

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

Dr. Sudhir K. Samantaray^{1*}

ABSTRACT

Changes have taken place in the lives of Indian organisations due to globalization and developments in information and communication technology revolutions. The present research focused on comparative perspectives and conceptual frame work suggested by Daft (1995) to study public and private sector organisations relating to culture, structure and strategy on organisational effectiveness. 400 front line managers comprising of 200 public and 200 private sectors, were taken into consideration. Group t-tests were conducted to assess the similarities and dissimilarities among HR personnel. The findings made a modest empirical contribution to understanding the fundamental challenges of sectoral perspectives. On one hand, the findings confirmed significant differences between public and private sector employees in their perceptions of organisational culture, structure and strategy; and on the other hand, examined the theoretical model of the relationship between organisational effectiveness as a series of work-related outcomes stating no significant differences across the sectors. The study provided practical implications for organisational development in linking structural variables to performance; focused on organisational culture in organisational efforts; addressed organisational issues holistically; suggested future studies in the areas of measurement improvement; and explored further research questions.

Keywords: *Organisational Diagnosis, Organisational Culture, Structure, Strategy, Organisational Effectiveness, Public Sector and Private Sector*

How to achieve greater organisational effectiveness is a million dollar question for all the time to come. From a research perspective, the importance of defining and measuring organisational effectiveness remains understandable because organisational effectiveness is a significant indicator to show the direction, position, and future of the organization. The continual effectiveness of an organisation not only depends on conformity to its role requirements but also

¹ Professor in Psychology, P. G. Department of Psychology, Dronacharya Government College, New Railway Road, Gurugram, Haryana, India

[*Responding Author](#)

Received: March 12, 2017; Revision Received: March 20, 2017; Accepted: March 22, 2017

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

on its ability to grow, develops and changes over a period of time. Making organisation effective is a major task for the business planners. To make organisation more effective; a number of interrelated factors are responsible for achieving its goals like organisational culture (Hofstede, 1991; Denison, Haaland & Goelzer, 2004), strategy (Enticott & Walker, 2008 Delery & Gupta, 2016), and structure (Andrews, Boyne, Law & Walker, 2009) play very significant roles in organisations.

Many organisation development (OD) strategies exist for improving an organisation's effectiveness (Beer & Spector, 1993; Cummings & Worley, 1993; Rothwell & Sredl, 1992). One of these strategies, organisational diagnosis, involves diagnosing or assessing, an organization's current level of functioning in order to design appropriate change interventions. The concept of diagnosis in organisational developmental programme is used in a manner similar to the medical model (Tichy, Hornstein, & Nisberg, 1977). Like the physician, the organisational diagnostician views the organisation as a total system. In the field of medicine, this is considered to be holistic medicine, while in the field of organisation development, the total system view is considered to represent *open systems theory* (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Fischbacher-Smith (2017) advocated that relationships between success and failure can be seen to offer some interesting challenges for the practice of business continuity. That is, an organisation can be viewed as a total system with inputs, throughputs, and outputs.

Organisational culture, structure and strategy encompass both the social and technical systems of an organisation. It is noticed that these factors have been studied as key organisational determinants impacting organisational effectiveness and other out put variables (Gold, Malhotra & Segars, 2001; Lee & Choi, 2004; Walker & Ruekert, 1987). There is no doubt many researches were conducted to study organisational effectiveness, but in the light of recent past, a comparative diagnosis of organisational effectiveness along with organisational culture-structure-strategic similarities and differences was not assessed jointly.

Comparative Perspectives: Public and Private Sector Organizations

Public and private sector organisations play very crucial role in sustaining the economy of any country (Costa, Guntupalli, & Trieu, 2006; Wu, 2007). Organisational culture, structure and strategy are varied along with the nature of management (public and private). Significant differences have been observed between public and private sector organizations with regard to organisational culture, structure and strategy (**Mathur, Aycan, & Kanungo, 1996**; Parker & Bradley, 2000; Erakovic, 2006; Agrawal & Tyagi, 2010). In addition to it, significant differences have been observed between public and private sector organisations in Indian context and abroad with regard to various aspects of organizations viz. planning, policy implementations, strategy, leadership, managerial effectiveness (Bains, 2007; Clayton et al., 2008; Rhys, 2008; Manolopoulos, 2008; Gupta & Mittal, 2008; Bao, 2009).

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

Rooted in the above findings, it is hypothesised that there are differences between the public and private sector organisations in terms of their organisational culture, structure, strategy and organisational effectiveness.

HYPOTHESIS

H1: There are significant difference between the public and private sector organisations in terms of organisational culture, organisational structure, organisational strategy and organisational effectiveness.

More specifically:

H1:1: There are significant differences between the public and private sector organisations in terms of organisational culture.

H1:2: There are significant differences between the public and private sector organizations in terms of organizational structure

H1:3: There are significant differences between the public and private sector organizations in terms of organizational strategy.

