

ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE INTERNAL FACTORS AND ENVIRONMENT

Dr.Kerbouche Mohammed

*Assistant professor
Laboratory of SME Research &Innovation
University of Mascara. Algeria.*

Dr.Bouhelal Fatima

*Assistant professor
Laboratory of SME Research &Innovation
University of Mascara. Algeria.*

Dr.Belmimoun Abdennour

*Assistant professor
Laboratory of SME Research &Innovation
University of Mascara. Algeria.*

Abstract

The purpose of the research is to study the impact of the fit among strategy, organizational structure and environment on organizational effectiveness of Algerian organizations, from the perspective of its managers. this study is complementary to Kerbouche.M & Bouhelal.F (2017) study. Questionnaire has distributed on a set of organizations consisting of 73 medium and large enterprises. The results indicated that the fit among the strategy, the organizational structure and the environment has produced an impact on the organizational effectiveness of the Algerian organizations where these organizations use formal structures , and analyst strategy that works in two types of business, relatively stable production and variable production, it is therefore suitable for both stable and dynamic environments Milles & Snow (1978), even in a competitive environment. After extracting the fit equation, we tested the hypothesis using simple regression equation. We found that there is an impact of fit on the effectiveness of the Algerian organizations under study.

Keywords: strategy, organizational structure, environment.

Introduction

Under environmental uncertainty arising from changes such as rapid globalization, volatile customer expectations, and escalating competition. The field has opened for organizations to local and foreign competition, prompting the managers of these organizations to reconfigure their organizations and develop new skills to meet market demands (Kshetri, 2009), Eun Jin Hwang, Marjorie J. T. Norton, (2014).

This raises questions about the relationship among the organization's strategy, organizational structure and the environment in which it is active. The present study deals the nature of the relationship among these variables. Our goal was to determine the value of the fit between the strategy, the organizational structure and the environment, and then study the impact of this fit on the organizational effectiveness of a set of Algerian institutions.

A previous study was conducted about fit between the strategy and organizational structure and the results showed that Algerian institutions with fit produced higher levels of performance than other institutions without fit Kerbouche.M & Bouhelal.F (2017). The current study deals with fit among strategy, organizational structure and the environment through the following problematic:

Does the fit among strategic choice, organizational structure and environment affect the effectiveness of Algerian economic institutions?

Literature review

In light of the concepts and approaches that were brought by the contingency theory which is based on the principle that there is no ideal and unified path in managing the organizations,

this study was bringing to shed light on the relationship between (strategy/structure) and , Where found three conflicting approaches between them, in which the first stream ensured that the strategy affects the structure, each change in strategy is followed by a change in the structure, and therefore emphasized the relationship between strategy and structure, The strategy indicates the structure Chandler, A. D. (1962) Katsanis, C. J. (1998). . Within this context, various strategic choices cannot be effectively implemented within the organizational structures without any change. The second stream emphasized that the structure influences the strategy through Hall and Saias (1979) and Hall and Saias (1979), where they emphasized that the strategy follows the organizational structure, as Fredrickson sees that because of the impact of the structural framework on the formulation of strategic projects, it can be assumed that the strategy follows the structure, This is also confirmed by Miller (1985), who, in contrast to Chandler, assumes that any change in strategic dimensions would be connected with the structural and the environmental variables, and later (Robbins 1999) confirms this stream. (1983) emphasized that the relationship between the strategy and the organizational structure is more complex than the relationship between the dependent and the independent variable. Gersick (1991) and Romanelli and Tushman (1994).

Thus, there is a mutual influence between these two concepts, taking into account internal and external influences, and supporting the idea that the structure leads the strategy and the contrary in different stages of life cycle of the organizations (Gersick (1991) and Romanelli and Tushman (1994).

Within the framework of the fit between the strategy and the organizational structure, Venkatraman and Camillus (1984) identified basic perspectives of compatibility on the basis of whether the following elements are aligned: (1) the internal view of the organization, ie, the alignment between strategy and organizational structure, Implementation of the strategy; (2) the external view of the organization, ie the alignment between the strategy of the organization and its environment, where the focus is on the formulation of the strategy; and (3) the third view is an integrated mix, where the formulation and implementation of the strategy are interactive elements.

The uncertain environment have been argued by traditional contingency theorists , in which they seem to necessitate it, require organic (Burns & stalkers,1961)decentraliged distinguished (Laurance & Lorsh,1967) and intensively intergrated (Galliraith, Lawrence, and Lorsch,1967) structures. In the same vein, authors considered strategies as crucial responses to environments much more than like influencers of environments. They had a determinant tone (child,1972). On the light of the light of this, performance has been taken to be a function of the match between organization and environment without taking into account strategy. In order to obtain such determinism, one tended to establish the influence of strategic choice on environment, and structure(Bourgeois, 1980; Child, 1972; Hrebiniack and Joyce, 1985; Lenz, 1981).

