .610 | .600 | .539 | .583 | .581 | .654 | .647 | .787 | .764 | .707 | 1.000 | |
| | OE19 | .351 | .369 | .367 | .359 | .387 | .343 | .327 | .508 | .495 | .448 | .464 | .482 | .642 | .619 | .699 | .708 | .711 | .854 | 1.000 |
| Sig. (1-tailed) | OE01 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE02 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE03 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE04 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE05 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE06 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE07 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE08 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE09 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE10 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE11 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE12 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE13 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE14 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE15 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |



| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | OE16 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE17 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE18 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | OE19 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| a. Determinant = 1.932E-12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The first part of output concerns data screening, assumption testing and sampling adequacy. Second part follows with hypothesis testing. In first part none of the values are more than 0.9 and in second part all the values are below 0.05 and determinant is more than 0.00001. Therefore, both are found to be significant. Table Number:1 - One Tailed Test of OE factors

KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test is a proportion of how fit present information is for Factor Analysis. The test estimates sampling sufficiency for every factor in the model and for the total model. The measurement is a proportion of extent of variance among variance. The lower the extent, the more fit information is for Factor Analysis. Following Table- 1 shows the results of the KMO and Bartlett's test.

Table No: 2 KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) and Bartlett's test of Organisational Effectiveness

| KMO and Bartlett's Test | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .930 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 10299.039 |
| | df. | 171 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

(Source: Primary Data)

The above Table- 2: reveals that KMO value i.e., .930 is neither nearer to zero nor close to one. So, the range is found to be good. Bartlett's test for Sphericity compares correlation matrix (a matrix of Pearson correlation) to the identity matrix. In other words, it checks if there is a redundancy between variables that can be summarized with some factors. Therefore, this test should be momentous (i.e., have a significant value less than 0.05). A significant value from chi-square test shows that for the present data R-matrix is not an identity matrix. Here Bartlett's test for Sphericity is highly significant ($p < 0.001$), therefore it is concluded that the factor analysis is appropriate



Table - 3: Anti image matrices for Organizational Effectiveness Factor

| | | Anti-image Matrices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| Anti-image Correlation | OE01 | .956 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE02 | -.103 | .958 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE03 | -.368 | -.286 | .934 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE04 | -.166 | -.300 | -.506 | .936 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE05 | .124 | .017 | -.107 | -.136 | .970 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE06 | .155 | -.229 | -.086 | .009 | -.099 | .928 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE07 | -.177 | .193 | -.136 | -.066 | -.129 | -.614 | .922 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE08 | -.046 | .089 | .013 | -.026 | -.037 | -.163 | .064 | .949 ^a | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE09 | .089 | -.004 | -.089 | -.039 | .068 | .065 | .010 | -.453 | .954 ^a | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE10 | -.018 | .005 | -.050 | .020 | -.018 | -.041 | .051 | -.154 | .040 | .942 ^a | | | | | | | | | |
| | OE11 | -.091 | -.052 | -.014 | .148 | -.051 | .029 | -.037 | -.295 | -.230 | -.536 | .903 ^a | | | | | | | | |
| | OE12 | .097 | -.080 | .075 | -.145 | .144 | .097 | -.122 | -.040 | .138 | .049 | -.491 | .939 ^a | | | | | | | |
| | OE13 | .085 | -.008 | -.070 | .099 | -.082 | .030 | -.091 | .084 | -.032 | -.034 | .046 | -.130 | .902 ^a | | | | | | |
| | OE14 | -.117 | .054 | -.028 | .029 | -.051 | -.032 | .092 | -.022 | -.034 | .073 | -.046 | -.129 | -.693 | .901 ^a | | | | | |
| | OE15 | -.108 | .027 | .078 | -.040 | -.096 | -.087 | .184 | .007 | .006 | .062 | -.073 | -.073 | -.048 | -4.334E-5 | .942 ^a | | | | |
| | OE16 | .076 | -.071 | -.010 | .024 | -.041 | .024 | -.057 | .042 | -.001 | .126 | -.132 | .150 | .138 | -.392 | -.038 | .924 ^a | | | |
| | OE17 | -.011 | .055 | .079 | -.165 | .186 | .039 | -.068 | .020 | -.054 | -.246 | .185 | .001 | -.264 | .053 | -.335 | -.391 | .904 ^a | | |
| | OE18 | .092 | .050 | .007 | -.073 | .057 | .004 | -.052 | -.082 | -.070 | -.008 | -.010 | -.059 | -.028 | .102 | -.357 | -.284 | .132 | .900 ^a | |
| | OE19 | -.065 | -.105 | -.018 | .120 | -.129 | .006 | .061 | -.074 | .041 | .014 | .084 | .012 | -.067 | .007 | .070 | .023 | -.223 | -.628 | .907 ^a |

