



## The Degree of Organizational Effectiveness in the Palestinian Higher Education Institutions

Fathallah A. Ghanem

Associate Professor, Al-Quds Open University, Palestine

### **Abstract:**

*Effectiveness considered as an important indicator of the organization in measuring the extent to which organizations achieved their aims in line with its environment in which it operates in terms of utilization of the available resources, as developed organization can't be determined accurately without the degree of the effectiveness of the organization as well as its efficiency and its ability to achieve its goals. Considering higher education institutions of importance in the overall development process of the community as an essential pillar of the development of societies in directing and improving of raising the standards of the community of many aspects such as cultural, intellectual, social and economic, etc.. Therefore this study looked at the important aspect of its purposeful to assess the effectiveness of the Palestinian institutions of higher education through the study of the faculties of administrative and economic sciences in those institutions. After reviewing the related literature, studies and applied researches to this subject, the aim of this study has been drafted with two hypotheses, and a questionnaire was designed according to "Cameron 1978" scale in his study that was dedicated to evaluate the effectiveness of higher education institutions who and many other researchers in applied studies used it. The study data were collected through an electronic questionnaire on a sample study of the faculties of administrative and economic sciences in Palestinian universities through deans and heads of departments in the colleges surveyed, the number of valid questionnaires were 62 questionnaire, completed and analyzed electronically using Spearman coefficient and the coefficient of variation Kruskal-Wallis. The results showed that the applied dimensions of organizational effectiveness are linked with each other with positive relations at macro-scale, and the level of each dimension. These results also showed that the higher education institutions generally vary in the degree of effectiveness at macro-scale, and the level of each of the dimensions as eight of the fourteen colleges surveyed came with the overall average in the level of organizational effectiveness, while the other six colleges came below the overall average, therefore accepting the alternative hypothesis which proved the existence of variation as there was a positive relationship among the surveyed colleges.*

**Keywords:** *Organizational effectiveness, Higher education institutions, Faculty of administrative and economics science.*

### **1. Introduction**

Many existing organizations faces lots of internal and external pressures and challenges affecting the survival and growth and its ability to such organizations to continue as the global system now features a fast movement where the weaves of changes and transformations and the escalation of forces of change in many different aspects of the world. Changing conditions quickly pinpoint the requirements of governments and management organizations to make the necessary arrangements and further improvements to the various programs and operations, and even edit the culture of the whole of these organizations, so that they can meet these challenges, to strengthen their capacity to survive and grow. The need to survive and grow, and the ability to adapt to the global variables are the basic criteria for the success of these organizations, as indicators determined in accordance with the level of organizational effectiveness in the broad sense and what can be seen as a basic requirement for modern organizations, whether they produce a good or service offering. This may be considered to organizational effectiveness as the primary engine for energy development and modernization and continuous improvement of performance in various contemporary organizations. The organizations that provide various services to the community and other non-industrial organizations occupied a great importance at the present time, as systems add a lot to the welfare of societies. Therefore universes as an organization are considered in its aims to produce products (graduates) that supple all different kinds of organizations with human resources, thus other organization are dependent on the education system, and therefore see it as a productive organization, offering what might be called in the

language of production management, human supply of human resources available to society. And no doubt that the preservation of the largest level of organizational effectiveness on an ongoing basis should have a positive impact on the organization's performance.

## 2. Statement of the Problem

Effectiveness has brought many researchers, who focused their efforts to absorb and frame approaches and dimensions and implications of this vital subject. Taking into consideration effectiveness concept as a complex and multi-dimensional (Balci: 2001) (Karagoz & Oz: 2008). Therefore it seems difficult in the definition and measurement, and still uncertain due to the lack of fixed theory that support it (e.g., Cameron, 1978; Cameron: 1986 a ; Campbell, 1977; Connolly, Con- Ion, & Deutsch, 1980; C. Perrow, 1977; Price, 1972; Steers, 1977; Pennings & Goodman: 1977; Zigarelli: 1996; Yildiz: 2001; Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983 Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1991). This uncertainty stems from the mystery of the studies in this area, which is still dependent on things and relative rules because of the different nature of the organizations and the multiplicity of aspects and the different meanings contained in the concept of effectiveness as a construction complex (Carnall: 1982) (Van de Ven & Ferry: 1988) (Cameron & Freeman: 1991) (Cameron & Quinn: 2006).

However in spite of that we find on the other side that the issue of organizational effectiveness may represent one of the most concepts for organization theory (McCann: 2004) (Hill & Jones: 2006) (McAuley, et al: 2007), where a lot of literature on Organizations have sought to find ways and means to improve organizational effectiveness. However, this did not lead to the development of a comprehensive accepted theory or methodology to estimate and guess the effectiveness of the overall organization, but definitions went cross-cutting effectiveness to identify many different explanatory variables, resulting in the emergence of the approaches of many different models to measure the effectiveness (Cameron: 1982) (Clark, et al : 1984) (Jones: 2007), and this position was also reflected in the relatively few studies conducted on the organizational effectiveness of institutions in general and in higher education institution in particular (Cameron: 1980) (Cameron: 1986 a) (McGriff: 2001).

Despite the importance of organization institution in higher education in general, and in Palestine in particular there is no availability and relatively clear information that reflects the organizational effectiveness of Palestinian organization institutions in higher education and how to achieve their goals as indicators of performance trends and growth levels.

Based on the foregoing, the main focus of this study is drawn from the following main question:

- Is it possible to measure and evaluate the degree of organizational effectiveness of Palestine higher education institutions? And emerge from this question the following sub questions:
  - What is the concept of organizational effectiveness? Can this concept be framed? And the ongoing attempts in this regard?
  - What are the methodologies that led to the disparity in determining the contents and the dimensions of organizational effectiveness? Is it possible to discuss and seek to overcome them?
  - What are the causes of variation in the results of studies and applied researches in measuring the effectiveness? Is it possible to provide systematic and scientific explanations for that?
  - Is there a serious scientific attempts to propose criteria and indicators for studying and evaluating organizational effectiveness in light of the theoretical basis and the results of studies and applied researches that will serve to be as the basis for starting towards agreement on criteria and indicators that can be built upon the concept of effectiveness in the organization and methods of measurement?
  - Can organizational effectiveness in Palestine higher education institutions be evaluated in accordance with the approved measurement in this study?
  - What are the results of the respondent's views in evaluating their organizational effectiveness for the college surveyed?

These questions represent a general framework of the problem of this study that the researcher seeks to answer them in the contents of theoretical and applied of this study.

## 3. Research Objectives

This study aims to achieve the following:

- Review and discuss the concept of organizational effectiveness and its approaches and models as a complex and multi-dimensional concept.
- Assess the degree of organizational effectiveness in Palestine higher education institutions.
- Identify the relationship between the dimensions of organizational effectiveness for organization surveyed in accordance with the approved measurement level in this study.
- Extrapolation of the variation levels of organizational effectiveness of the colleges surveyed.
- Provide appropriate proposals and recommendations to improve the organizational effectiveness of the study sample, according to the results produced by the study.

## 4. The Importance of this Study

In our contemporary world, higher education institutions are facing political, economic and social challenges, regulatory and various technological mixed variables, operates in fast changing environment with many events in their requirements and resources, and then changing the trends and dimensions (Roome & Wijten: 2006), as well as the challenges of accelerating operations change resulting from the enormous development made in the techniques and styles, which has obvious impact on the progress and development of society, and therefore its effects on the continuous change in the size and type of labor demand in the

labor market which forces the universities and higher educational institutions the need to adopt a permanent methodology for evaluating their performance in terms of inputs, processes and outputs to be always aware of the goals and responsibilities, and the role of relying upon the direction of the community and stakeholders relevant to their work. Therefore serve as a solid tower for the development of science and knowledge, and a major tributary to serve the economic and social reconstruction and development.

Consequently, the importance of this study is reflected in the fact that a serious attempt to enter in the field of assessing the effectiveness of higher education institutions, and scientific contribution modest in two essential aspects:

The first is to seek and adapt knowledge and make use of the useful global experience to apply their results and use them in a study to assess the reality of Palestine higher education institutions in order to know where we are now from the path of the development of university education in the region and in the world.

The second is the effort of scientific modest and public invitation to researchers and interested people to contribute to the construction standards and the adoption of a clear dimensions of effective organizational institutions of higher education to be of such dimensions and standards of general agreement and high reliability based on the global experience of scientific and objective aspects, and therefore a clear procedural frameworks for assessing the effectiveness of these institutions, as an input for the advancement of university education is important anchor in the overall development and sustainable community development.

## 5. Review of Literature

### 5.1. First: The Concept and Definition of Organizational Effectiveness

A number of writers and researchers went to assert that the theorists and thinkers of organization theory did not agree so far for a suitable definition of effectiveness (Sullivan: 1996) (Karagoz & Balci: 2007). Across the accumulation of knowledge long term for management and organization theory did not find a consensus concept on what is effective organization (Cameron & Whetten: 1996) (McAuley, et al: 2007), thus those thinkers and researchers are still facing difficulties in reconciling the discrepancies between theory disparate and the results of applied research and studies attitudes (Karagoz & Oz: 2008), although effectiveness could serve as a character is generally desirable and important in organizations, but serious attempt has been made to clarify constructing effectiveness either theoretical or empirical still very few, and the only point could be accepted on a large scale is that the effectiveness is very important in organizations (Cameron: 1984) (Mensah, et al: 2005) (Jones: 2007).