Strategies have been studied by such researchers in which they described them in details(Dess and Davis, 1984; Hambrick, 1983a,1983c, 1985; Hatten, Schendel, and Cooper, 1978, Milller and Friesen, 1986). They have chosen to neglect organizational structure, may be because of the nature of their data, assuring that strategy can lead to a good performance of it suits a firm's environment . In the present research, both can argue that strategy is basically connected to environment as well as structure. A number of these correlations have implications for performance Chandler(1962), Channon(1973), Rumelt(1974) and others studied the correlations between strategy and structure . On the hand, actual features of the two categories ought to advance toward the now common place considerations of diversification as well as divisionalization. In reality, the focal point of the research was emphasized on the strategies of undiversified companies.

At the bottom, in spite of the fact that Hofer(1975), Miles and Snow(1978), Miller and Friesen(1977), Snow and Hrebeniak (1980) described business strategies in detail, their work antedates the theoretical sophisticated strategic nations of Porter (1980). In addition to this, they featured structure employing big and simple scales, they don't want in team to investigate the statistical correlations among strategy, its context and economic efficiency. The work in hand evaluated such relationships taking refined and multi item measures. The current investigation was guided by four major themes. The initial is that strategy has powerful relationships with environment. As proposed the

traditional contingency literature, environment ought to impact strategy (Burns and Stalker, 1961; Dess and Beard, 1984, Hambrick, 1983&1985; Miller and Friesen, 1984, Zaltman, Duncan, and Halbek, 1973). As a typical example, innovation and marketing distinction are compulsory in dynamic as well as uncertain environments (Burns and Stalker, 1961; Porter, 1980). A similar stance has been adopted by industrial economists, stating that industrial structure has an impact on conduct that is to say strategy (Porter, 1980; Scherer, 1980). However, there is also some latitude for a firm to select strategy. Environment can be influenced by strategy leading a company to gravitate toward clients as well as inviting retaliation in kind from competitors (Lenz, 1981). Both causal directions are likely to interact in an iterative, dynamic process. Particular specific niches of an environment are attentively defined by strategy. Also, customer wants and competition challenge include strategic adaptation. Mutual causality is probably the rule; it will be affirmed that performance can be influenced by the matching of strategy and environment; performance can be hurt through a poor match.

Porter's second theme emphasizes on business strategy that will have a deep impact on organizational structure through the coordinative, technical as well as control tasks they entail (Porter, 1980: 40-41). For instance, technocrats are needed by a strategy of innovation well trained¹.

Empirical Study

Selection of the sample

To determine the size of the sample, Roscoe (1975) confirmed that the sample that is larger than 30 units shows ensure to the researcher's many benefits of theory, and within these limits (30-500), it is recommended to use a sample size about 10% of the targeted community (Robin Hill, 1998). Therefore, our sample size will be 80 medium and large institutions of the total of medium and large institutions on the North-West level of Algeria, which includes the following Wilaya: Tlemcen, Oran, Mascara, Relizane, Mostaganem, Sidi Bel Abbès and Ain Temouchent (Collection statistics, 2012).

Our sample consists of seven different samples corresponding to the seven cities mentioned above*. Therefore, the study sample is stratified sample, and it was

¹ Miller, D. (1988). Relating Porter's business strategies to environment and structure: Analysis and performance implications. *Academy of Management journal*, 31(2), 280-308.

* It has been relying on this classification in accordance with the administrative division of the National Bureau of Statistics.

** The sample stratified according to (Claire Durand, 2002) is to choose the part depending on certain characteristics of the community (Sex, region, situation, and age, etc...). According to, (Dussaix et Gros Bras 1994) the stratification is used to reduce the margin of error, and be allowed to monitor the cost.

ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE INTERNAL FACTORS AND ENVIRONMENT

withdrawn in a random simple manner **.We distributed a80 questionnaires based on the proportion of the number of medium and large institutions in each state and we collected only (73), Which represent 91.25% of total questionnaires.

Table 01: The number of questionnaires that was distributed and retrieved

<i>Cities</i>	<i>The number of questionnaires distributed</i>	<i>Number of questionnaires collected</i>	<i>The proportion of the questionnaire collected from each city</i>
<i>Tlemcen</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>90,91</i>
<i>SidiBel Abbes</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>87,50</i>
<i>Mostaganem</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>83,33</i>
<i>Mascara</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>83,33</i>
<i>Oran</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>92,50</i>
<i>Ain Témouchent</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>100,00</i>
<i>Relizane</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>100,00</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>91,25</i>

Source: Prepared by the researcher

The variables of study

To Identify strategic and structural variables that Algerian medium and large enterprises are characterized by, and their impact on organizational effectiveness, we focused on three variables and each variable has a sub-variables as shown in the table (below). To Measure these variables .We found it valuable to use Likert scale five level as follows 1.Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-neutral, 4.Agree, 5.Strongly Agree (James Dean Brown, 2011), (Bertram, 2015), (John M. Linacre, 1999).