H1:4: There are significant differences between the public and private sector organizations in terms of organizational effectiveness.

Comparative Perspectives: Manufacturing and Service Sector Organisations

Manufacturing and service sector organisations play very significant role in our economy (Costa et al., 2006; Wu, 2007). Significant differences have been observed between manufacturing sector and service sector organisations with regard to the varied nature of organisational culture, structure and strategy. Some studies were under taken to study structural differences in manufacturing sector and service sector. Prakash & Gupta (2008) explored the relationship between organisational structure and perceived innovation in the manufacturing industry sector of India. Structural variables include vertical and horizontal complexity; formalisation; centralisation; concentration of authority; and participation in decision-making. Concentration of authority and participation in decision-making combine to form centralisation, both the former are analysed as separate variables. Innovation, measured by a perceptual variable, is labelled as perceived innovation. Gupta & Mittal (2008) studied promotional strategies among public and private sector banks in India. It was found that in traditional tools of promotion, both sectors' banks are almost same. Private Sector banks are adopting more push strategies to attract and catch the customers. They found differences between promotional strategies adopted by Public and Private Sector Banks (Gupta & Mittal, 2008).

Rooted in the above studied it is hypothesised that there are significant differences between manufacturing and service sector organisations.

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

H2: There are significant difference between the manufacturing and service sector organisations in terms of organisational culture, structure, strategy and organisational effectiveness.

More specifically:

H2:1: There are significant differences between the manufacturing and service sector organisations in terms of organisational culture.

H2:2: There are significant differences between the manufacturing and service sector organisations in terms of organisational structure.

H2:3: There are significant differences between the manufacturing and service sector organisations in terms of organisational strategy.

H2:4: There are significant differences between the manufacturing and service sector organisations in terms of organisational effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY ADOPTED

Since the prime objective of the study was to find out the similarities and dissimilarities across the four sectors with regard to organisational culture, structure and strategy and organisational effectiveness, the following methods and procedures were adopted.

Design

The study followed a comparative paradigm of research, group t-test, mean (M) values and standard deviations (SDs) of different factors for each subscale for all the four subgroups were taken into consideration.

Population

The unit of analysis in this study was the organization. Organizations are often differentiated based on their cultural (Schein, 1990), structural (Burns & Stalker, 1961), and strategic characteristics (Porter, 1980). This study collected people's perceptions of their organizational characteristics, and organizational effectiveness. The population in this study was organizations of Northern India, particularly located in Chandigarh, Punjab, Ludhiana, Haryana, Delhi, Gurgaon etc. The reason this geographical region was chosen was twofold. First, constraining geographical location can eliminate potential influence on study results due to different geographical locations. Second, the researcher had easier access to organizations in this region than those in other regions or parts of India.

In order to obtain employee perceptions, HR professionals working as Executives/Managers were chosen as the respondents. HR professionals were selected because they frequently interact with organizational members of other departments and of different job levels (Evans, 2003). They have good knowledge of organizational members (Gilley & Maycunich, 2000) and a more realistic view of the organization as a whole.

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

Sample

The sample consisted of 400 executives, 100 in each sub-group such as (i) executives from public sector industry, (ii) executives from private sector industry, (iii) executives from public sector service organizations, and (iv) executives from private sector service organization. The minimum educational qualification of all the respondents was graduation and the age range is from 25- 60 years. They belonged to the frontline and middle level in the hierarchy of their organizations.

Measures and Instruments Adopted

Four standardised questionnaires were adopted to collect data on four constructs like organisational culture (Fey and Denison, 2003), structure (Caruana, Morris, & Vella 1998), strategy (Venkatraman, 1990) and organisational effectiveness (Lee and Choi, 2004). All the measures were having high reliability and validity tested in various cultural settings.

Method of Study, Procedure & Data Analysis

After proper selection of the measures and samples, each executive was contacted personally by the investigator. He or she was clearly apprised about the design and objectives of the research undertaken. Proper instruction for each tool was given with clarity and patience. All the measures were administered and the data were collected put into statistical treatment with the help of SPSS.

FINDINGS

The purposes of this study was to find out any similarities and differences across four organisational set up viz. public, private, manufacturing and service sector organizations.

1. Public and Private Sector Analysis:

- (i) Group “t” ratios between public and private sector employees on organizational effectiveness, reveals that there were no significant differences between public and private sector employees on organizational effectiveness (0.759 >.05 level).
- (ii) Group “t” ratios between public and private sector employees on organizational culture, reveals that there were significant differences between public and private sector employees on organizational culture (t = 2.804, p<0.05). The total score of mean values of the public and private sector employees were 53.34 and 56.81 respectively. With regard to the various dimensions of organizational culture, the private sector employees were high on mission (M= 14.3, t = 3.586, p<0.01) and involvement (M=14.22, t = 2.545, p<0.05).
- (iii) There were significant differences between public and private sector employees on organizational structure on both the dimensions viz. centralization and formalization. The private sector employees were high on both the dimensions i.e. centralization (t = 2.863, p<0.01) and formalization (t = 3.677, p<0.01).