Despite this variability and uncertainty inherent in the concept of effectiveness, still some thinkers and researchers sought to develop a proposed definitions of organizational effectiveness, some of them counted, "the degree of achievement of the organization's objectives" (Koontz & Weihrich: 1989) (Kreitner: 1989) (Daft: 1989) (Northcraft & Neale: 1990), and some of them counted, "the ability of the organization to move the centers of power to produce efficiently and adapt to environmental and internal problems" (Gun & Holdaway: 1986) (Schreisheim & Eisenbach: 1995), while others went to the promise of "portability organization to create results accepted in achieving the requests of interested organization groups" (Cullen & Calvert: 1995) (Pajunen: 2006) (Roome & Wijen: 2006), however others such as (Rashford & Coghlan: 1992) went to "the result of a dynamic in which affect the individual's efforts and behavior within the organization in the process of achieving organizational goals", although (Carnall: 1990) emphasize on "the immediate efficiency and adaptability of future events", while (Gordon, et al: 1990) emphasize on the degree of production operations of the outputs destination".

In general, (Row, et al: 1986) summarize the general pattern emanating from the organizational effectiveness definitions as follows:

- The effectiveness is a concept of a complex and multi-dimensional (Cameron: 1980) (Lysons & Ryder: 1988) (Lysons & Ryder: 1989) (Cameron & Whetten: 1996).
- Effectiveness deal with the systems of the organization perspective (Schneider: 1983) (Spreitzer: 1995).
- Effectiveness include changes and organizational adaptation (Weick & Daft: 1983) (Masuch: 1985) (Yorke: 1987) (Friedlander & McDougall: 1990)
- Effectiveness include the efficiency and performance (Webster: 1985) (Herman & Renz: 1988) (Rojas: 2000) (Jones: 2007).
- Effectiveness require strategic management (Smart & John: 1996) (Hill & Jones: 2006) (Haberberg & Rieple: 2008).

### 5.2. Second - Approaches to Organizational Effectiveness

Thinkers, researchers and theorists discussed many approaches for the measurement of organizational effectiveness, some of them counted three approaches (Bedeian & Zammuto: 1991) (Narayanan & Nath: 1993), and others counted four approaches (Griffin: 1993) (Rao & Rao: 1995) (Rao & Rao : 1997), while (Daft: 1989) (Zigarelli: 1996) (Vintwatanakhun: 1998) (Jones: 2007) pointed out the possibility of dividing these approaches of effectiveness into three traditional approaches, and two contemporary approaches, whereas some theorists (Chelladurai 1987, Shillbry & Moore, 2006) have assumed five approaches to measure organizational effectiveness as clarified comes to these approaches:

#### 5.2.1. Goal Approach

- This approach consider the effectiveness as the degree of achieving organization goals (Reddin: 1970) (Price: 1972) (Cameron: 1980) (Narayanan & Nath: 1993) (Griffin: 1993), and this approach is the most widely used, according to Weese (1997). This includes the formal operational targets, and serve as the most logical way in assessing the effectiveness of the organization, because organizations develop a strategy for achieving specific goals of output, profits, customer satisfaction or others, which is focused on measuring progress toward achieving those goals (Daft: 1989).

- Approach determinants, This approach may look at first glance right and reliable for measuring effectiveness, because compared to the actual performance and operational official targets is relatively easy, but there are a number of difficulties that are compatible with the most important approach (Birdsall: 1987):
  - Targets ideal situations.
  - Multiplicity of targets.
  - Uncertainty in the measurement of effectiveness standards
- Approach Indicators, The operational objectives are important objectives that could be noted in this approach, and efforts to measure the effectiveness is broader than the measurements of productivity targets in operations, operational goals reflect the organization activities that actually performed (Daft: 1989).
- Approach Benefits, This approach is used in business organizations because of the ease of measuring output goals, and organization usually evaluated in a format of profit or market share or return on investment or other indicators, which can be measured objectively (Jordan, et.al. 1999).

### 5.2.2. System Resource Approach

- This approach has been proposed as an alternative to the goal approach and drew the attention of intellectuals and researchers, and effectiveness here means: "up to what extent can an organization exploit its environment in absolute terms or relative to get scarce resources with a value" (Cameron: 1986 a) (Cameron: 1986 b), or "the degree of success that is achieved by the organization access to scarce resources with value from the environment" (Bedeian & Zammuto: 1991) (Griffin: 1993) (Narayanan & Nath: 1993) (Pounder: 1999). The logic core of this approach believes that there are clear interactive between the input system of the environment and the performance of the organization, therefore this approach is against the goal approach where inputs take place of the outputs as a basic observation, thus looking at organizations as a bargaining relationship with its environment on a variety of scarce resources for the purpose of processing it in the organization and turn it back into the environment as goods and services (Lysons: 1996).
- Approach determinants, Despite the advantage provided by this approach with its focus on the interaction between the organization and the environment, but it includes a number of parameters (Quinn & Cameron: 1983) (Lewin & Minton: 1986) such as:
  - ⇒ Operating difficulties and how to optimize better exploitation of resources.
  - ⇒ Identification of related resources related to any of rare or valuable resources that have an essential estimation of effectiveness.
  - ⇒ Excessive focus on access to resources and neglecting the use of those resources.
- Approach Indicators, The process of obtaining the resources to maintain the standard of organization system through estimating organizational effectiveness, this indicators generally include the following dimensions (Cunningham: 1978) (Cameron, et.al.: 1987):
  - ⇒ Bargaining position which is intended to exploit the organization to use the rare and valuable resources.
  - ⇒ Viability of the decision maker in the organization to understand and interpret the realism of priorities of the external environment.
  - ⇒ Maintain constant internal organizational work activities.
  - ⇒ Viability of the organization to respond to changes in the environment.
- Approach Benefits, this approach is useful when performance indicators are difficult to implement (Whetten: 1981), as in non-profit organizations, it is difficult to measure the goals of output or internal efficiency, it is difficult, for example, to measure the impact of the university in the community, so universities usually implement this application of this approach using indicators to evaluate the effectiveness that depends on the ability to get a rare valuable resources, represented by qualified professors, large financial grants, the quality of outstanding students, and other resources (Herman & Renz: 1988) (Rojas: 2000), therefore in this case, this approach is with a great benefit, especially when measurements are not available or difficult to implement, as it is characterized by fast results despite the fact that the ability to obtain the resources seem less important than the use of those resources (Mensah, et.al.: 2005).

### 5.2.3. Internal Process Approach.

- Effectiveness could be judged on pursuant to this approach as a "lack of internal stress" (Cameron: 1980), or as "organizational health and efficiency", which means a good flow in the internal process and satisfaction of the employees in the organization, or "organization and personnel integration, which leads to smooth and efficient operations" (Griffin: 1993). However this approach does not take account for the external environment, but rather focuses on the internal mechanism and effectiveness in the use of resources, which is reflected in the organizational aspects of health and efficiency, for example, job satisfaction, morale, attention of supervisors, and the quality of decision-making and others. (Cameron & Quinn: 2006).
- Approach determinants, The most important determinants of this approach is reflected in the following (Reed: 1991) (McGriff: 2001)) (Room & Wijen: 2006):
  - ⇒ Does not deal with the effects of the environment on the organization and does not measure the organization's relationship to their environment.
  - ⇒ Focus on efficiency, provides a limited view of the effectiveness of the organization in the long term.
  - ⇒ The main focus of this approach is on the internal operation of the organization without regard to resources or outputs.

- Approach Indicators, in this approach effectiveness indicators are divided into two groups, the first of them are (Cunningham: 1977):
  - ⇒ Supervisor cares and focuses on workers.
  - ⇒ Team spirit, and loyalty to the group.
  - ⇒ Trust, honesty, cooperation, and communication between management and staff.
  - ⇒ The close availability of resource information to decision-making centers, despite of the location of those sources in the organization.
  - ⇒ Clear vertical and horizontal communication.
  - ⇒ Bonuses to managers for their performance, growth, and development of subordinates, and the creation of effective working group.
  - ⇒ Interaction between the organization and its parts, and the solutions to conflicts between the projects are in the interest of the organization.
  - ⇒ The second set of internal practical effectiveness indicators are associated with the measurement of economic efficiency, namely: resource inputs, and the diversion of resources into outputs, and the final product delivered to consumers outside the organization.
- Approach Benefits, This approach consider important because the efficient use of resources and internal regularity employment represents one of the ways to measure effectiveness, especially when measuring the performance of departments or administrative units to focus on efficiency in performance (O'Neill: 1998).

