

**ORGANISATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION  
ON THE BASIS OF STUDENT BACKGROUND**

Dr. Shefali Pandya  
Professor  
Department of Education  
University of Mumbai

Dr. R. K. Srivastava  
Professor  
SIMSREE  
Mumbai

**Organisational Effectiveness in Higher Education on the Basis  
of Student Background****Introduction**

Organisational effectiveness is essentially about the ability of an organisation to meet its pre-determined goals and objectives given the available resources. It refers to the degree of congruence between an organisation's pre-determined goals and its observable outcomes. In the case of institutions of higher education, some of the observable outcomes include students' (a) academic performance (AP) and (b) their perceived gains from post-graduate education (PGFPGED). The present paper focuses on these two outcomes as these are concerned with the most important stakeholders of institutions of higher education, namely, students.

**Rationale of the Study**

The student-outcomes of an educational organisation, namely, academic performance of students and their perceived gains from post-graduate education are likely to differ on the basis of their background measured in terms of being a first generation college/tertiary education entrant or second/third/fourth generation college/tertiary education entrant as these are expected to bestow advantages or otherwise to students. Besides, these outcomes are also likely to be influenced by the socio-economic status (SES) of students in that students from different SES backgrounds expose students to diverse facilities and benefits or the lack of it. If the effect of SES of students is statistically removed from student-outcomes, it may reflect on the indicators of organisational effectiveness differently. Thus, the comparison of PGFPGED as an indicator of organisational effectiveness is done twice, one with raw scores of PGFPGED and once with residual scores of PGFPGED from which the effect of SES is removed statistically from raw scores of PGFPGED. Besides, the comparison of AP as an indicator of organisational effectiveness is done thrice, once with raw scores of AP, once with

residual scores of AP from which the effect of SES is removed statistically from raw scores of AP and once with residual scores of AP from which the effect of prior academic performance of students is removed statistically from raw scores of AP.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Organisational Effectiveness in Higher Education on the Basis of Student Background

### **Variables and their Operational Definitions**

The present research included the following variables :

#### **Organisational Effectiveness**

It refers to the extent to which post-graduate education achieves the goals of high level of academic performance of students at the post-graduate level.

#### **Academic Performance (AP)**

It refers to a student's percentage of marks represented by numerical scores obtained in the final year examination at the Master's degree.

#### **Perceived Gains from Graduate Education (PGFGED)**

It refers to a student's perceptions of his/her gain in the field of knowledge, attitudes, values and skills received from graduate education (Masters Degree) in order to be a socially useful and economically productive individual.

#### **Socio-Economic Status**

It refers to the extent of wealth, power and prestige enjoyed by a student's family.

#### **First Generation College/Tertiary Education Entrant (FGCE)**

It refers to a student whose either parent (father or mother) has had no access to higher education or not.

#### **Non-First Generation College/Tertiary Education Entrant (NFGCE)**

It refers to a student whose either parent (father or mother) has had access to higher education or not.

### **Research Questions**

1. Is there a difference in the raw academic performance of post-graduate students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE?
2. Is there a difference in the residual academic performance of post-graduate students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE after partialling out the effect of socio-economic status of students?
3. Is there a difference in the residual academic performance of post-graduate students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE after partialling out the effect of prior academic performance of students?

4. Is there a difference in the raw perceived gains of post-graduation education among students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE?
5. Is there a difference in the residual perceived gains of post-graduation education among students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE after partialling out the effect of socio-economic status of students?

### Research Design

The study has adopted the quantitative approach as it has used structured instruments of data collection. Besides, statistical techniques have been used to analyse numerical data so as to arrive at a nomothetic body of knowledge. Methodology of the study is an essential component of a research design.

### Methodology of the Study

The study has adopted the descriptive method of the causal-comparative type as it is focussed on studying organisational effectiveness in the present times and neither studies the past nor administers an intervention programme to test its effectiveness. It is causal-comparative in that it compares indicators of organisational effectiveness on the basis of gender of the students.

### Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The sample was selected using a three stage sampling technique. At the first stage, four faculties were selected using stratified random sampling technique. At the second stage, subjects were selected using stratified random sampling technique. At the third stage, students from intact classes were selected.

Initially, data were collected from 284 students. Of this, 11 students had given incomplete data and hence were rejected. Thus, the final sample size was 273 with a response rate of 96.13%. The sample consisted of 121 (44.32%) boys and 152 (55.68%) girls. The distribution of the sample by subjects is given in table 1.