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

(iv) Group ‘t’ ratios between public and private sector employees on organizational strategy, clearly reveals that there were significant differences between public and private sector employees on organizational strategy. The private sector employees were high on analysis and defensiveness dimensions of organizational strategy. The means of private sector employees were high on analysis and defensiveness dimensions of organizational strategy than public sector employees i.e. Analysis ($t = 2.911, p < 0.01$) and Defensiveness ($t = 2.953, p < 0.01$). Where as no significant difference has been found between the public and private sector employees on futurity and proactiveness.

2. Manufacturing and Service Sector Analysis:

(i) Group “t” ratios between manufacturing and service sector employees on organizational effectiveness, reveals that significant differences were found between the two sectors. The means of the organizational effectiveness score of service and manufacturing sectors were 22.67 and 21.25 respectively ($t = 2.03, p < 0.05$).

(ii) Group “t” ratios between service and manufacturing sector organizations on organizational culture and its various dimensions clearly indicates that there were significant differences found between employees of service and manufacturing sector organizations (Mean of Service Sector = 56.48, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 53.67, $t = 2.27, p < 0.05$). More specifically, the mean score of service sector employees were higher than manufacturing sector employees on three dimensions of organizational culture i.e. Mission (Mean of Service Sector = 14.01, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 13.19, $t = 2.078, p < 0.05$); Adaptability (Mean of Service Sector = 13.92, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 13.21, $t = 2.04, p < 0.05$) and Consistency (Mean of Service Sector = 14.48, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 13.77, $t = 2.065, p < 0.05$).

(iii) There were significant differences between employees of service and manufacturing sector organizations on organizational structure on both the dimensions viz. centralization and formalization. The service sector employees were higher than manufacturing sector employees on both the dimensions i.e. centralization (Mean of Service Sector = 22.88, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 20.87, $t = 3.377, p < 0.01$) and formalization (Mean of Service Sector = 27.01, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 24.81, $t = 3.45, p < 0.01$).

(iv) There were significant differences between employees of service and manufacturing sector organizations on organizational strategy on two dimensions of organizational strategy, viz. Analysis and Proactiveness. The service sector employees were higher than manufacturing sector employees on both the dimensions i.e. Analysis (Mean of Service Sector = 28.29, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 25.92, $t = 3.171, p < 0.01$) and Proactiveness (Mean of Service Sector = 23.46, Mean of Manufacturing Sector = 21.98, $t = 2.592, p < 0.01$). Where as no significant difference has been found between the service and manufacturing sector employees on Defensiveness and futurity.

DISCUSSION

Public Vs Private Sector Organisations

The findings of this present study make a modest empirical contribution to understanding one of the fundamental challenges of sectoral perspectives. It documents the relationship and differences between the public and private sector organisations in terms of organisational culture, organisational structure, organisational strategy and organisational effectiveness.

The most prominent result of this study is the clear variance that was found between private and public sector employees in their perceptions of organisational culture. The private sector employees were high on mission and involvement. This seems that the private sector employees are more goals oriented, having more vision and involvement in organisational activities. It is evident that public sector employees are having more ambiguous role in comparison to private sector employees. Public sector organisation employees experience more turbulence, interruptions, recycles, and conflict in comparison to private sector organisations (Perry and Rainey 1988; Rainey, Backoff, and Levine 1976; Ring and Perry 1985). Baldwin (1987) identified some of the distinguishing characteristics of public sector organizations. He proposed that in comparison to the private sector, public sector organisations have: (a) vague, unclear, or ambiguous goals and objectives; (b) more frequent leadership turnover; and (c) relative job security for tenured employees. This present finding is very much consistent with the study conducted by Srivastava & Krishna (1992) that the private sector employees were observed to be comparatively more involved in their job than public sector employees. Schraeder, Tears & Jordan (2005) highlighted some interesting similarities and differences between public and private sector organisations in terms of organisational culture and its challenges to evoke change in the organisations.

With regard to structural differentiation, this present investigation clearly identifies differences between public and private sector employees on organisational structure on both the dimensions viz. centralisation and formalisation. This clearly implies that in private sector, there is more centralisation as well as formalisation. It seems that the private sectors in India are more formalised and centralised in their approach, orientation and operation. This might be the reason that due to more goals orientated activities and focused vision, the private sector organisations are more determined by contextual factors. It seems very clear that due to contextual factors, the structure of organisation changes.