#### 5.2.4. Strategic Constituencies Approach

- This approach has been also emerged as a substitute for the previous approaches, attracting the attention of authors and researchers, and also called (Stakeholders Approach), the supporters of this approach sought to contain the previous three approaches, therefore efforts towards achieving an integrated approach to the effectiveness accommodate the perspective of the organization needs to complete many works with different results, and to unite many indicators in a single framework (Kinicki, et.al.: 1985) (Cameron, et.al. : 1987) (Cameron & Quinn: 2006). Consequently, this approach drew attention to the organization related broader environment (as in System Resource Approach), and for the results of the organization's performance (as in the target approach), and for organization's internal mechanism (as in the Internal Process Approach), thus reflected the logic for this approach in a way that some individuals or groups become an interest or a link to organizations over time for various reasons, it is expected that these reasons are reflected in the preferences and expectations of the organization's performance (Bedeian & Zammuto: 1991) (Kassinis & Vafeas: 2006), as the effective organization is able to satisfy requests for beneficiaries user groups in the environment (Robbins: 1988) (Pajunen: 2006). As the strategic beneficiaries usually processors groups, lenders, employees, owners, and managers of the organization, customers, and government institutions, and others who influence and are affected by the organization (Cameron: 1982) (Bedeian & Zammuto: 1991) (Griffin: 1993) (Sullivan: 1996).
- Approach determinants, This approach represent a good image for effectiveness, although it has some shortcomings, as one of the manifestations of the approach focuses on the preferences of the organization must seek to satisfy them, therefore some researchers suggest the satisfaction of preferences and expectations of the owners of the greatest strengths of the strategic beneficiaries or stakeholder groups as long as they control the necessary resources to build the organization (Robbins: 1992) (Denison & Mishra: 1995). Other researchers suggested that organizations must focused on satisfying the needs and expectations of the users with the most hostile to organization (Keeley: 1978) (Keeley: 1984), while others assume that organizations are working towards maximizing their ability to survive in the long term, which means working actually toward long-interest term of the organization, (Cameron & Smart: 1998) some others went to emphasize that there is no perfect way to choose, but attention must be focused on all user groups or stakeholders (Connolly, et.al: 1980) (Goodman, et.al: 1983) (Lewin & Minton: 1986). This topic has been discussed hosting both (Narayanan & Nath: 1993) and noted the need to consider two important dimensions in this regard:
  - ⇒ The power of any group of beneficiaries.
  - ⇒ The importance of any group of beneficiaries.
- Approach Indicators, This approach sees that measuring the organization's performance index can be a group satisfaction or satisfying more strategic beneficiaries, despite the fact that each set of beneficiaries groups have different effectiveness of the standard because of the different concerns direction of the organization, and the different reciprocal relations between them and the organization, and these differences highlight the neglect often for the appearance of building effectiveness, as organizational effectiveness is concept based on value (Value-Based) (Cullen & Calvert: 1995) (Cullen & Calvert: 1996)).
- Approach Benefits, the strength of this approach is reflected in the broad view of the effectiveness, testing of various environmental factors, in addition to the internal factors of the organization (McCann: 2004), it also could be noted the importance of local beneficiaries and the social responsibility that has not been officially measured in the traditional three approaches (Cullen & Calvert: 1995), In addition, it contains standards and multiple indicators which are used at the same time, with regard to inputs, internal processes, and outputs, and confirms that there is no single standard for effectiveness (Kassinis & Vafeas: 2006). Therefore this approach has gained very popular based on the view that the effectiveness is complex concept with multi-dimension and can not be measured in a single scale, but the adoption of several criteria and indicators by the organization describes the results of the strategic interests of beneficiaries (Cullen & Cavert: 1996) (Jones: 2007).

5.2.5. Competing Value Approach

- This approach has been developed by both (Quinn & Rohrbaugh: 1983) in order to clarify the notion of effectiveness as "a social concept building as this was put by researchers and theorists in light of organization theory", as there was a request from a group of thinkers and researchers of the organization theory to study the thirty standards for effectiveness as presented by (Campbell: 1977) and the elimination of overlaps and duplication to assess the similarity of all possible pairs of elements set out, and the result made up a list of seventeen standards of effectiveness which undergone (136) pair compared, also underwent provisions similarities resulting multidimensional measure to determine the basic dimensions of the underlying effectiveness of the organization. This has been repeated as pairing and measurement using these existing list at a later time for a larger group and more different thinkers and researchers organization theory, and appeared dimensional inherent itself in the first attempt with secondary suggest differences "that the thinkers and researchers of organization Theory are involved in a common framework" (Lewin & Minton: 1986) (Yorke: 1987) (Cullen: 1997). And appeared to them that effectiveness is composed of "three axes or dimensions of value", and these axes orthogonal one over another and represent: the structure of the organizations characteristics (centralized / decentralized), and trends in interest (internal / external) concentration, and the relationship between (methods and goals) to achieve the desired results. They have carried out the identifying various structures for effectiveness, they called it the "Spatial Model" of the effectiveness of the organization, as it represents a framework of competitive models, consisting of goals, methods, administrative values, preferred structure, and the implicit assumption of this model is that, it represents a common (Shared Construct) or group Knowledge (Cognitions) shared between individuals restrictive standards provided by (Campbell). One of the advantages of this model the possibility of calculating the criteria for the effectiveness of the implicit or clear organization by drawing those standards on the basic framework of the model, while giving due attention to the site on the vertical structure and focus on horizontal structure (Jones: 2007)
- Approach Indicators, The first related dimension of the values of competition to organizational focus, whether on the internal or external aspects of the organization. Internal focus reflects the direction of the administration towards the satisfaction and efficiency of workers, and external focus reflects on the well-being of the same organization in relation to the environment (Quinn & Cameron: 1983). The second dimension relates to the organization structure, whether on the stability or flexibility, as stability reflects the administration values controlled from top to bottom, which is similar to mechanical model, while flexibility deals with adaptation and change values, which is similar to the structure of the organization (Robbins: 1992) (Jones: 2007).
- Approach Benefits, This approach gave two main contributions points, the first is the ability to unite the different concepts of effectiveness in one perspective, and the second has give attention to the efficiency standards as it is the management values. Therefore managers estimate which values they wish to adopt, and which of them are given less focus, the values of the four competition exist at the same time, but they do not have the same precedence (Sundstorm, et al: 1990).

Approaches	Concepts	When it's useful
Goal Approach	Organization is effective if achieved specific goals	When goals are specify by time Clear and can be measured
System Resource Approach	Obtain the required resources	Input and output clearly Interrelated
Internal Process Approach	Coordinate functions without effort	Performance coherence with clearly operations
Strategic Constituencies Approach	Satisfy all stakeholders	Stakeholders have the strength to the organization
Competing Value Approach	The balance of trade-offs	Facing contradictory pressures

Table 1: Approaches Summary

From: Cameron " Effectiveness as Paradox: Consensus and Conflict in Conception of Organization Effectiveness" Management Science, Vol, 32, No 5, May 1986. Printed in U.S.A

5.3. Third: Measurements Standards of Organizational Effectiveness of Higher Education Institutions

The theoretical study of (Antia) which was developed by the year (1976) is the early study that addressed the research on the subject of organizational effectiveness in higher education institutions, where he proposed a set of dimensions which were considered as an essential to assess the effectiveness of these institutions, and included: University physical services, workforce development at the university, arrangement and coordination between the educational curricula, expenses control, relations between students, relations between workers at the university, the overall responsibility of the university, participation, public reputation of the university with others (Karagoz & Oz: 2008). On the other hand (Cameron) in his applied study (1978) raised a set of dimensional key to the organizational effectiveness institutions of higher education, and tested in (6) American universities based on students' perception and faculties' perception in assessing the effectiveness of the university, these dimensions has been represented, as the following:

- Student educational satisfaction.
- Students' academic development
- Students' professional development
- Students' personal development
- Faculty job satisfaction
- Faculty professional satisfaction

- Openness of the system and its interaction with the environment
- The ability to attract resources
- Organizational health

In (Cameron) subsequent studies (1981) where he identified four main fields of effectiveness: academic, moral, adaptation to the external environment, and activities outside the educational program. Thus restoring the order of the nine dimensions proposed by the previous study on the four fields. Cameron concluded as a result of his study that there are three types of universities classified by effectiveness levels which differ among themselves clearly, first group of universities with a high level in the moral field (they are active in the fields of moral and academic, but it is not as effective as in the adaption of external) and the second group with a trend towards the external environment (it is effective in adapting to the external environment, but it is not as effective as in other fields), while Central Group universities correspond moderately with both the academic and with the moral fields, but with a low level in the external adjustment field, and concluded from these results:

- The effectiveness is a multi-dimensional structure, and cannot be considered a one-sided.
- When looking at organizational effectiveness as a multi-dimensional, the relationship between organizational variables be different, because such variables are correlated with environmental variables significantly, therefore effectiveness level will be affected with such relationship, as there is a difference between the level of effectiveness between universities with structural flexible as they have the good ability and record of success compared to those with static structural Universities.
- Effectiveness levels decline in the influence of the external adjustment with the other internal fields. Based on the results of the current study Cameron has acknowledged that the higher education institutions are possible to be effective in either internal or external fields, but cannot achieve effectiveness in both fields at the same time.

On the other hand (Lindsay) Measured the effectiveness of higher education institutions in his study (1981) with nine dimensions proposed namely: the goals and objectives of the university, physical resources and other supplies, responsibilities and performance of faculty, arranging and coordinating educational programs, university management and administrative leadership, financial operations, university climate, students' housing, the development of students education and graduates, research and public services, the relationship with government organization and environment (Karagoz & Oz: 2008).

Cameron (1982) Conducted a study based on the organizational effectiveness dimensions according to his model of measurement prepared (1978) which included 29 universities and colleges in the United States, where he sought to assess the effectiveness of universities and colleges surveyed from the point view owners interest or group beneficiaries.

(Rigdon: 1983) endorse (Cameron: 1978) scale in his study of the experimental model of benefit resulting from scientific research in universities, seeking to reveal the relationship between the organizational effectiveness of the surveyed universities and scientific research as a function of the university.

(Kleeman & Richardson: 1985), present a measurement of organizational effectiveness in higher education institutions whom they named as (effective fields standards), and pointed effectiveness in higher education institutions can be determined through the use of relevant standards as the following fields:

- Educational programs and services provided to students
- Taking into consideration the minorities and women
- Research and Quality Education
- Research and dissemination of knowledge
- Presentation of services for enrollment to the university and the availability of provided information
- Sporting activities
- Support cultural activities
- Opportunities presented to graduates
- Leased facilities
- Promote and raise the general level of University

The most relevant findings showed the understanding of students to the importance of development in the educational programs and public services, and the quality of education and research, and the quality of the presentations presented for graduates, as the most important criteria for assessing effectiveness respectively.

(Cameron) returned in (1986) to apply the effectiveness prepared by a common scale of his study (1978) on the private universities and colleges in the Northeast of the United States of America, aiming to identify the main factors that have an impact of a high level of organizational effectiveness, where the result set he reached (external environment, age of the university, and its type) has an impact in the variation level of effectiveness.

(Gigliotti: 1987) used a model and scale of (Cameron: 1978) for organization effectiveness in her study of academic departments at community colleges in the United States, through the focus on the link between faculty members and the heads of academic departments perceptions, and between organizational effectiveness and types of organizational culture in the academic departments.