Table 1 : Sample size

FACULTY	SAMPLE SIZE	%
Arts	157	57.51
Science	75	27.47
Commerce	26	9.52
Law	15	5.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>100</b>

Moreover, the sample consisted of 136 FGCE and 137 NFGCE students. It included 106 students from the open category and 167 students from the reserved category. (The Constitution of India provides for reservation of seats in educational institutions to students from socio-economic disadvantaged sections based on caste. These are termed as reserved category students. The rest are termed as open category students.) This implies that 61.17% of the sample is from socio-economic disadvantaged section of the Indian society. Besides, 34 (12.45%) students' parents were illiterate, 109 (39.93%) students' parents had completed primary or secondary education, 48 (17.58%) students' parents were graduates, 43 (15.75%) students' one parent was a post-graduate, 25 (9.16%) students' both parent were post-graduates and 14 (5.12%) students' parents had qualifications higher than post-graduation. Thus, 52.38% students had parents who had no access to higher education.

### **Instruments Used in the Study**

**Perceived Gains from Post-Graduate Education (PGFGED) :** This tool was developed by the researcher and was used to measure the gains from Graduate education as perceived by students. It is a self-report measure and covered the dimensions of students' perceptions of knowledge in the subject areas as well as a broad knowledge base in related subjects, preparation for future career/profession, cognitive, affective and psychomotor development and self awareness. These dimensions were identified on the basis of literature review in the subject. The content and face validities of the tools were established by obtaining opinions of 8 experts and an item analysis of the tool was conducted in a pre-pilot study. Its final form consisted of 33 items. Its internal consistency reliability & test-retest reliability were found to be 0.82 and 0.80 respectively on a sample of 87 post-graduate students in a pilot study.

### **Socio-Economic Status Inventory**

This was developed by Patel (1997) and modified in 2015. It covers the following areas:

- (i) The size and nature of the family
- (ii) The type of accommodation, facilities and services available in the home
- (iii) Articles and assets possessed
- (iv) Total family income
- (v) Literacy level of parents
- (vi) Occupation of parents
- (vii) Exposure to mass media
- (viii) Library/Club membership
- (ix) Interaction among family members

The inventory provides a comprehensive index of an individual's level of socio-economic status. This inventory was modified slightly. There are 35 items in this inventory. The internal consistency reliability of this tool after modification as calculated by the split-half method was found to be 0.96 and the test-retest reliability was found to be 0.77. The highest possible score of an individual on this tool is 178 and the lowest possible score is 28.

### Techniques of Data Analysis

Differences in AP and PGFPGED on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE are tested using the t-test. The residual scores on AP and PGFPGED are computed using Dyer's Regression Residuals Analysis techniques.

### Null Hypotheses of the Study

1. There is no significant difference in the raw academic performance of post-graduate students [AP] on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE.
2. There is no significant difference in the residual academic performance of post-graduate students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE after partialling out the effect of socio-economic status of students [ $AP_{(SES)}$ ].
3. There is no significant difference in the residual academic performance of post-graduate students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE after partialling out the effect of prior academic performance of students [ $AP_{(PAP)}$ ].
4. There is no significant difference in the raw perceived gains of post-graduation education among students [PGFPGED] on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE.
5. There is no significant difference in the residual perceived gains of post-graduation education among students on the basis of whether they are FGCE or NFGCE after partialling out the effect of socio-economic status of students [ $PGFPGED_{(SES)}$ ].

These null hypotheses were tested using the t-test as shown in table 1.

Table 1 : Differences in indicators of organisational effectiveness on the basis of being FGCE or NFGCE

No.	Variable	Group	N	Mean	t	P	Significance
1	AP	FGCE	136	67.95	2.97	0.0032	Significant
		NFGCE	137	72.48			
2	$AP_{(SES)}$	FGCE	136	-1.52	1.89	0.0598	NS
		NFGCE	137	1.51			
3	$AP_{(PAP)}$	FGCE	136	0.0475	0.09	0.9283	NS

		NFGCE	137	-0.0472			
4	PGFPGED	FGCE	136	96.03	3.11	0.0021	Significant
		NFGCE	137	88.82			
5	PGFPGED <sub>(SES)</sub>	FGCE	136	1.85	1.56	0.1199	NS
		NFGCE	137	-1.83			