In this study, the perceived dimensions of organisational structure differed among the public and private sector organisations. This is quite consistent with earlier studies high lighting public-private differentiations. A “public-private difference” stream of research, begun by Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976), initiated a study of the roles that public and private organisations exhibit may lead to how they operate. Using this framework, researchers have found that the

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

demands placed on public and private organizations vary to the extent that different practices are recommended for each sector (Perry and Rainey 1988; Ring and Perry 1985). A variety of factors has been identified to distinguish public and private organizations (e.g., Bozeman 1987; Ring and Perry 1985). The most widely accepted classification, developed by Rainey, Backoff, and Levine (1976) and updated by Rainey (1989), uses environmental, transactional, and process factors to highlight differences among the sectors. It is clearly evident that structural dimensions and their conceptual relationships very much affect individual attitudes and behaviour. The finding of this present study is very much similar to study conducted by Mark (1985) in private service sector organisations. Mark (1985) found high level of centralisation and formalisation was associated with administrative effectiveness. An enhancing effect of organisational structure is suggested as contributing to organisational effectiveness. Johnson, Leenders & McCue (2000) found significant differences between public and private sector organisations with regard to organisational structure. Therefore, the significant differences found in this study are more congruent with regard to the perceived structure of organisation by the public and private sector employees.

Further, it is evident from this present study that significant differences have been found between public and private sector employees on organisational strategy. The private sector employees were high on analysis and defensiveness dimensions of organisational strategy. Since, analysis refers to the overall problem solving posture that indicates the extent of tendency to search deeper for the roots of problems and to generate the best possible solution alternatives (Miller & Friesen, 1984). Schwenk (1990) examined decisions in public and private organisations and reported notable differences. Private, for-profit organizations have smoother decision-making processes. Public organizations experience more turbulence, interruptions, recycles, and conflict (e.g., Perry and Rainey 1988; Rainey, Backoff, and Levine 1976; Ring and Perry 1985). Employees display unique roles in different sectors. These distinct roles suggest vastly different kinds of expectations and accountability that may call for different decision-making practices. The private sector employees were having high score on analysis which clearly signifies that they are more autonomous in taking decisions and arriving at solutions in comparison to public sector employees (Hickson et al. 1986).

In addition to analysis, the private sector employees were having high score on defensiveness dimension of organisational strategy. Defensive behaviours are demonstrated through cost reduction and efficiency seeking methods (Venkatraman, 1989). Becker (2002) has also highlighted improvement of organisational performance by exploiting workplace flexibility i.e. planning and design that reduce costs and increase flexibility. Nelson (2007) found significant differences between public and private sector employees in term of team member competence, standards, structure, and leadership. Gupta and Mittal (2008) studied that private sector employees adopted more efficient methods and strategies in comparison to public sector

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

employees. Therefore, the present findings confirm the earlier findings that private sector employees are better and differed on the two dimensions of organisational strategy i.e. analysis and defensiveness in comparison to public sector employees.

Further, in continuation of the observed findings, where as, no sector wise differences were found on the other two dimensions of organisational strategy i.e. futurity and proactiveness among the public and private sector employees. Futurity refers to temporal considerations reflected in key strategic decision, relative emphasis of long term effectiveness versus efficiency considerations at the present (Venkatraman, 1989). Proactiveness refers to proactive behaviours such as participation in emerging industries, continuous searching for market opportunities and experimentation with potential responses to changing environmental trends (Venkatraman, 1989). Baldwin (1987) and Khan (2009) found no specific difference in public and private sector organizations in strategic orientations. It is visualised that due to globalization and overall competition among the organization one over another, these two dimensions of organisational strategy were perceived similarly by the employees.

This present findings are very much consistency with earlier studies conducted by Schwenk (1990) and Nutt (2006) who had identified differences across the sectors. Again, some researchers had also suggested that sector differences exist (Child and Smith, 1987; Paget and Lau, 1985) among public and private management organisations. **In addition to it, the present finding was supported by recent findings carried out by Clayton et al. (2008) stating significant differences between the sectors with regard to lack of autonomy in public organisations as compared to private sector organisations.**

In a more similar way, Mathur, Aycan and Kanungo (1996) studied significant difference between public and private sector organisations. In comparison to public sector organisations, the internal work culture of private enterprises placed greater emphasis on internal locus of control, future orientation in planning, participation in decision-making, and obligation towards others in the work context. Accordingly, human resource management practices in the private sector utilised more effective motivational techniques (that is, feedback, autonomy, task significance, empowerment, supervisory control, and performance-reward contingency) compared to those in the public sector. Therefore, due to some contextual as well as organisational factors, it is obvious that private sector employees exhibited some differences on the said dimensions.

This study examined one theoretical model of the relationship between organisational effectiveness as a series of work-related outcomes in two separate sectors: the private and the public, stating no significant difference across the sectors. The study by Baldwin (1987) supported this present finding that no significant differences exist between public and private

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

sector employees on organizational effectiveness. Khan (2009) has also found no specific differences between public and private sector organisations. The reasons might be due to globalization in economy, knowledge diffusion and transmission, competitive environments etc. Both the public and private sector organisations are trying their best to compete with the changing environment. Sung (2008) highlighted competitive advantage of information technology (CAIT), corporate strategy, organisational structure, and organisational performance among the organisations. Information technology provides several traits of strategic advantages such as efficiency, threat, functionality, preemptive-ness, and synergy, directs corporate strategy, shapes organisational structure, and significantly contributes to corporate performance. This might be the reason that no significant difference has been found in this present study.