(Yorke: 1987) compared the proposed standards groups set by (Antia: 1976) and (Cameron: 1978) and (Lindsay: 1981) in his study marked (determinants of educational success), and has concluded from that comparison the similarity of effectiveness and its dimensions, has tried to summarize the following dimensions:

- Objectives achievements
- Obtaining resources
- Staff development

- Educational programs
- The development of university students
- University climate
- Research and Information
- Educational institution operations (structure and procedures)
- Relationship with foreign or external powers
- Ability to influence the environment
- Increase the value of the institution

As a result of (Yorke) study, it was concluded that achieving organizational goals requires success in all effectiveness specific dimensions, because the relevant factors of educational institution work linked one to another, and any weakness or failure in one of them will affect the rest.

(Kealy & Rochel: 1987) in their study focused on the factors affecting the effectiveness of the university, especially the students, where the results of the study showed that the fundamentals factors are represented by higher level aspect of academic fields, as well as social aspects, and the status of the university and its reputation, and the quality of their facilities, the researchers concluded to emphasize the importance of the juridical aspects and academic respect resulting from the quality of academic faculty members, and the conditions for affiliation to the University, and the opportunities for graduates, and public respect for the graduates from the community.

In (Masuch: 1985), (Cameron, et al: 1987), (Sutton & Aunno: 1989) studies, they have been focusing on the problems facing higher education institutions, and in particular what criticism the media has criticize working universities, suffering from decline in resources, which requires to focus on good management of the university from their point of view, and so they believe that the effectiveness level will be affected depending on the quality of management, noting that the period in which they were preparing these studies (late eighties) that witness a clear decline in many countries in supporting the universities, which necessitated to research in the educational needs in the areas of quality and plans, and to draw attention to the importance of raising the level of effectiveness to meet these challenges (Cameron, et al.: 1987) and strengthening the role and responsibility of the administration in planning and supporting programs to the level of effectiveness (Cameron: 1986 a) taking into consideration the need to re-examine the effectiveness approaches and standards in relation to the problems and challenges facing higher education institutions, accompanied by repeated calls to provide clear educational services that correlate clearly to technological development, however some specialist concluded the slowdown in US economic that occurred in that period to lower education levels of universities in US.

In (1990) (Murray) conducted study of eleven American University, aiming to identify the areas of interaction between the model of leadership adopted in his study and a model for organizational effectiveness, using (Cameron: 1978) model and scale, where he found that the model leader of the applicable variables supports organizational effectiveness levels in education institutions surveyed, which led him to the conclusion that effective leadership supports the chances of achieving organizational effectiveness. (Daugherty: 1990) sought to discuss the dimensions of organizational effectiveness that (Cameron) used in his studies of the year (1978) (1982) (1986) by focusing on his study of the relationship and impact between what is spent on students at the university or college as services to administration, education, public services, and organizational effectiveness for those universities and colleges, and has concluded that efficiency and rationalization in financial management are related to the level of the estimated effectiveness of the university.

(Cameron) returned in (1992) with the participation of his colleague (Tschirhart) to study the impact of some environmental factors on the organizational effectiveness of universities and colleges in US which has a period of study in four years, using his model and his scale of the organizational effectiveness, they have indicated that the reason of this return are the results of some studies and researches which concluded the importance of attention to environmental factors as an important and influential variable in the effectiveness of higher education institutions, particularly those provided by the theoretical study of (Hrinco: 1992) which includes the proposed environmental model of organizational effectiveness.

(Lysons) went in his numerous studies about the effectiveness of higher educational institutions prepared by him only, or with the participation of other colleagues to use a scale and dimensions of effectiveness of (Cameron) in Australian universities and compare it with the British and American universities. First he applied these dimensions in (14) Australian University in his study which was prepared with (Ryder) (1988) and (1989), where the results supported the reliability and validity of the correct nine-dimensional scale in the Australian environment. Secondly, when applied in British universities in his study (1992), where the results were consistent with the results of his study in Australian universities, which enhanced the confidence scale and dimensions.

(Lysons) sought to add new dimensions to the effectiveness and develop a broader outlook to them in his numerous studies in (1990 a), (1990 b) and (1993), where he added organizational climate, and then culture as two dimension influencing the level of effectiveness of higher education institutions, he found that organizational climate dimension has clear effect in the relationship between the nine-dimensional adopted to measure the effectiveness and total level of effectiveness of the universities surveyed. This effect has emerged clearly when compared the findings in Australian universities with the results of (Cameron) studies in US universities. As culture factor affect the clear understanding of effectiveness level when compared to the results of his studies in Australia with the results of studies in American universities, while this culture factor has no statically significant level when comparing the results applied in Australia and Britain studies, and has been attributed to the closeness between the two cultures.

In the direction of the study of the challenges faced by higher education institutions, particularly the decline in resources, the researchers (Cameron & Smart: 1998) prepared a study with a relatively large sample of (334) public and private universities in the United States, the researchers reached a stunning result that the university which has suffered from lower resources were

among the highest level in the overall organizational effectiveness of those universities that have not been affected by the financial resources, and so the researchers summarized the results of their study, as the following:

- The financial shortage and a high level of effectiveness factors is opposite to each other.
- The facts that represent the factors upon which to estimate the level of effectiveness are strongly linked to those facts and realities that are under the control of the administration, which means that quality management has a fundamental effect on the level of effectiveness.
- The decline in resources is not an important reason for the emergence of cases of unwanted at the university, which lead to the low level of effectiveness, instead attention has to be directed towards lower effectiveness associated with the quality of the administration to deal with cases of unwanted indicators away from the cases of lack of resources faced by the university.
- The decline in resources has an impact on the level of effectiveness, it is a strong probability factor, but it may lead to support the high level of effectiveness, or about the low level of effectiveness, keeping quality of management, as median influential factor in that direction.

(Lysons) added two dimensions; financial resources and leadership in his study with colleagues (Hatherly) and (Mitchell) (1998), and figured out the important variations as a result of adding these two dimensions, especially when comparing their findings with the results of previous studies of Australian universities and the universities of British.

In (2007) (Karagoz & Balci) used the nine dimensions given by (Cameron) as a dimensions for organizational effectiveness in their study (effectiveness of health administration departments in Turkish universities) based on the views of students and faculty members in the scientific departments surveyed, they found that faculty members were aware of the level of effectiveness of their departments higher than students' awareness, and the level of effectiveness perceived to university of (Baskent) - a private university is the highest among the surveyed universities, as it was realized higher effectiveness of the overall nine-dimension is the organizational well fair, as the dimension of the ability of resources polarization is the least, and overall effectiveness to the departments surveyed appeared at the middle level.

## 6. Research Methodology

### 6.1. Research Hypotheses

For the purpose of developing proposed solutions to the problem of this study two hypotheses were formulated as the following:

- There is no positive relationship between the dimensions of organizational effectiveness for colleges surveyed at the macro scale, and to each dimension separately.
- There are no significant differences in the dimensions of organizational effectiveness among the colleges surveyed at the macro scale, and to each dimension separately.

### 6.2. Study Scale of Organizational Effectiveness

This study is based on (Cameron: 1978) scale measure to measure the degree of effectiveness of higher education institutions, that included the scale of nine basic dimensions which are compatible with the major components and areas of business and functions of higher education institutions, where the scale allows to obtain quantitative information on the extent and level group evaluation of organizational effectiveness universities and colleges practiced (Cameron: 1980).

This measurement scale has been used as its reliability and high level of authenticity for detecting the level of organizational effectiveness as confirmed by studies that endorse it in their procedures in the findings, and in order to achieve the desired goals and the highest possible benefits, some modification has been made to the scale by amending some wording of some clauses scale to fit with the reality of the Palestinian higher education and organizational structure of the colleges surveyed, as it is different from the American higher education environment, as the researcher introduced the scale measure to a group of experts and specialists to verify the authenticity of the content of the scale and their opinion came with the agreements on the validity of the measure to use, in addition to that the statistical test to measurement scale in one of the selected colleges of the respondent society to check the stability according to the correlation coefficient for (Spearman) was supportive of the test results to measure the stability of the entry of the scale, and thus is ready from a statistical standpoint of the application and use. The scale of the study consisted of (9) different dimensions that represent a whole comprehensive measure of the organizational effectiveness of the colleges surveyed, and the dimension are clarify as follows:

Effectiveness Dimensions	Number of elements
students education satisfaction (SES)	6
students academic development (SAD)	5
students career development (SCD)	5
students personal development (SPD)	4
faculty and administrators employment satisfaction (FAES)	6
professional development and quality of the faculty (PDQF)	5
system openness and community interaction (SOCI)	5
ability to acquire resources (AAR)	6
organizational health (OH)	15
Total	57

Table 2: shows the dimensions of effectiveness adopted in the scale of the study and the number of elements for each dimension

Source: Cameron, K.S. (1978) "Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.23, no.6, P: 614.

Based on the previous table, the scale of the study consists of (57) items distributed to the sections of business colleges to cover the nine dimensional approved for the purposes of this study, each item of the scale have been drafted in a way that describe the behavior of the college may practice, or they determine the status of management and faculty characteristics.

### 6.3. Methods of Data Collection and Processing

- Data collection, the questionnaire of this study was used to collect data from the study sample (deans and heads of departments) in the colleges surveyed, as well as some personal interviews. As the researcher distributed an e-questionnaire to the selected respondents.
- Data processing: for the purpose processing the data, a number of statistical methods has been utilized, namely:
  - Simple correlation coefficient (Spearman) to test the scale, and then measure the strength of the relationship between the effectiveness of the nine dimensions in the colleges surveyed (Kazmier: 1973).
  - T-test, to determine the level of trust between the nine dimension as compared with a significant level of ( $p \leq 0.05$ )
  - Coefficient of variation for (Kruskal-Wallis) to differentiate and identify differences in the level of organizational effectiveness between the colleges and the nine dimensions surveyed.
  - Chi-square to determine the level of trust of variation coefficients, as compared with a significant level of ( $p \leq 0.05$ ).