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA)



Table- 3 shows KMO, Bartlett's test of Sphericity and anti-image matrix. As per Kaiser's (1974) recommendations .000 to 0.49 unacceptable, 0.50 to 0.59 miserable, 0.6 to 0.69 mediocre, 0.7 to 0.79 middling, 0.8 to 0.89 meritorious, 0.9 to 1.00 marvellous. In the table KMO values for individual factors are formed on the diagonal of the anti-image correlation matrix. After the observation it is identified that all the factors the values are above 0.5. Thus, all the factors should be considered for communalities analysis. The off-diagonal values represent the partial correlation between factors. Therefore, off diagonal elements been scanned to ensure that they are lesser than diagonal values and found off diagonal values are lesser than diagonal values.

Communalities

Initial communalities estimate the differences among each factor accounted for, from all the variables. Extraction communalities values are estimates of the differences in each factor accounted for the variables in the factor solution. Below Table- 4 shows the particulars of communalities of Organisational Effectiveness.

Table - 4: Communalities of Organizational Effectiveness

| Communalities | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------|
| | Initial | Extraction |
| How well do you feel the company's strategy aligns with your role and responsibilities? | 1.000 | .881 |
| How satisfied are you with the level of teamwork within your department and across the organization? | 1.000 | .900 |
| How effective do you feel communication is within the organization? | 1.000 | .957 |
| How satisfied are you with the decision-making processes in the company? | 1.000 | .935 |
| How satisfied are you with the allocation of resources (such as budget and manpower) in the organization? | 1.000 | .709 |
| How well do you feel the company values employee input and feedback? | 1.000 | .860 |
| How satisfied are you with the level of support and resources provided to your department? | 1.000 | .869 |
| How satisfied are you with the level of transparency in the company? | 1.000 | .889 |
| How satisfied are you with the level of recognition and rewards offered to employees? | 1.000 | .805 |
| Wide application of Analytics will change the organization results drastically | 1.000 | .852 |
| Analytics helps to measure the effects on employee and company performance | 1.000 | .941 |
| The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing. | 1.000 | .772 |
| The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus, and participation | 1.000 | .762 |
| The management style in the organization is characterized by individual risk-taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness. | 1.000 | .765 |
| The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist. | 1.000 | .762 |
| The organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant. | 1.000 | .819 |
| The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people | 1.000 | .807 |
| Information is conveyed properly to avoid ambiguity and misconceptions. | 1.000 | .784 |
| The senior management demonstrates transparency and involvement in their decision-making. | 1.000 | .732 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. | | |

The above table- 4 gives the communalities of initial and extraction Principal Component analysis deals with the initial hypothesis that all factors are common in the table, values for the initial communalities are 1 for all the factors. The value in the column titled extraction shows the common differences in the data structure. For, factor 3 how effective do you feel communication is within the organization Explains 957 Extraction is 95.7 percent of variance observed is



common deference. There is second dimension for observing these communalities is in terms of the ratio of difference explained by the underlying variables.