Service Vs Manufacturing Sector Organisations

Another major comparison was made between manufacturing and service sector organisations. It documented the relationship and differences between the service and manufacturing sector employees with regard to the dimensions of, organisational effectiveness, organisational culture, organisational structure, and organisational strategy in more systematic manner.

Efforts to delineate the performance implications of organisational culture elements continue. The study examined four major organisational culture traits, involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission and compared organisational culture between the service and manufacturing sectors and it found significant differences between the employees of both the sectors. The perceived organisational culture was more in service sector than in manufacturing sector on the three dimensions of organisational culture dimensions i.e. mission, adaptability and consistency. There is no doubt that cultural traits may vary depending on the types of management (Denison, 1990; Denison & Mishap, 1995; Denison & Neale, 1996; Fey & Denison, 2003; Denison, 2009).

The findings of this present study are more consistent with the earlier studies conducted by Mathew (2007) and Coffey (2010) in understanding organisational culture in the service sector organisations. Mathew (2007) explored the relationship of organisational culture with productivity and quality in Indian software organisations. He developed a range of insights into the way cultural processes tend to influence productivity and quality in people centric and knowledge intensive work contexts such as software. Rodman & Bray (2009) studied the influence of organisational culture on members' behaviour and organisational performance. They have documented a variety of performance outcomes related to specific characteristics of organisational culture profiles that describe and apply a theory of culture related to behaviour and performance from a managerial perspective oriented to the attainment of results which are critical for the survival and viability of organisations. Ramadan (2010) in his research provides empirical evidence on the links between organisational culture and competitive advantage and

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

studied influence of objective aspects of organisational culture on objective measures of the outcomes of a firm's sustainable competitive advantage.

In the line of service and manufacturing sector wise differentiation, this present study has investigated differences between employees of service and manufacturing sector organizations on organizational structure on both the dimensions viz. centralisation and formalisation. There is no doubt that the impact of organisational structure has been highlighted as having both positive and negatives effects depending on the nature and type of organisation. In this context, Yu and He (2007) and Carney (2009) suggested and analysed various advantages and disadvantages/positive benefits and negative consequences of organisational structures. In this present investigation, the service sector employees were found to be higher on both the dimensions i.e. centralisation and formalisation than manufacturing sector employees. It is very clear that there is more perceived centralisation and formalisation in the service sector.

It is quite clear from the review of existing literature that researches are scanty and limited in stating the impact of structures on service and manufacturing sectors. It is attributed that the service sector employees may be having less autonomy in their functioning and less roles in the decision making process of the organisation.

The findings of the present study documented marginal differences between employees of service and manufacturing sector organisations on organisational strategy. The service sector employees were higher than manufacturing sector employees on two dimensions organisational strategy, viz. analysis and proactiveness. Where as no significant differences have been found between the service and manufacturing sector employees on other two dimensions of organisational strategy i.e. defensiveness and futurity.

In this research, the importance of measuring organisational effectiveness remained understandable because organisational effectiveness is a significant indicator to show the direction, position, and future of the organisation (Cameron, 1986; Redshaw, 2000; Tonti & Herbs, 2009). It is found that there are significant differences between the service and manufacturing sectors on organisational effectiveness. The service sector organisations were proved to be more effective in comparison to manufacturing sectors. The reasons may be attributed to a number of factors like, motivation, job satisfaction, leadership, compensation, organizational justice, communication, intra and inter-team functioning, judgement and decision-making, organizational development and change. Psychological insights are offered on management interventions, organizational theory, organizational productivity, organizational culture and climate, strategic management, stress, and job loss and unemployment (Anderson, Ones & Sinangil, 2005).