### 7. Fourth – Limitation of the Study

In order to address the problem of this study and test its hypotheses, 15 out of 20 universities of the Palestinian higher education institutions where selected as the population of this study, all of them has the administrative and economic science colleges, these are: Palestine Technical University, Birzeit University, Bethlehem University, Palestine Polytechnic University, An-Najah National University, Al-Quds Open University, Al-Quds University, Hebron University, The Arab American University, Al-Istiqlal University, Palestine Ahliya University, Gaza University, Al-Aqsa University, Al-Azhar University, Islamic University. However Al-Quds Open University was excluded from the study due to the preliminary testing of the questionnaire in that university. Therefore the study sample consist of 14 universities in all section of the selected colleges, which number (56) sections, in addition to 14 deans, therefore totaling the sample size of this study which consist of 70 Deans and section head of business colleges in Palestine universities. The total responses after distribution of the questionnaires consist of 62 questionnaire or 89% the actual questionnaires received, representing the actual size of the sample of the total respondents community, the distribution of questionnaires and data collection where distributed through e-questionnaire and this took about 2 weeks to gather the data.

### 8. Findings

Some of the results of previous studies tended to support the relationship between the dimensions of organizational effectiveness, but tended toward the relative agreement on the degree of differences in levels between higher education institutions in different countries of the world that was covered by researches in these studies, as the researcher viewed such studies, and came out with the following table:

Researcher Name	Year	Sample of the study
Cameron	1978	Public US universities
Cameron	1982	(600) Faculty Member and (694) Administrative Officer in the public and private universities US
Rigdon	1983	US and Canadian universities
Cameron	1986	Universities in the Northeast US
Taylor	1986	British Universities
Moran & Volkwein	1987	Universities in the United States and some South American countries
Gigliotti	1987	(37) academic department in the US community colleges
Lysons & Ryder	1988	Australian universities
Lysons & Ryder	1989	Australian universities
Escala	1989	Dominican Republic Universities
Murray	1990	American universities
Daugherty	1990	An assessment study for effectiveness dimension that included (Cameron) studies for the year (1978) (1982) (1986)
Lysons, 1990a, 1990b	1990a 1990b	Australian universities
Cameron & Tschirhart	1992	American universities with four years of study
Lysons	1992	British Universities

Lysons	1993	Australian universities
Salman	1993	Public Jordanian universities
Perry	1996	Guiana University
Lysons	1996	British Universities
Cheng & Wong	1996	Universities in East Asia
Lysons, Hatherly & Mitchell	1998	British Universities
Vinitwatanakhun	1998	Bangkok University in Thailand
Pounder	1999	University of Hong Kong
Cameron & Smart	1998	European and American universities
Myers	2000	American universities
Travis	2003	Nursing departments in American universities
Karagoz & Balci	2007	Health department of in Turkish universities

Table 3: summarizes the samples examined, in a number of applied studies of the effectiveness of higher education institutions

From the results of these studies reviewed in the previous table, the researcher came out with two important things:

- The general trend - despite some variation in the least number of studies – it is about the existence of a positive relationship between the different dimensions of organizational effectiveness proposed by the researchers in their studies, and in particular such studies that have adopted (Cameron: 1978) scale measurement which emerged a positive relationship clearly.
- Universities and colleges surveyed vary in the levels of organizational effectiveness according to selected dimensions to measure the effectiveness of which may be a realistic and acceptable, but this disparity has emerged more clearly in the results of those studies used a scale of (Cameron: 1978).

Accordingly, for the purpose of validating hypotheses of this study, and after counting and tabulation of data and statistically treated by computer using (SPSS) software, the following findings emerged:

First, the relationship between the dimensions of organizational effectiveness for colleges surveyed shown in the following table containing the test results of simple correlation coefficient (Spearman) to correlate the dimensions of effectiveness and relationship among them, as the following:

Dimension	(SES)	(SAD)	(SCD)	(SPD)	(FAES)	(PDQF)	(SOC1)	(AAR)	(OH)
(SES)	1								
(SAD)	0.3542*	1							
(SCD)	0.4270*	0.3211*	1						
(SPD)	0.4612*	0.3928*	0.4323*	1					
(FAES)	0.5910*	0.4571*	0.4401*	0.3842*	1				
(PDQF)	0.3212*	0.4131*	0.3999*	0.4323*	0.4672*	1			
(SOC1)	0.4222*	0.4640*	0.3211*	0.4231*	0.4670*	0.3938*	1		
(AAR)	0.3321*	0.4121*	0.5210*	0.4111*	0.4254*	0.4411*	0.4074*	1	
(OH)	0.1451	0.5011*	0.4421*	0.4322*	0.4643*	0.4231*	0.4661*	0.3843*	1

Table 4: shows the results of testing simple correlation coefficients between the effectiveness of dimension of the colleges surveyed (\*) statistically significant  $P < 0.5$ ,  $N = 62$

It could be noted from the previous table, that all dimension has a positive relationship to each other except for (SES) with (OH), therefore the test proved the positive relationship in 34 coefficients out of 36 coefficients.

When testing the simple correlation coefficient at the macro level of the scale, the test revealed the presence of a significant positive relationship between the nine combined dimensions, where the value of the test result came out with the coefficient equal to (0.3412), and a statistically significant coefficient. Therefore rejecting the first hypotheses that says "there is no significant positive relationship between the dimensions of organizational effectiveness of colleges surveyed at the macro-scale level as well as at the level of the dimensions of seven of the nine dimensions.

Second: the variation between the organizational effectiveness dimensions of the colleges surveyed.

For the purpose of testing the second hypothesis of the study, the analysis of variance (Kruskal-Wallis test) was utilized to detect the differences between the views point of the sample of this study on the organizational effectiveness of the college surveyed, and tested the coefficient variation level ( $p \leq 0.05$ ), where the results as shown in the following table:

Dimension	H	P
(SES)	8.32	0.243
(SAD)	11.83	0.012*
(SCD)	7.89	0.178
(SPD)	11.77	0.011*
(FAES)	14.31	0.009*
(PDQF)	12.88	0.033*
(SOCI)	11.21	0.038*
(AAR)	11.00	0.040*
(OH)	11.15	0.039*
Over all	11.16	0.048*

Table 5: shows the (Kruskal-Wallis test) results of coefficient variation between the effectiveness dimensions of the colleges surveyed

(\*) statistically significant  $P \leq 0.05$ ,  $N=62$

It could be noted from the previous table with regards to (Kruskal-Wallis test), that seven out of nine dimensions has a significant coefficient relationship as the value of (P), which represents the extracted coefficient level are (0.012, 0.011, 0.009, 0.033, 0.038, 0.040, 0.039) respectively, and when compared to the value of the coefficient of variation with extracted tabular value, showing high significant difference between the colleges surveyed in these dimensions, which is less than or equal to 0.05 thus rejecting the hypothesis. On the other hand two dimensions revealed coefficient greater than 0.05 thus accepting the hypothesis for two dimensions namely: (SES), and (SCD). However taking into consideration the overall nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness as the test registered the value of (H) equal to (11.16) and value (P) equal to (0.048), and when compared to the value of the coefficient of variation with extracted tabular value from the table values, showing high significant difference between the colleges surveyed in all nine dimensions, which is less than or equal to 0.05 thus rejecting the hypothesis, which means that the second hypothesis of the study, which states that "there are no statistically significant differences between the dimensions of organizational effectiveness at the level of macro-scale" is rejected.

In the discussion of the results obtained, we find that seven of the nine dimensions of the effectiveness are associated with each other with a positive relationship. This results are consistent with the results of several studies; (Cameron: 1978), (Cameron: 1981), (Cameron: 1982), (Lysons & Ryder: 1988), (Lysons & Ryder: 1989), (Karagoz & Balci: 2007), taking into consideration the importance of (SES) that came with no significant differences with (SCD), which can be interpreted as respondents recognize the weakness of organizational effectiveness of (SES), and this directions are also related to personnel administrators at colleges in addition to the management of the college, which may require a further survey from the point view of the relevant people to the educational aspect (students) in order to verify the accuracy of the results broader, which is consistent with the results of several studies; (Cameron: 1981) (Cameron: 1986 a, b) (Cameron & Tschirhart: 1992), In addition to that, the perceived weakness may also return to the way Palestinian universities accept fresh students based on their grade obtained from high school, which serve universities as a critical point to determine where students should go for their study without taking care into consideration the student's opinion and favorite desire in scientific specialization which tends to his studies and interests and abilities rate, which reflects the level of educational satisfaction and the degree of conviction in the specialty and college that is affiliated to his study. These results seem to be consistent with the results of a study by (Kealy & Rochel: 1987).

Consequently relations at the macro level of the scale and the level of each dimension, although it prove to be positive in its majority, still the findings revealed some relative variation between the effectiveness level perceived by the colleges surveyed, these results agreed with the arguments of majority of studies such as (Cameron: 1978) (Cameron: 1981) (Masuch: 1985) (Taylor: 1986) (Jones: 1987) (Lysons & Ryder: 1988) (Escala: 1989) (Lysons & Ryder: 1989) (Murray: 1990) (Daugherty: 1990) (Solomon, 1993) (Yildiz: 2001) (Balci: 2001) (Karagoz & Balci: 2007).

However if we take another look at the tables numbered (3) and (4) that consist of simple correlation coefficients and Kruskal-Wallis results Thus:

The highest relationship was registered between (FAES) and (PDQF), a result which represents the realistic view of the respondents, since career and professional satisfaction are linked with each other. Followed by the relationship between the dimensions (SOCI) and (OH), a logical result, as college's ability to provide services to the community in its potential organization and administrative, communication channels, communication and flexibility of structural, and strong response to requests from stakeholders and beneficiaries of the total services colleges provide. These results came in favor of (Cameron study) for the two years (1981) (1982). Followed by the relationship between the dimensions (FAES) with (OH), as professional development for faculty support depends on the college's ability to provide basic necessities for enhancing and developing the education process that include courses, curricula and library services and access to sources, and scientific exchanges and cooperation with other universities, as well as administrative and logistical services necessary in the promotion of professional growth opportunities for faculty, this finding was consistent with the results of (Kleeman & Richaedson: 1985) (Kealy & Rochel: 1987), were the values of higher than half of one percent only was registered in the previous relationships of the nine dimensions as in table (3).