Table 02: the study variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>sub-variables</i>
<i>Strategic Choice</i>	<i>Defender Strategy</i>
	<i>Prospector Strategy</i>
	<i>Analyzer Strategy</i>
	<i>Reactor Strategy</i>
<i>Organizational structure</i>	<i>Formalization Degree</i>
	<i>Degree of centralization</i>
	<i>The degree of complexity</i>
<i>Organization effectiveness</i>	<i>Morale</i>

ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE INTERNAL FACTORS AND ENVIRONMENT

<i>Environment</i>	<i>Qualifying workers</i>
	<i>Planning and growth</i>
	<i>Stability and production efficiency</i>
	<i>Market competitiveness</i>

Source: Prepared by the researcher

Reliability analysis

The purpose is to verify the existence of a high degree of internal cohesion for the variables under study, which means, to what extent can these items achieve similar answers if they are used in another period of time (Robert F. DeVellis, 2012).

Their liability parameters incoming in the table (03) accepted in Management and behavioral studies as the minimum acceptable is (0.60) (Mudisk, et al, 1990).

And based on (Eun Jin Hwang, 2005) regarding to (Schuessler, 1971) A good coefficient of reliability is considered to have a Cronbach alpha value greater than (0.60) (Hair et al., 1998: 135), Reliability coefficients estimates between (0.60) and (0.70) represent the minimum acceptable reliability, therefore we found that (Eun Jin Hwang, 2005) identified Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of (0.60) or higher is acceptable in studies (Eun Jin Hwang, 2005).

(Lance et al, 2006), McAllister and Bigley (2002) 'Spector et al. (2002) 'Schilling (2002) 'Considered that good reliability coefficient the one that his value equal or greater than (0.70), and this according to a study made by Nunnally (1978). And confirmed by Rothbard and Edwards (2003) (Rothbard, N. P., & Edwards, J. R. 2003, p713).

Table 03: *Interpretation of reliability test results*

Sub-variables	Cronbach Alpha (current study)	Cronbach-Alpha (previous studies)	Based on previous studies
Defender Strategy	0,929	(0.83)	Nunnally, J. C. 1978)) (Rhys Andrews and all, 2008)
Prospector Strategy	0,935	(0.82)	El Yasseri (2005)
Analyzer Strategy	0,947	(0.954), (0.85)	Venkatraman's 1989, Kerbouche 2014, El yasiri 2005
Reactor Strategy	0,744	(0.66)	(Rhys Andrews and all, 2008)
Formalization Degree	0,775	(0.65)	(Miller & Droegge 1986)

ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE INTERNAL FACTORS AND ENVIRONMENT

Degree of centralization	0,543	(0.82)	(Miller&Droege1986)
The degree of complexity	0,654	(0.85)	(Miller&Droege1986)
Environment	0.79	(0.74)	(Miller&Droege1986)

Source: Prepared by the researcher

Through the table (03) we found that Cronbach Alpha of the current study is compatible with Cronbach Alpha of the previous studies.

An Empirical Study of the strategic choice, organizational structure, and organizational effectiveness

- *Order of importance according to the coefficient of variation of the strategic choice variable*

In order to measure this variable, we chose four dimensions of strategic choice for Milles & Snow (1978) (Prospectors, Defenders, Analyzers, and Reactor.). Table (04) shows the variation coefficients and arrangement strategies.

Table 4: Order of importance according to the coefficient of variation of the strategic choice variable

<i>Strategy</i>	<i>Arithmetic mean</i>	<i>standard deviation</i>	<i>Coefficient of variation</i>	<i>Arrangement</i>
<i>Prospectors</i>	2,107	1,171	0,555	4
<i>Defenders</i>	2,829	1,276	0,451	3
<i>Analyzers</i>	3,591	0,689	0,191	1
<i>Reactor</i>	2,287	0,967	0,422	2

Source: prepared by researchers based on SPSS output20

For the purposes of the order of Importance of strategic choice variables, the coefficient of variation of the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation were taken into account, and Table (04) shows that the strategic analyst was ranked first by a difference factor equal to (0,191). This result can be returned to that Institutions under study adopt this strategic choice (strategic analyst) because it is located between the prospector strategic choice and the defender strategic choice, thus, the institutions are working in two types of business, production relatively stable and production variable, and therefore, it is commensurate with the stable environment and dynamic environment, As well as when the organization adopts this kind of strategic choice, stays very keen, where and before entering into new businesses must ensure their profitability while ensuring its ability to maintain its current market share.