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

Downey-Ennis and Harrington (2002) found more organisational effectiveness in private sector (i.e. Irish health-care organizations). Bao (2009) has also found more managerial effectiveness in light of organisational effectiveness in service sector such as identification of specific opportunities and appropriate motivation by the managers. Drummond and Al-Anazi (1997) studied leadership styles in terms of risk taking behaviour. Hickson (1986) and Schwenk (1990) Nutt (2006) organizations have smoother decision-making processes. Public organizations experience more turbulence, interruptions, recycles, and conflict (e.g., Perry and Rainey 1988; Rainey, Backoff, and Levine 1976; Ring and Perry 1985). Some times, the effectiveness of organisation depends on leadership as well as management styles. This might be another reason that service sector organisations were proved to be more effective than manufacturing sector. According to Pattanayak, Niranjana and Ganguly (2005) leadership is a power function and contributes to influence strategies of ingratiation and it is very well associated with organisational effectiveness. Wu, (2007) viewed that in India, the service sector has become the dominant contributor to the Indian economy, accounting for 54.2 per cent of GDP in 2004. The success in this sector is regarded as "India's services revolution". Therefore, in this study the service sector organisations proved to be more effective as perceived by the employees. Therefore, it is obvious that sector differentials exist in the life of Indian organisations due to organisational and contextual factors. There is no doubt that organisational factors are the prime factors contribute to, as a result ultimately affecting organisational growth, development as well as effectiveness.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Many organisations still view organisational effectiveness as launching some welfare programme without adequate consideration of their organisational characteristics to ensure the success of their organisational development initiatives. Through analyzing the relevance of organisational characteristics to organisational success enhancement, this study brings to attention the importance of focusing on creating a harmonious culture-friendly environment that is made up of appropriate cultural, structural, and strategic features. This study also provides empirical evidence for the positive contribution of organisational factors that leads to organisational success. The following specific conclusions were derived.

Further studies are needed to extend the current research in the areas of measurement and further research questions. This study employed measurements from different instruments, and measurement problems came up and should be addressed in future research that the items measuring organisational effectiveness could be improved and increased by adopting other factors of organisational effectiveness at individual level, group level as well as organisational level. For informants to give accurate perceptions of their whole organisation is not a realistic expectation, especially in large organisations. Future research could focus the level of analysis on the business unit or even department.

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study results established that differences and similarities across the four organisational sectors were identified and discussed. Contingency theory offers a theoretical justification for the relationships among these constructs. The contingency approach (Galbraith 1977; Ruekert, Walker, and Roering 1985) holds that there are no universal principles that apply to all organisations and that not all available approaches are equally effective. Contingency theory argues that for an organisation to survive and perform in a given context, it must exhibit congruence between its internal elements and its external environment (Galbraith 1977). The results of the analysis carried out on the organisational culture, structure and strategy of organisations indicated very significant importance as part of its organisational growth leading to organisational effectiveness. Brewster, Gooderham, & Mayrhofeg (2016) and Fischbacher-Smith (2017) linked human resource management strategy with performance, and organisational effectiveness. Therefore, necessary strategic approach should be undertaken how to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness on the part of organizations. Therefore, on the basis of obtained findings as perceived by the respondents, it can be concluded that having efficient and effective organisational culture, structure and strategy is an important aspect of an organisation to ensure organisational effectiveness. The congruence between its internal elements and its external changing and challenging environments is to be taken care of greater effectiveness and efficient functioning of organisations.

Acknowledgments

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interests

The author declared no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, R. K., & Tyagi, A., (2010). Organisational culture in Indian organisations: an empirical study. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 3 (1): 68-87.
- Anderson, N., Ones, D. & Sinangil, H.K., (2005). *Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology: Volume 2: sage publications.*
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G.A., Law, J. & Walker, R. (2009). Centralization, organizational strategy, and public service performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, January 01.
- Bains, D.R., (2007). *A Comparative Study of Integrated Human Resource Development Systems of Public and Private Sector Organizations (A Case Study of Selected Organisations).* Theses, Dept. of Commerce and Business Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi.

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

- Baldwin, J.N. (1987). Public versus private: Not that different, not that consequential. *Public Personnel Management*, 16, 2, 181-193.
- Bao, C. (2009). Comparison of public and private sector managerial effectiveness in China: A three parameter approach. *Journal of Management Development*, 28 (6): 533-541.
- Becker, F., (2002). *Improving organisational performance by exploiting workplace flexibility*. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 1 (2): 154-162.
- Beer, M. & Spector, B. (1993). Organizational diagnosis: Its role in organizational learning. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 71, 642-650.
- Bozeman, B. (1987). *All organizations are public*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brewster, Chris, Gooderham, Paul N. & Mayrhofer, Wolfgang (2016). "Human resource management: the promise, the performance, and the consequences", *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, Vol. 3 Iss: 2, pp.181-190.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Cameron, K. (1986). A Study of Organizational Effectiveness and Its Predictors. *Management Science*, 32 (1): 87.
- Carney, M. (2009). Middle manager involvement in strategy development in not-for profit organizations: the director of nursing perspective-how organizational structure impacts on the role. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 12 (1): 13-21
- Caruana, A., Morris, M.H., & Vella, A.J. (1998). The effect of centralization and Formalization on entrepreneurship in export firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 36 (1): 16-29.
- Child, J. & Smith, C. (1987). The Context and Process of Organisational transformation: Cadbury Limited in its sectors. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24: 565-593.
- Clayton, B., Fisher, T., Harris, R., Bateman, A., & Brown, M. (2008). *A study in difference: structures and cultures in Australian registered training organisations*. Project Report. National Centre for Vocational Education Research NCVER, Adelaide, South Australia.
- Coffey, V. (2010). *Understanding Organisational Culture in the Construction Industry*. Taylor and Francis, pp. 272.
- Costa, P., Guntupalli, M., Rana, V. & Trieu, H. (2006). China and India: A Comparative Study of the Manufacturing and Services Industries Submitted April 24th, 2006 Prepared for the International Economic Development Program, Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan.
- Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (1993). *Organization development and change*. Fifth Edition. New York, NY: West Publishing.
- Daft, R.L. (1995). *Organizational theory and design*. St. Paul: West Publishing Co.
- Delery, John & Gupta, Nina (2016). "Human resource management practices and organizational effectiveness: internal fit matters", *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, Vol. 3 Iss: 2, pp.139-163.
- Denison, D.R. & Mishra, A.K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6 (2): 204-223.