On the other hand the lowest Relations With the exclusion of (SES) with (OH), which was a weak foundation and not significant and are consistent with the results of (Lysons) for the two years (1990 a) (1990 b), however the relationship between (SES) with (PDQF) represent the lowest relations, followed by the relationship between the (SAD) and (SCD), it could be depicted from the low relationship between these two dimensions of the study sample, as the recognition of the importance of the link between

education outputs and the contents that students receives during their study from the courses and lessons, as this depends largely on demand apparent in the labor market and thus the possibility of graduate to get a chance to work, this was supported by the following relationship between (SCD) and (SOCI) as respondents refers to realized the need to link between what students learn and what labor market needs and society from the scientific disciplines. These results are consistent with the view of each study of (Kleeman & Richardson: 1985) (Gun & Holdaway: 1986) (Kealy & Rochel: 1987).

The results of the test of the coefficient of variation support the discussion that took place in the preceding paragraphs, as there was no significant differences in the views of the study sample, meaning there is almost agreement between them on the dimensions that represent (SES) and (SAD) and (SCD) as these dimension where consistent with the lowest variation coefficients accordingly.

While the dimension of (FAES) represent the highest variation as views by the study sample, followed by (OH), however (SOCI) and (AAR), register the lowest coefficient variation within five dimensions in which differences emerged high.

For the purpose of increasing in-depth analysis and comparison of the level of effectiveness perceived by the heads and deans of the scientific departments of the colleges surveyed, the researcher utilized a distribution of a middle arithmetic mean of 62 and a standard deviation of 14 in the effectiveness level of the overall as perceived by the respondents. The faculty of administrative and economics Beirzait University, Al-Istiqlal University, Bethlehem University, Al-Islamic University, Palestine Technical university and Al-najah University, where ranked first, followed by Alazhar University, and al-quds university respectively. As the level of effectiveness in these universities were accepted, while Al-Aqsa University, Palestine Polytechnic University, Hebron University, The Arab American University, Palestine Ahliya University, and Gaza University marked nine to fourteenth respectively of the overall average.

The researcher conclusion to the causes of variation due to the realization of the study sample to the effectiveness factors of their colleges to a number of factors, the most important of them as the following:

1. The external environment and its factors, the age of the college, and the geographical location, which is consistent with the results of studies of (Cameron: 1986 a) (Ijeoma: 1990) (Cameron & Tschirhart: 1992) (Helfat & Peteraf: 2003) (Roome & Wijen: 2006).
2. Organizational culture and organizational climate prevailing in the college, which is consistent with the results of a study of (Gigliotti: 1987) for organizational climate, and studies of (Lysons) for the years (a 1990) (1990 b) (1993) for organizational culture, as well as studies of (Denison & Mishra: 1995) (Smart & John: 1996) (Smart, et al: 1997) (Cameron & Quinn: 2006) (Hays: 2008).
3. System and conditions of acceptance of the College, which is consistent with the results of a study by (Kealy & Rochel: 1987).
4. Quality management and administrative leadership of the college, which is consistent with the results of studies of (Masuch: 1985) (Cameron, et al: 1987) (Sutton & Aunno: 1989) (Chapman: 1993) (Cameron & Smart: 1998) (Karagoz & Balci: 2007).
5. The labor market and the opportunities for graduates to work, which is consistent with the results of studies of (Kleeman & Richardson: 1985) (Kealy & Rochel: 1987) (Cameron & Moore: 2005).
6. The quality of financial management and the total resources available to enhance the infrastructure and the development of its business, which is consistent with the results of studies of (Cameron & Smart: 1998) (Lysons, et al: 1998) (Helfat & Peteraf: 2003).

## 9. Conclusions

The researcher could conclude a set of conclusions through a review of the implications of this study and its results, as follows:

- Research and Studies sought to evaluate and measure the organizational effectiveness of higher education institutions (schools, institutes, colleges and universities) the review of these studies and researches has produced a thorough to determine the directions in this area, the first of them that higher education institutions can achieve effectiveness in overall organization when the effectiveness at the level of each dimension is included, relative studies have varied in determining these dimensions, and second, that the higher education institutions vary in their levels of organizational effectiveness as it depend on a variety of factors, internal and external conditions, researchers have sought to study the effects and identified them.
- the extensive review of the literature and researches of organizational effectiveness of (Cameron) with regard to his scale of effectiveness he used in his applied study last 1978 and in his subsequent studies, has proved to be one of the best organizational effectiveness standards scale allocated to institutions of higher education (schools, institutes, colleges and universities), and what supports this finding the widespread studies many used in applied relevant research.
- The results of this study demonstrated that the applied dimensions of organizational effectiveness are linked with each other with positive relations at macro-scale, and the level of each dimension. These results also showed that the higher education institutions generally vary in degree of effectiveness at macro-scale, and the level of each of the dimensions.
- Eight of the fourteen colleges surveyed came with the overall average in the level of organizational effectiveness, while the other six came below the overall average.
- Based on that, the null hypothesis of this study were rejected, therefore accepting the alternative hypothesis which proved the existence of variation as there was a positive relationship.

## 10. Recommendation

Based on what has been reviewed in the theoretical literature presented in this study, and applied findings, the researcher came out with a set of recommendations that could be installed as follows:

First, on the practical level:

- The Reliability use of (Cameron: 1978) scale adopted in this study as to its comprehensiveness and its familiarity with the overall functions and activities of the higher education institutions (educational, academic, professional and organizational) within the perspective approach of the systemic assimilated to external surrounding environment, which is clearly evident in the results of this study.
- The ability to use this scale as it proved its success and its ability to provide an accurate assessment of a reliable measuring of effectiveness, and therefore could be used in Palestine universities.
- There is a need for further studies and subsequent researches in this field as to introduce new dimensions such as culture and organizational climate and organizational quality management and administrative leadership, etc. as previous studies were reviewed proved some impact on the overall level of effectiveness and its dimensions.
- Expanding the sample researched whether at the level of the number of colleges or on the level of coverage of university administrations or at the level of diversification of the sample to include students and administrative staff.

Second, on the research level:

- The concept of effectiveness is still a major focus in the overall theoretical research and applied studies, which requires a recommendation need to attract the researchers and theorists of organization theory about depth by more efforts, and discuss its dimensions, and strive to consolidate and build a complete theory to it, where it still agreed that achieving effectiveness has become more complex and that the organization models generally has become more and more complex with continuous additions of relevant variables, and the increasing complexity of organizations themselves with the passage of time, as some intellectuals led on to say that the current models are relatively limited for providing clear approaches to assess the organizational effectiveness (Haberberg & Rieple : 2008).
- The best way to develop a more complex view of organizational effectiveness is to address explicitly of the seven critical questions proposed by Cameron (1980) as the foundation for all effectiveness studies. These questions are:
  - What time frame is employed in the assessment?
  - What level of analysis is used in the assessment?
  - From whose perspective is effectiveness judged in the assessment?
  - On what domain of activity is the judgment focused?
  - What is the purpose of the evaluation?
  - What type of data are being used in the assessment?
  - What is the referent against which effectiveness is judged?
- There is a need to move towards the use of sensitivity analysis in the study of the organizational effectiveness and evaluation of their levels, as it has been emphasized from frequent researchers that the use of this analysis was one of the main reasons for the development of theoretical frameworks and the evolution of the approaches adopted in these studies (Karagoz & Oz: 2008).
- The importance of focusing on the development of (Cameron) scale that was prepared last (1978) and its dimensions without the other scales, where test results indicated by many researchers that (Cameron) scale register the reliability ranged from (0.80 - 0.90), which is significantly higher than the rest of other scales (Karagoz & Balci: 2007).
- Some studies have pointed to the possibility of adapting the approaches to measure the effectiveness of higher education institutions to serve as an approaches to measure the effectiveness of other organizations in other sectors, especially the general government sector organizations ((Mensah, et al: 2005 (Karagoz & Oz: 2008).
- A recent limited studies presented some ideas and general frameworks for a new direction for dealing with the concept of organizational effectiveness dubbed as (effectiveness rationality), and the first to deal with the researcher (Reed) in his study in (1991), and then (Beinhocker) and his colleagues in their study last (2007), where they associate this trend with the strategic intent of the organization, dynamism and increase revenue and benefit (Hays: 2008).

## 11. References

- i. Balci, A. (2001) "Effective School & Improving School: Theory, Application & Research" (Revision Second Edition), Pegem Publishing, Ankara.
- ii. Bedeian, A.G. & Zammuto, R.F. (1991) "Organizations: Theory & Design", Dryden Press, Chicago.
- iii. Birdsall, W.C. (1987) "When Benefits are Difficult to Measure", Evaluation & Program Planning, 10, PP: 109-118.
- iv. C. Perrow, Three types of effectiveness studies', in new perspectives on organizational effectiveness, eds. Paul S. Goodman and Johannes M. Pennings, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, p. 146-184, 1977.
- v. Cameron, K.S. & Freeman, S. (1991) "Cultural Congruence, Strength & Type: Relationship to Effectiveness", Research in Organizational Change & Development, 5, 1, PP: 23-58.
- vi. Cameron, K.S. & Quinn, R. (2006) "Diagnosing & Changing Organizational Culture", Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- vii. Cameron, K.S. & Smart, J. (1998) "Maintaining Effectiveness Amid Downsizing & Decline in Institutions of Higher Education", Research in Higher Education, 39, 1, PP: 65-86.
- viii. Cameron, K.S. & Tschirhart, M. (1992) "Postindustrial Environment & Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges & Universities", Journal of Higher Education, 23, 1, PP: 87-108.