To understand about the exact level of difference among factors is initially assumed as all communalities are "1". But after the analysis the differentiated values for each variable are found. How well do you feel the company's strategy aligns with your role and responsibilities has 88.1 percent. How satisfied are you with the level of teamwork within your department and across the organization has 90.0 percent. How effective do you feel communication is within the organization has 95.7 percent. How satisfied are you with the decision-making processes in the company has 93.5 percent. How satisfied are you with the allocation of resources (such as budget and manpower) in the organization has 70.9 percent. How well do you feel the company values employee input and feedback has 86.0 percent? How satisfied are you with the level of support and resources provided to your department has 86.9 percent. How satisfied are you with the level of transparency in the company has 88.9 percent. How satisfied are you with the level of recognition and rewards offered to employees has 80.5 percent. Wide application of Analytics will change the organization results drastically has 85.2 percent. Analytics helps to measure the effects on employee and company performance has 94.1 percent. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing has 77.2 percent. The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus, and participation has 76.2 percent. The management style in the organization is characterized by individual risk-taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness has 76.5 percent. The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist has 76.2 percent. The organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant has 81.9 percent. The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people has 80.7 percent. Information is conveyed properly to avoid ambiguity and misconceptions has 78.4 percent. The senior management demonstrates transparency and involvement in their decision-making has 73.2 percent. It is shown in Total variance Explained table which is following.

Table - 5: Total variance Explained of Organizational Effectiveness

| Component | Total Variance Explained | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------|
| | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings ^a |
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total |
| 1 | 11.372 | 59.855 | 59.855 | 11.372 | 59.855 | 59.855 | 8.976 |
| 2 | 3.067 | 16.143 | 75.997 | 3.067 | 16.143 | 75.997 | 8.355 |
| 3 | 1.362 | 7.167 | 83.164 | 1.362 | 7.167 | 83.164 | 8.902 |
| 4 | .643 | 3.382 | 86.546 | | | | |
| 5 | .397 | 2.090 | 88.637 | | | | |
| 6 | .333 | 1.751 | 90.387 | | | | |
| 7 | .298 | 1.571 | 91.958 | | | | |
| 8 | .266 | 1.401 | 93.359 | | | | |
| 9 | .245 | 1.287 | 94.646 | | | | |
| 10 | .221 | 1.162 | 95.808 | | | | |
| 11 | .171 | .899 | 96.708 | | | | |
| 12 | .121 | .639 | 97.347 | | | | |
| 13 | .118 | .622 | 97.969 | | | | |
| 14 | .103 | .543 | 98.512 | | | | |
| 15 | .078 | .411 | 98.923 | | | | |
| 16 | .066 | .346 | 99.269 | | | | |
| 17 | .060 | .318 | 99.587 | | | | |
| 18 | .050 | .264 | 99.851 | | | | |
| 19 | .028 | .149 | 100.000 | | | | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. When components are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.



Table- 5 shows that Eigen values related with each factor displays the differences explained by that particular linear factor. This table also shows the Eigen values in terms of percentage of difference explain. So, factor 1 explains 59.855 per cent, factor 2 explains 16.143 per cent, factor 3 explains 7.167 per cent, factor 4 explains 3.382 per cent and factor 5 explains 2.090 per cent of total variance; it should be clear that these five factors explain relatively large amount of variance of 88.637. Finally, it is concluded that the initial five variables explain relatively major part of difference whereas subsequent variables explain only small part of difference. There are five variables among all with Eigen value greater than 1. The Eigen values related with these variables are again shown and the percentages of difference explained in the columns are labelled extraction sums of squared loadings

Form the above table- it is identified that only first five factors in organization effectiveness through Management effectiveness and employee effectiveness are highly impacting aspect and the residual were of not that much. Because it only exceeds Eigen value more than 1.