### Conclusion

The t-ratios for  $AP_{(SES)}$ ,  $AP_{(PAP)}$  and  $PGFPGED_{(SES)}$  are not significant. Hence the null hypotheses are accepted for these three indicators of organisational effectiveness. On the other hand, the t-ratio for AP and PGFPGED is significant at 0.0032 and 0.0021 levels respectively. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected for these two indicators of organisational effectiveness. It can be seen that NFGCE students are higher on AP as compared to FGCE students. On the other hand, FGCE students are higher on PGFPGED as compared to NFGCE students. 2.94% and 2.79% of the variance in AP and PGFPGED is explained by their status of being FGCE or NFGCE respectively. It further needs to be noted that these differences in AP and PGFPGED disappear when the effect of SES and PAP of students is partialled out. In other words, SES and PAP of a student influences their AP and PGFPGED.

### Implications of the Study

These findings have implications for equity in education. Equity in education means that personal or social circumstances such as gender, being a first generation of college entrant, ethnic (caste) origin or family background, are not obstacles to achieving educational potential (fairness) and that all individuals reach at least a basic minimum level of skills (inclusion). Equity in education is a measure of achievement, fairness and opportunity in education. Educational equity is dependent on two main factors. The first is fairness, which implies that factors specific to one's personal conditions should not interfere with the potential of academic success. The second important factor is inclusion, which refers to a comprehensive standard that applies to everyone in a certain education system. These two factors are closely related and are dependent on each other for true academic success of an educational system (<http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/39989494.pdf>). Thus, a fair and inclusive system that makes the advantages of education available to all is one of the most powerful levers to make society more equitable. Education has expanded significantly in the past half-century, but hopes that this would automatically bring about a fairer society have been only partly realised. Income has always played a significant role in

shaping academic success. Those who come from a family of a higher SES are privileged with more opportunities than those of lower SES. Those who come from a higher SES can afford things like better tutors, computers and access to internet, admissions to elite schools and colleges and so on. This creates an unfair advantage and distinct class barrier. These barriers and an unfair advantage lead to lower AP of NFGCE students as compared to FGCE students. Similarly, NFGCE students perceive that they have a relatively higher gain more from post-graduate education as compared to FGCE students. A large majority of FGCE students are from rural areas or from the reserved category. Thus, they find that they have gained considerably from post-graduate education.

### References

- Alhaji & Wan Yusoff (2011). Does Motivational Factor Influence Organizational Commitment and Effectiveness? A Review of Literature Journal of Business Management and Economics Vol. 3 (1) pp. 001-009, January
- Altschuld, J. W., & Zheng, H. Y. (1995). Assessing the effectiveness of research organizations. Evaluation Review, 19(2), 197-216.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0193841X9501900205>
- Andres Sandoval-Hernandez (2008). School Effectiveness Research: A Review of Criticisms and Some Proposals to Address them, Educate~ Special Issue, March 2008, pp. 31-44
- Ashraf & Kadir (2012). A Review on the Models of Organizational Effectiveness: A Look At Cameron's Model in Higher Education, International Education Studies Vol. 5, No. 2; April.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 297-308.  
<http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1198&context=dissertations>  
Accessed on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2016.
- Blekic (2011). Attaining A Sustainable Future for Public Higher Education: The Role of Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Dependence. Unpublished Thesis  
[Http://Pdxscholar.Library.Pdx.Edu/Open\\_Access\\_Etds/277](http://Pdxscholar.Library.Pdx.Edu/Open_Access_Etds/277)
- Cameron, K. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 604-632.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2392582>
- Cameron, K. (1981). Domains of organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities. Academy of Management Journal, 24 (1), 25-47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/255822>