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

- Denison, D.R., & Neale, W. (2000). *Denison Organizational Culture Survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: Denison Consulting.
- Denison, D.R., & Neale, W.S. (1996). *Denison organization culture survey: Facilitator's guide*. Ann Harbor, MI: Aviat.
- Denison, D.R., Haaland, S. & Goelzer, P., (2004). Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness: Is Asia Different From the Rest of the World? *Organizational Dynamics*, 33 (1): 98-109.
- Deshpande, R., Farley, U., & Webster, F. (1993). Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: A quadratic analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (1): 23-37.
- Downey-Ennis, K. & Harrington, D., (2002). Organisational effectiveness in Irish health-care organizations. *Managing Service Quality*, 12 (5): 316-322.
- Drew, S. (1997). From knowledge to action: The impact of benchmarking on Organizational performance. *Long Range Planning*, 30 (3), 427-441.
- Drummond, K. & Al-Anazi, F. B. (1997). Leadership Styles in Saudi-Arabia: Public and Private Sector Organizations Compared. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Management*, 4 (4): 3-8.
- Enticott, G., & Walker, R.M., (2008). Sustainability, performance and organizational strategy: an empirical analysis of public organizations. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 17 (2): 79-92.
- Erakovic, L. (2006). Researching organisational change in the public sector. *International Journal of Learning and Change*, 1 (2): 201-216.
- Evans, C. (2003). *Managing for Knowledge: HR's strategic role*. MA: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Fey, C.F., & Denison, D.R., (2003). Organizational Culture and Effectiveness: Can American Theory Be Applied in Russia? *Organization Science*, 14 (6): 686-706
- Fischbacher-Smith, Denis (2017). "When organisational effectiveness fails: Business continuity management and the paradox of performance", *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, Vol. 4, Iss: 1, pp.89-07.
- Galbraith, J.R. (1977). *Organizational Design*. Reading: Mass.: Addison Wesley.
- Gilley, J.W., & Maycunich, A. (2000). *Organizational learning performance and change: An introduction to strategic human resource development*. MA: Perseus Publishing.
- Gold, A.H., Malhotra A., and Segars, A.H. (2001). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management information Systems*, 18 (1): 185-214.
- Gupta, S.L. & Mittal, A. (2008). Comparative study of promotional strategies adopted by public and private sector banks in India. *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, July-Sept, 2008.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, P.F., Leenders, M.R. & McCue, C.P. (2000). A Comparison of Public and Private Sector Supply Organizational Structures and Corporate Activities," *IPSERA Conference Proceedings*, University of Twente, The Netherlands, March 2002, p. 355-364.

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social psychology of organizations* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Khan, I. (2009). Public vs. private sector: an examination of neo-liberal ideology. Online at [http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/13443/MPRA Paper No. 13443](http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/13443/MPRA_Paper_No._13443), posted 17. February 2009 / 18:51.
- Kilmann, R.H., Saxton, M.J., & Serpa, R. (1986). Issues in Understanding and Changing Culture. *California Management Review*, 28: 87-94.
- Lather, A.S., Puskas, J., Singh, A.K., & Gupta, N., (2010). Organisational culture: A study of selected organisations in the manufacturing sector in the NCR. *Agric. Econ. -Czech*, 56(8): 349-358.
- Lee, H., & Choi, B. (2004). Knowledge management enablers, process, and Organizational performance: An integrative view and empirical examination. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20 (1):179- 228.
- Manolopoulos, D. (2008). An Evaluation of Employee Motivation in the Extended Public Sector in Greece. *Employee relations*, 30 (1): 63-85.
- Mark, B. (1985). Task and structural correlates of organizational effectiveness in private psychiatric hospitals. *Health Services Research*, 20 (2): 199-224.
- Mathew, J. (2007). "The relationship of organisational culture with productivity and quality: A study of Indian software organizations," *Employee Relations*, Volume: 29 Issue: 6 Page: 677-695.
- Mathur, P., Aycan, Z. and Kanungo, R.N., (1996). Work Cultures in Indian Organisations: A Comparison between Public and Private Sector. *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 8 (2): 199-222.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P.H. (1984). Strategy- making and environment: the third link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4, 221-235.
- Nelson, C.K. (2007). *Identifying Teamwork Differences between Public and Private Organizations*. Paper presented at the 57th Annual Conference of the International Communication Association within the Organizational Communication Division, Nelson Consulting, LLC. May 2007
- Nutt, P.C. (2006). Comparing public and private sector decision-making practices. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 01, April.
- Parker, R. & Bradley, L. (2000). Organisational culture in the public sector: evidence from six organisations, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 13 Iss: 2, pp.125-141
- Pattanayak, B., Niranjana, P. and Ganguly, S. (2005). Power dynamics, leadership and ingratiation: a study on Indian public sector. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, 5 (1): 57-68.
- Pavett, C.M. & Lau, A.W. (1985). A Comparative Analysis of Research and Development Managerial Jobs across Two Sectors. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22 (1): 69-82.