Table - 6: Organizational Effectiveness Grouping Factors Pattern Matrix

| Pattern Matrix ^a | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|-------|
| | Component | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| How satisfied are you with the decision-making processes in the company? | .974 | | |
| How effective do you feel communication is within the organization? | .961 | | |
| How satisfied are you with the level of teamwork within your department and across the organization? | .939 | | |
| How satisfied are you with the level of support and resources provided to your department? | .935 | | |
| How well do you feel the company values employee input and feedback? | .915 | | |
| How well do you feel the company's strategy aligns with your role and responsibilities? | .911 | | |
| How satisfied are you with the allocation of resources (such as budget and manpower) in the organization? | .833 | | |
| The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people | | .942 | |
| The organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant. | | .922 | |
| The senior management demonstrates transparency and involvement in their decision-making. | | .882 | |
| The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist. | | .838 | |
| The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus, and participation. | | .822 | |
| Information is conveyed properly to avoid ambiguity and misconceptions. | | .805 | |
| The management style in the organization is characterized by individual risk-taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness. | | .761 | |
| Analytics helps to measure the effects on employee and company performance | | | -.989 |
| Wide application of Analytics will change the organization results drastically | | | -.923 |
| How satisfied are you with the level of transparency in the company? | | | -.917 |
| How satisfied are you with the level of recognition and rewards offered to employees? | | | -.843 |
| The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing. | | | -.783 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization. | | | |
| a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations. | | | |

Table- 6 shows the Pattern Matrix- Organizational Effectiveness dependent on Management and Employees Effectiveness. On the basis of Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization, three groups emerged. These three groups consist of all those factors that have factor loadings greater than or least equal to 0.5. Thus, the first group there are 7 dimensions and this group is titled as OE1. For second component there are 7 dimensions and these six dimensions are combined together to get one group extracted and it is conceptualized as OE2. For third component there are 5 dimensions and these eight dimensions are combined together to get one group extracted and it is conceptualized as OE3.

Table - 7: Component Correlation Matrix of Organizational Effectiveness

| Component Correlation Matrix | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Component | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 1.000 | .444 | -.618 |
| 2 | .444 | 1.000 | -.621 |
| 3 | -.618 | -.621 | 1.000 |

Extraction Method: Principal
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

The final part of the factor analysis output is a component Correlation matrix between the factors. This matrix contains the correlation coefficients between the factors. From Table- 7 it is understood that all these factors are interrelated with each other to some degree. The fact that these correlations exist tells that the constructs measured can be interrelated. If the constructs are independent then the component correlation matrix should have been identity matrix. Therefore, from this final matrix it appears that the independence of the factors cannot be assumed.

FINDINGS

- The evaluation of employee satisfaction with the decision-making processes in the company revealed varying levels of contentment among the Employee. While a significant portion expressed overall satisfaction, a notable portion indicated possibility for improvement in the decision-making processes.
- The assessment of the perceived effectiveness of communication within the organization yielded diverse perspectives among the participants. While a considerable number of employees expressed satisfaction with the communication practices, a notable portion highlighted areas for improvement.
- The evaluation of employee satisfaction with the level of teamwork within their department and across the organization revealed mixed sentiments among the respondents. While a significant number of employees expressed overall satisfaction with the level of teamwork, a notable portion indicated possibility for improvement.
- The evaluation of the organization's definition of success, focusing on the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people, revealed a strong alignment between the organization's values and the perceptions of the respondents.
- The evaluation of the organization's emphasis on competitive actions and achievement, particularly in terms of hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace, revealed a prevailing focus on competitiveness and results-driven performance.
- The evaluation of senior management's approach to decision-making revealed a positive perception among the respondents regarding their transparency and involvement.
- The assessment of the impact of analytics on measuring employee and company performance revealed a significant positive correlation between the use of analytics and performance evaluation.
- The examination of the wide application of analytics within the organization revealed a strong indication that it has the potential to significantly impact organizational results.
- The evaluation of employee satisfaction with the level of transparency in the company unveiled varying degrees of contentment among the respondents. While a significant portion expressed overall satisfaction with the level of transparency, a notable proportion indicated a desire for greater openness and disclosure.