- Cameron, K. S. (1984). "The effectiveness of ineffectiveness." *Research in Organizational behavior* 6: 235-285.
- Cameron, K. (1986). A study of organizational effectiveness and its predictors. *Management Science*, 32(1), 87-112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.1.87>
- Choudhary, Philip & Rajender Kumar, (2011). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Effectiveness. *Industrial Engineering Letters Www.Iiste.Org Vol 1, No.3, 2011*
- Campbell, J. P. (1977). On the nature of organizational effectiveness. In Goodman, P.S. & Pennings, J.M. (Eds.), *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness* (pp. 13-55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conolly, T., Colon, E. M., & Deutsch, S. J. (1980). Organizational Effectiveness: A Multiple Constituency Approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 211-218.
- Gordon & Louis (2009). 'Linking Parent and Community Involvement with Student Achievement: Comparing Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Stakeholder Influence'. *American Journal of Education*, 116(1), 1-31.
- Graham, S. and Gisi, S. (2000). Adult Undergraduate Students: What Role does College Play? *NAPSA Journal*, Vol. 38(1), pp. 99-121.
- Harper, S.R. and Quaye, S.J. (2009) Beyond Sameness, with Engagement and Outcomes for All. In: *Student Engagement in Higher Education*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 1–15.
- Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2002). Non-profit Organizational Effectiveness: Practical Implications of Research on an Elusive Concept. An Occasional Paper Issued by the Midwest Center for Non-profit Leadership. Retrieved November 21, 2014, from <http://bsbpa.umkc.edu/mwcnl//research/FINAL%20MCNL%20.pdf>
- Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2004). Doing things right: Effectiveness in local non-profit organizations, a panel study. *Public Administration Review*, 64(6), 694-703. <http://ozgurzan.com/management/ot/organizational-effectiveness>
- <http://www.oecd.Org/Edu/Skills-Beyond-School/Litterature%20review%20vam.pdf>
- Iyer (2009). Current Views of the Characteristics of School Effectiveness in the Context of National Secondary Schools from the Perception of Principals, Heads of Department and Teachers <http://www.icsei.net/icsei2011/Full%20papers/0048.pdf>
- Jarad, Yusof & Nikbin (2010). A Review Paper on Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 1 (3) (2010), pp. 26–46

- Joyce (2009). Leadership and Organisational Effectiveness – Lessons to be drawn from Education? *Journal Of Nursing Management* Volume 17, Issue 4, Pages 494–502, May 2009.
- Kargoz, S. and Oz, Ece. (2008). Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education Measures, Measurement and Evaluation. EABR and TLC Conference Proceeding, Rothenberg, Germany.
- Kent, R. (2015). *Analysing Quantitative Data*. UK : Sage Publications.
- Kim and Lalancette (2013). Literature Review on the Value-Added Measurement in Higher Education <http://www.Oecd.Org/Edu/Skills-Beyond-School/Litterature%20review%20vam.pdf>
- Lizzio, A. and Wilson, K. (2009) Student Participation in University Governance: the Role Conceptions and Sense of Efficacy of Student Representatives on Departmental Committees. *Studies in Higher Education*. 34 (1), pp. 69–84.
- Mukhtar, Islam & Siengthai (2013), A Dilemma of Definition and Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education, *SAARC Journal of Human Resource Development* Volume 9, Number 1, December 2013.
- Mukhtar, Siengthai & Ramzan (2011). Mediating Role of HRM in Organizational Conflict and Impact on Organizational Effectiveness: Empirical Evidence of Pakistan Public Universities, *International Journal of Business Management & Economics Research*, Vol 2(6), 2011, 391-40.
- Perrow, C., (1961). The analysis of goals in complex organisations, *American Sociological Review*, Dec, 854-66.
- Robinson et al (2008). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types, *Educational Administration Quarterly* Vol. 44, No. 5 (December 2008) 635-674.
- Rodgers, K. A., & Summers, J. J. (2008). African American students are predominantly white institutions: A motivational and self-systems approach to understanding retention. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20(2), 171–190.
- Siddique, Aslam, Khan & Fatima (2011). Impact of Academic Leadership on Faculty's Motivation, and Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education System *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 8, 84-92.
- Temple, P., Callender, C., Grove, L. & Kersh, N. (2014). Managing the student experience in a shifting higher education landscape.

[https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/managing\\_the\\_student\\_experience.pdf](https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/managing_the_student_experience.pdf) Accessed on 14th August 2015.

Ten Steps to Equity in Education. <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/39989494.pdf>  
Retrieved on 21st December 2016.

Teodorović (2009). School Effectiveness: Literature Review  
<http://Www.Doiserbia.Nb.Rs/Img/Doi/0579-6431/2009/0579-64310901007t.Pdf>

Wahlstrom & Louis (2008); 'How Teachers Experience Principal Leadership: The Roles of Professional Community, Trust, Efficacy, and Shared Responsibility'. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 458-95.

Paper Received : 8<sup>th</sup> September, 2016

Paper Reviewed : 12<sup>th</sup> October, 2016

Paper Published : 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2016

CTE