- ix. Cameron, K.S. & Whetten, D.A. (1996) "Organizational Effectiveness & Quality: The Second Generation", (in) Smatt, J. (ed.), "Higher Education: Handbook of Theory & Research", Vol. XI, Agathon, N.Y., PP: 265-306.
- x. Cameron, K.S. (1978) "Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 6, PP: 604-633.
- xi. Cameron, K.S. (1980) "Critical Questions in Assessing Organizational Effectiveness", *Organizational Dynamics*, 9, 2, PP: 66-80.
- xii. Cameron, K.S. (1981) "Domains of Organizational Effectiveness in Colleges & Universities", *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 1, PP: 25-47.
- xiii. Cameron, K.S. (1982) "Assessing Institutional Ineffectiveness: A Strategy for Improving" (in) Scott, R. (Ed), "Determining Effectiveness of Campus Services", Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, PP: 67-84.
- xiv. Cameron, K.S. (a) (1986) "A Study of Organizational Effectiveness & Its Predictors", *Management Science*, 32, 1, PP: 87-112.
- xv. Cameron, K.S. (b) (1986) "Effectiveness as Paradox: Consensus & Conflict in Conceptions of Organizational Effectiveness", *Management Science*, 32, 5, PP: 539-553.
- xvi. Cameron, K.S., Kim, M.U. & Whetten, D.A. (1987) "Organizational Effects of Decline & Turbulence", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 2, PP: 222-240.
- xvii. Cameron, K.S. (1984) "The Effectiveness of Ineffectiveness", (in) Staw, B.M. & Cummings, L.L. (eds.) "Research in Organizational Behavior", CB. JAI Press, Greenwich, PP: 235-286.
- xviii. Campbell, J.P. (1977) "On the Nature of Organizational Effectiveness", (in) Goodman, P.S. & Pennings, J.M. (eds.) "New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness", Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, PP: 13-55.
- xix. Carnall, C.A. (1982), "Semi-autonomous work groups and the social structure of the organization", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 19, pp. 277-94
- xx. Carnall, C.A., 1990. *Managing Change in Organisation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- xxi. Chapman, J. (1993) "Leadership, Management & the Effectiveness of Schooling: A Response to Mr. Grad grind", *Journal of Education Administration*, 31, 4, PP: 4-18.
- xxii. Chelladurai, P. & Haggerty, T.R. (1991). Measures of organizational effectiveness in Canadian national sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Science*, 16, 126-133
- xxiii. Clark, D.L., Lotto, L.S. & Astuto, T.A. (1984) "Effective School & School Improvement: A Comparative Analysis of Two Lines of Inquiry", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20, 3, PP: 41-68.
- xxiv. Connolly, T., Collon, E.J. & Deutsch, S.J. (1980) "Organizational Effectiveness: A Multiple Constituency Approach", *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 2, PP: 211-217.
- xxv. Cullen, R.J. & Calvert, P. (1995) "Stakeholder Perceptions of University Library Effectiveness", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 12, Nov., PP: 438-448.
- xxvi. Cullen, R.J. & Calvert, P. (1996) "New Zealand University Libraries Effectiveness Project: Dimensions & Concepts of Organizational Effectiveness", *Library & Information Science Research*, 18, 1, PP: 99-119.
- xxvii. Cullen, R.J. (1997) "Does Performance Measurement Improve Organizational Effectiveness? A Post-Modern Analysis in Department of Information & Library Management, University of Northumbria at Newcastle", *Proceedings of the 2nd Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measurement in Libraries & Information Services, Upon Tyne: Information North, Newcastle*, PP: 7-11.
- xxviii. Cunningham, J.B. (1977) "Approaches to the Evaluating of Organizational Effectiveness", *Academy of Management Review*, 2, PP: 463-474.
- xxix. Cunningham, J.B. (1978) "A System-Resource Approach for Evaluating Organizational Effectiveness", *Human Relations*, 31, 3, PP: 631-656.
- xxx. Daft, R.L. (1989) "Organization Theory & Design", 3rd. ed., West Publishing Co., St. Paul, Min.
- xxxi. Daugherty, P.T. (1990) "An Exploratory Study of the Relationships Between Expenditures & Institutional Effectiveness for Colleges & Universities", *University of Kentucky, Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 4, PP: 1128-1129.
- xxxii. Denison, D.R. & Mishra, A.K. (1995) "Toward a Theory of Organizational Culture & Effectiveness", *Organization Science*, 6, 2, PP: 204-223.
- xxxiii. Escala, M.J. (1989) "Application of a Socially Relevant Model for the Assessment of Organizational Effectiveness in Dominican Republic Institutions of Higher Education", *The Pennsylvania State University, 1988, Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 7, PP: 1710-A.
- xxxiv. Friedlander, J. & McDougall, P.R. (1990) "Responding to Mandates for Institutional Effectiveness", *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 72, 4, PP: 93-100.
- xxxv. Gigliotti, L.I. (1987) "An Adaption of Cameron's Model of Organizational Effectiveness at the Academic Department level in Two-year Community Colleges", A Summary of an ED, *Dissertation Syracuse University, ERIC Document Reproduction Services no. 284614*.
- xxxvi. Goodman, P.S., Atkin, R.S., & Schoorman, F.D. (1983) "On the Demise of Organizational Effectiveness Studies" (in) K.S. Cameron & D.A. Whetten (Eds.) "Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models", *Academic Press, N.Y.*, PP: 163-183.
- xxxvii. Gordon, J.R., Mondy, R.W., Sharplin, A., & Permeaux, S.R. (1990) "Management & Organizational Behavior", *Allyn & Bacon, Mass.*
- xxxviii. Griffin, R.W. (1993) "Management", 4th. ed., Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.

- xxxix. Gun, J.A. & Holdaway, E.A. (1986) "Perceptions of Effectiveness, Influence & Satisfaction of Senior High Schools' Principals", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22, 2, PP: 43-62.
- xl. Haberberg, A. & Rieple, A. (2008) "Strategic Management: Theory & Application", Oxford University Press, Inc., N. Y.
- xli. Hays, S.M. (2008) "Restructuring for a Brighter Future: Organizational Design & Culture Change in 21st Century Higher Education", *Leadership Advance Online*, Published by the School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship, Issus XII, spring.
- xlii. Helfat, C. & Peteraf, M. (2003) "The Dynamic Resource-Based View: Capability life Cycles", *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 10, PP: 997-1010.
- xliii. Herman, R.D. & Renz, D.O. (1988) "Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness: Contrasts between Especially Effective & less Effective Organizations", *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 9, 1, PP: 23-38.
- xliv. Hill, C.W.L. & Jones, G.R. (2006) "Strategic Management: An Integrated Approach", Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- xlv. Hrincu, M.E. (1992) "The Concept of Organizational Effectiveness", University of Toronto (1990), *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, P: 3783-A.
- xlvi. Ijeoma, M.E. (1990) "Relationships Between Educational Environment & Institutional Goals in Institutions of Higher Education", University of Minnesota (1989), *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 2, P: 426-A.
- xlvii. Jones, G.R. (2007) "Organizational Theory, Design & Change", 5th. ed., Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddler River, N. J.
- xlviii. Jordan, G.B., Striet, L.P. & Binkley, J.S. (1999) "A Framework for Assessing the Effectiveness of Research Organizations", Albuquerque, Sandia National Laboratories, NM.
- xlix. Karagoz, S. & Balic, A. (2007) "Effectiveness of Health Management Departments of Universities That Train Health Managers in Turkey", *International Journal of Health Planning & Management*, 22, 4, PP: 263-288.
1. Karagoz, S. & Oz, E. (2008) "Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education: Measures, Measurement & Evaluation", *EABR & TLC Conferences Proceedings*, Rothenberg, Germany, PP: 41-61.
  - ii. Kassinis, G. & Vafeas, N. (2006) "Stakeholder pressures & Environmental Performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 1, PP: 145-159.
  - iii. Kazmier, L.J. (1973) "Statistical Analysis for Business & Economics", 2nd. ed., McGraw-Hill Co., N. Y.
- liiii. Kealy, M.J. & Rochel, M.L. (1987) "Student Perceptions of College Quality", *Journal of Higher Education*, 58, 6, PP: 683-703.
- liv. Keeley, M. (1978) "A Social Justice Approach to Organizational Evaluation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 2, PP: 272-292.
- lv. Keeley, M. (1984) "Impartiality & Participant-Interest Theories of Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 1, PP: 1-13.
- lvi. Kinicki, A., Bannister, B., Hom, P. & DeNisi, A. (1985) "Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales vs. Summated Rating Scales: Psychometric Properties & Susceptibility to Rating Bias", *Educational Psychological Measurement*, 45, 5, PP: 35-49.
- lvii. Kleeman, G.L. & Richardson, R.C. (1985) "Student Perceptions of University Effectiveness", The Paper Presented at 69 Annual Meeting of the Union of American Educational Researches, Chicago.
- lviii. Koontz, H. & Weihrich, H. (1989) "Management", 9th. ed., McGraw-Hill, Singapore.
- lix. Kreitner, R. (1989) "Management", 4th. ed., Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.
- lx. Lewin, A.Y. & Minton, J.W. (1986) "Determining Organizational Effectiveness: Another Look & An Agenda for Research", *Management Science*, 32, 5, PP: 514-538.
- lxi. Lysons, A.F. & Ryder, P.A. (1988) "An Empirical Test of Cameron's Dimensions of Effectiveness: Implications for Australia Tertiary Institutions", *International Journal of Higher Education & Educational Planning*, 17, 3, PP: 323-332.
- lxii. Lysons, A.F. & Ryder, P.A. (1989) "An Application of Jones & James' Perceived Climate Questionnaire in Australia Higher Educational Institutions", *International Journal of Higher Education & Educational Planning*, 18, 6, PP: 697-705.
- lxiii. Lysons, A.F. (1990 a) "Taxonomies of Higher Educational Institutions Predicted from Organization Climate", *Journal of the Association for Institutional Research*, 3, 2, PP: 115-128.
- lxiv. Lysons, A.F. (1990 b) "Dimensions & Domains of Organizational Effectiveness in Australian Higher Education", *International Journal of Higher Education & Educational Planning*, 20, 3, 287-300.
- lxv. Lysons, A.F. (1992) "Cameron's Dimensions of Effectiveness in the U.K.: A Cross-Cultural Comparison", *The International Journal of Higher Education & Educational Planning*, 23, 3, PP: 221-230.
- lxvi. Lysons, A.F. (1993) "The Typology of Organizational Effectiveness in Australian Higher Education", *Journal of the Association for Institutional Research*, 34, 4, PP: 465-488.
- lxvii. Lysons, A.F. (1996) "Predicting Taxonomy of Effectiveness in U.K. Higher Educational Institutions", *International Journal of Higher Education & Educational Planning*, 32, 5, PP: 23-39.
- lxviii. Lysons, A.F., Hatherly, D. & Mitchell, D.A. (1998) "Comparison of Measures Organizational Effectiveness in U.K.", *Higher Education*, 36, 1, PP: 1-19.
- lix. Masuch, M. (1985) "Vicious Circles in Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 1, PP: 14-33.
- lxx. McAuley, J., Duberley, J. & Johnson, P. (2007) "Organization Theory: Challenges & Perspectives", Pearson Education Limited, England.
- lxxi. McCann, J. (2004) "The Changing Definition of Organizational Effectiveness", *Human Resource Planning*, 27, 1, PP: 12-27.