SUGGESTIONS

- Enhance the decision-making process within the organization to improve employee satisfaction. Through involving employees in decision-making, providing them with the necessary information.
- Focus on improving the communication system within the organization to enhance organizational effectiveness. To attain by implementing clear and transparent communication channels, using technology to facilitate communication, and regularly seeking feedback from employees to identify areas for improvement.



- Invest in the development of human resources by providing training and development opportunities to employees. This can include offering skill-building workshops, and creating a culture that encourages personal and professional growth. Foster a culture of teamwork and encourage employee commitment to improve organizational effectiveness.
- Organization focuses on winning in the marketplace through strategic competitive actions and Utilize analytics to measure the effective performance of both employees and the company as a whole. This can involve implementing performance management systems that incorporate data-driven metrics, using analytics tools to track key performance indicators, and talent acquisition and retention, predictive modelling for strategic planning, leveraging data for customer insights and personalized marketing, and finally utilizing analytics to optimize operational processes and resource allocation

CONCLUSION

The research is conducted to examine the factors contributing for organisational effectiveness in the study area and found that enhancing the need for continuous improvement in decision-making processes, communication practices, teamwork, and transparency, investing in human resources development, and utilizing analytics techniques, organizations can improve employee satisfaction and enhance organizational effectiveness. These strategies collectively contribute to a positive work environment, increased productivity, and a competitive edge in the marketplace. It is crucial for organizations to prioritize these areas to foster growth, success, and long-term sustainability.

Scope for Future Research

The present research considered employees of Insurance sector, in future researchers may involve employees of different sectors to get valid results of organization effectiveness. In future researcher also can examine the relevant factors like HR Analytics, work life balance and quality of work life impact on organizational effectiveness.

REFERENCES

1. Akhtar, C. S., Awan, S. H., Naveed, S., & Ismail, K. (2018). A comparative study of the application of systems thinking in achieving organizational effectiveness in Malaysian and Pakistani banks. *International Business Review*, 27(4), 767–776. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2018.01.001>
2. Akpa, Victoria O., Asikhia, Olalekan U., Nneji, Ngozi Evangeline (2022) "Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance" *International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM) Volume 3, Issue 1 Jan-Feb 2021*, pp: 361-372 www.ijaem.net ISSN: 2395-5252
3. Al Halbusi, H. (2022), "Who pays attention to the moral aspects? Role of organizational justice and moral attentiveness in leveraging ethical behavior", *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 357-379. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-09-2021-0180>
4. Alrowwad, A., Almajali, D. A., Masa'Deh, R., Obeidat, B., & Aqqad, N. (2019). The role of organizational commitment in enhancing organizational effectiveness. *Proceedings of the 33rd International Business Information Management Association Conference, IBIMA 2019: Education Excellence and Innovation Management through Vision 2020*, April, 9133–9154.
5. Amin, T., & Shila, S. (2015). Enhancing organizational effectiveness by performance appraisal, training, employee participation, and job definition. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(12), 56-63.
6. Budhiraja, S., & Malhotra, M. (2017). Leadership Style & Organizational Effectiveness in Indian IT & Banking Industry. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 49(2), 270–285
7. Cameron, K. (2015). Organizational Effectiveness. In *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management* (eds C.L. Cooper, P.C. Flood and Y. Freeney). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom110202>
8. Choudhry, N., Philip, P. J., & Kumar, R. (2011). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Effectiveness. 1(3), 18–25
9. Domains of Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges and Universities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(1), 25–47. <https://doi.org/10.5465/255822>.
10. Rana Tahir Naveed, Homoud Alhaidan, Hussam Al Halbusi, Abdullah Kaid Al-Swidi, "Do organizations really evolve? The critical link between organizational culture and organizational innovation toward organizational effectiveness: Pivotal role of organizational resistance," *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, Volume 7, Issue 2, 2022, 100178, ISSN 2444-569X, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100178>.
11. Zheng W., Yang B., & McLean G. (2010). Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(7), 763–771.