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

- Perry, J.L. & Rainey, H.G. (1988). The public-private distinction in organizational theory: A critique and research strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 182-201.
- Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. The Free Press: New York.
- Prakash, Y. & Gupta, M. (2008). Exploring the Relationship between Organisation Structure and Perceived Innovation in the Manufacturing Sector of India. *Singapore Management Review*.
- Rainey, H.G. & Milward, H.B. (1981). Public Organizations, Policy Networks, and Environments. In R. A. Hall and R. E. Quinn (eds.), *Organization Theory and Public Policy*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 133-46.
- Ramadan, W.H. (2010). The Influence of Organizational Culture on Sustainable Competitive Advantage of Small & Medium Sized Establishments. *E-Leader Budapest 2010*
- Redshaw, B., (2000). Evaluating organisational effectiveness. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 32 (7): 245-248.
- Rhys, Andrews (2008). Perceived Environmental Uncertainty in Public Organizations: An Empirical Exploration. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 32 (1): 25.
- Ring, P.S., & Perry, J.L. (1985). Strategic Management in Public and Private Organizations: Implications of Distinctive Contexts and Constraints. *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 276-86.
- Roldán, I.G., & Bray, R.G.R., (2009). Similarities and Differences Existing in Cultural Profiles of Colombian Organizations of Higher and Lower Performance. *rev.fac.cienc.econ.*, Vol. XVII (1): 9-24-
- Rothwell, W. J. & Sredl, H. J. (1992). *The ASTD reference guide to professional human resource development roles & competencies*. (2nd Ed.). Amherst, MA: HRD Press.
- Rueket, R.W., Walker, O.C., & Roering, K.J. (1985). The organization of marketing activities: a contingency theory of structure and performance. *Journal of marketing*, 49, 13-25.
- Schein, E. (1990). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schraeder, M., Tears, R.S., & Jordan, M.H., (2005). Organizational culture in public sector organizations: Promoting change through training and leading by example", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 26 Iss: 6, pp.492-502-
- Schwenk, C. R. (1990). Strategic Decision Making. *Journal of Management*, 21 (3): 471-493.
- Srivastava, A.K. & Krishna, A. (1992). Employees' Job Involvement and Mental Health in Public and Private Sector Organizations: A Comparative Study. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 28 (1): 62-70.
- Sung, T.K. (2008). Competitive advantage of IT and effects on strategy and structure: knowledge-intensive vs. manufacturing industries. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 41 (3-4): 359-378.
- Tichy, N. M., Hornstein, H. A., & Nisberg, J. N. (1977). Organization diagnosis and intervention strategies: Developing emergent pragmatic theories of change. In W. W. Burke (Ed.),

Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations

Current Issue and Strategies in Organization Development (pp. 361-383). New York, NY: Human Sciences Press.

- Tosti, D. & Herbst, S.A. (2009). Organizational Performance and Customer Value. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 29 (3 & 4): 294-314.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989). Strategic orientation of business enterprises: the contact, Dimensionality, and measurement. *Management Science*, 35: 942-962.
- Venkatraman, N., & Prescott, J.E. (1990). Environment strategy co-alignment: an Empirical test of its performance implications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11 (1)-23.
- Walker, Jr. O.C. & Ruekert, R.W. (1987). Marketing's Role in the Implementation of Business Strategies: A Critical Review and Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Marketing* (Summer 1987), p. 15-33.
- Wu, Y. (2007). Service sector growth in China and India: a comparison. *China: An International Journal*, March, 2007 http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_7070/is_1_5/ai_n28440958/
- Yu, X. & He, J. (2007). A Study on Organizational Structures. *International Journal of Business and Management*, December, 2007.

How to cite this article: S Samantaray (2017), Organisational Diagnosis on Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector Organisations, *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, Issue 2, No. 96, ISSN:2348-5396 (e), ISSN:2349-3429 (p), DIP:18.01.181/20170402, ISBN: 978-1-365-84232-0