- lxxii. McGriff, S.J. (2001) "Applications of Macro-Organizational Psychology in the Study of Higher Education Institutions", PhD. Thesis, Submitted to the Pennsylvania University, College of Education.
- lxxiii. Mensah, Y.M., Lam, K.C. & Werner, R.W. (2005) "An Approach to Evaluating Relative Effectiveness in Non-Profit Institutions", *International Journal of Higher Education & Educational Planning*, 41, 2, PP: 247-262.
- lxxiv. Murray, M.F. (1990) "A Study of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Effectiveness & Demographics in Selected Small College Settings", Kent State University (1988), *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 7, PP: 1879-1880.
- lxxv. Narayanan, V.K. & Nath, R. (1993) "Organization Theory: A Strategic Approach", Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Burr Ridge, Illinois.
- lxxvi. Northcraft, G.B. & Neale, M.A. (1990) "organizational Behavior: A Management Challenge", The Dryden Press, Inc., Chicago.
- lxxvii. O'Neill, M. (1998) "Ergonomic Design for Organizational Effectiveness", Boca Raton, CRC Press, Florida.
- lxxviii. Pajunen, K. (2006) "Stakeholder Influences in Organizational Survival", *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 6, PP: 1261-1288.
- lxxix. Pennings, J.M. & Goodman, P.S. (1977) "Toward A Workable Framework", (in) Goodman, P.S. & Pennings, J.M. (eds.) "New Perspective on Organizational Effectiveness", Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, PP: 146-184.
- lxxx. Pounder, J.S. (1999) "Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education: Managerial Implications of a Hong Kong Study", *Educational Management & Administration*, 27, 4, PP: 389-400.
- lxxxi. Price, J.L. (1972) "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness", *Sociological Quarterly*, 13, 1, PP: 3-15.
- lxxxii. Quinn, R.E. & Cameron, K. (1983) "Organizational Life Cycles & Shifting Criteria of Effectiveness: Some Preliminary Evidence", *Management Science Quarterly*, 29, 1, PP: 33-51.
- lxxxiii. Quinn, R.E. & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983) "A Spatial Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Toward Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis", *Management Science Quarterly*, 29, 2, PP: 363-377.
- lxxxiv. Rao, M.G. & Rao, V.S.P. (1995) "Strategic Planning & Decision Making", Kanishka Publishing Co., Delhi.
- lxxxv. Rao, M.G. & Rao, V.S.P. (1997) "Organizational Behavior: Text & Cases", Konark Publishing Co., Delhi.
- lxxxvi. Rashford, N. Coghlan, D. (1992) "Effective Administration through Organizational Levels", *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30, 4, PP: 63-72.
- lxxxvii. Reddin, W.J. (1970) "Managerial Effectiveness", McGraw-Hill, N. Y.
- lxxxviii. Reed, R. (1991) "Bimodality in Diversification: An Efficiency & Effectiveness Rationale", *Managerial & Decision Economics*, 12, 1, PP: 57-66.
- lxxxix. Rigdon, J.R. (1983) "Institutional Research & Organizational Effectiveness", Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (1983), *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44, 05, P: 1354-A.
- xc. Robbins, S.P. (1988) "Management: Concepts & Applications", 2nd. ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- xc. Robbins, S.P. (1992) "Organization Theory", Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- xcii. Rojas, R.R. (2000) "A Review of Models for Measuring Organizational Effectiveness Among For-Profit & Nonprofit Organizations", *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 11, 1, PP: 97-104.
- xciii. Roome, N. & Wijen, F. (2006) "Stakeholder Power & Organizational Learning in Corporate Environmental Management", *Organization Studies*, 27, 2, PP: 235-263.
- xciv. Row, A.J., Mason, R.O. & Dickel, K.E. (1986) "Strategic Management & Business Policy: A Methodological Approach", 2nd. ed., Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Canada.
- xcv. Schneider, B. (1983) "An Interaction Perspective on Organizational Effectiveness", (in) Cameron, K.S. & Whetten, D.A. (eds.) "Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models", Academic Press, N. Y.
- xcvi. Schreisheim, C.A. & Eisenbach, R.J. (1995) "An Exploratory & Confirmatory Factor-Analysis Research of Item Wording Effects on the Obtained Factor Structures of Survey Questionnaire Measures", *Journal of Management*, 21, 6, PP: 1177-1193.
- xcvii. Smart, J.C. & John, E.P. (1996) "Organizational Culture & Effectiveness in Higher Education: A Test of the Culture Type & Strong Culture Hypotheses", *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 16, 3, PP: 445-462.
- xcviii. Spreitzer, G.M. (1995) "Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement & Validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 5, PP: 1442-1465.
- xcix. Steers, Richard M (1977). *Organizational effectiveness : a behavioral view*. Goodyear Pub. Co, Santa Monica, Calif, <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/10958209>
- c. Sullivan, D. (1996) "Measurement the Internationalization of a Firm: A Reply", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27, 1, PP: 179-192.
- ci. Sundstrom, E., DeMeuse, K.P. & Futrell, D. (1990) "Work Team: Applications & Effectiveness", *American Psychologist*, 45, 2, PP: 120-133.
- cii. Sutton, R.I. & Annono, T.D. (1989) "Decreasing Organizational Size: Untangling the Effects of People & Money", *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 1, PP: 194-212.
- ciii. Taylor, J. (1986) "Comparing Universities: Some observation on the First Distention of New Graduates", *Higher Education Review*, 19, 1, PP: 35-43.
- civ. Van de Ven, A. H. & Ferry, L. (1988) "Measuring & Assessing Organizations", John Wiley & Sons, N. Y.
- cv. Vinitwatanakhun, W. (1998) "Factors Affecting Organizational Effectiveness of Nursing Institutes in Thailand", PhD. Thesis, Submitted to the National Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok, Thailand.
- cvi. Webster, D. (1985) "Effectiveness Using Peer Evaluation as Criteria", *Review of Higher Education*, 9, 1, PP: 67-82.

- cvii. Weick, K. & Daft, R. (1983) "The Effectiveness of Interpretation System", (in) Cameron, K.S. & Whetten, D. (eds.) "Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models", Academic Press, N.Y., PP: 71-93.
- cviii. Whetten, D.A. (1981) "Organizational Responses to Scarcity: Exploring the Obstacles to Innovative Approaches to Retrenchment in Education", *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 17, 1, PP: 80-97.
- cix. Yildiz, S. (2001) "Assessment of Air Academy by Effective School Properties", Master Thesis, Submitted to the Institute of Social Sciences, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul.
- cx. Yorke, D.M. (1987) "Instructional Achievement Some Theoretical & Empirical Consideration", *Higher Education*, 16, 1, PP: 3-20.
- cxii. Yuchtman, R.F. & Seashore, S. (1967). A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 891-903.
- cxiii. Zigarelli, M.A. (1996) "An Empirical Test of Conclusions from Effective Schools", *Journal of Educational Research*, 90, 2, PP: 103-111.
- cxiiii. Cameron, K. S., Mora, C., Leutscher, T., & Calarco, M. (2011). Effects of Positive Practices on Organizational Effectiveness. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 20, 1-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021886310395514>
- cxv. Chelladurai, P. (1987). Multidimensionality and multiple perspectives of organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Sport Management*, 1, 37-47
- cxvi. Shilbury, D. & Moore, K.A. (2006). A study of organizational effectiveness for National Olympic Sporting Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(1), 5-38
- cxvii. Weese, W.J. (1997). The development of an instrument to measure effectiveness in campus recreation programs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11, 263-274
- cxviii. Antia, J. M. (1976). Critical Success Factors in Polytechnic Performance. *Educational Administration*, Vol. 5, pp. 14- 32
- cxix. Lindsay, A. (1981). Assessing Institutional Performance in Higher Education: A Managerial Perspective. *Higher Education* Vol. 10, pp. 687-706.
- cx. BEINHOCKER, E. D. *The origin of wealth: evolution, complexity and the radical remaking of economics*. Boston: HBSPB, 2007.
- cxii. Moran, E.T. & Volkwein, J.F. (1987) "Organizational Climate of Institution of Higher Education: Construct Determination & Relationship to Organizational Effectiveness Criteria", Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego (1987), ERIC Document Reproduction Services no. ED.281481.