- *Order of importance according to the coefficient of variation of the Organizational Structure variable*

To measure this variable, we were interested by three dimensions of Organizational Structure of Hatch (1997)(Formalize, centralized, complexity).Table (5) shows the variation coefficients and arrangement of structural dimensions.

Table 5: Order of importance according to the coefficient of variation of the organizational structure variable

<i>structural dimensions</i>	<i>Arithmetic mean</i>	<i>standard deviation</i>	<i>Coefficient of variation</i>	<i>of Arrange ment</i>
<i>Formalize</i>	3,931	0,848	0,215	1
<i>Centralized</i>	3,792	1,019	0,268	2
<i>Complexity</i>	2,282	0,973	0,426	3

Source: prepared by researcher based on SPSS20 output

For the purpose of order of importance of the organizational structure variables, the coefficient of variation based on the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation were taken into account, and table (05) shows that the formalize was ranked first by a difference factor equal to the (0,215), in institutions understudy, which shows the paramount importance of this dimension, this result can be returned to the Robbins's (1988) study when he described formalized as the degree of the organization's dependence on the rules and procedures to direct the behavior of employees, and thus, we find that the Algerian institutions under study are based on these laws in order to control the individual's behavior and their works, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the institutions that have been researched are the medium and large-size enterprises, and thus, we find that the latter (size) is associated with a strong positive relationship with Formalization. This confirmation of what came in Hodge & Anthony (1991) study, which indicates that the institutions used the rules and procedures (Bureaucratic form) that are appropriate for such institutions, because of these rules and procedures, the administration can deal with problems of control and coordination that occur due to the increase institution's size. In addition to the environment in which they are active, these institutions, whenever they are more stable, are formal, which is appropriate with the strategic choice (analyst) adopted, they operate in a stable and dynamic environment.

- *study the relationship between the strategic choice (strategic analyst) and organizational structure (formal structure)*

Through what is shown by the coefficient of variation, which is calculated, where it was found that the Algerian organizations follow the strategic analyst with the formal structure, we will study the relationship between these two variables (study of the

relationship between the more strategic dimension prevalent in the Algerian institutions under study and represented in strategic analyst, as well as the more organizational dimension prevalent in the Algerian institutions under study and represented in formal structure), and we will try to study whether there is correlation or not between strategic analyst formal organizational structure, using the Spearman correlation coefficient*, and This according to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis: There is a statistically significant correlation between the strategic analyst and formal structure in the Algerian institution.

In order to verify this hypothesis we use hypotheses tests as follows:

H_0 : There is no correlation between the strategic analyst and formal structure in the Algerian institution.

H_1 : There is a correlation between strategic analyst and formal structure in the Algerian organizations

Where: H_0 : null hypothesis.

H_1 : an alternative hypothesis.

The decision is as follows:

We reject H_0 and accept H_1 when the value probabilistic P-Value is less than 0.05

And Table (06) shows the test results:

Table 6: The relationship between strategic analyst and formal structure

The study variables	Analyzers Strategy	
	Spearman correlation coefficient (r)	Probability value of P-Value
Formal structure	0,237	0,043
Environment	0.735	0.000

Source: prepared by researcher based on SPSS20 output

Through Table (06) we note the existence of a positive correlation relationship between strategic analyst and formal structure and environment, as the value of the correlation coefficient is (0.237), (0.735) respectively, these results can be returned to the fact that organization that follow this strategic dimension (Strategic analyst) is characterized by a set of characteristics, in which they find themselves working routinely and efficiently through formal processes and structures to retain current customers, using this strategic structure with a structure that lies between the organic structure and the automated structure represented in the mixed structure, where the formal is high and the centralized

*The correlation coefficient ranks, and it calculated by the following formula: $r_0 = 1 - (6 \sum d_i^2 / n(n^2 - 1))$.

is low, according to Hatch's(1997) study .Regarding to Venkatraman and Camillus(1984) confirmed that there is a relationship among strategic structure and environment .

We found that the P-Value probability has reached (0,043) (0.000) respective , and this value is lower than the value of moral α which is estimated to (0.05), and therefore we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis which provides for a correlation between the strategy analyst and the formal structure ,the strategy analyst and environment of the Algerian organizations under study.

This confirmation on what is stated in previous studies with regard to the existence of a relationship among strategy, organizational structure and environment regardless of the direction of this relationship, and our result compatible with the findings of each of the: Chandler , A , D (1962) , Miles and Snow (1978), Hall.D.J. and Saias.M .D (1979), Hall.D. J. and Saias.M, .D. (1980), John , B , Miner, (1982), Martin locket and Roger,spear (1983), Miller.D. (1985), Fredickson , James, W (1986), Lex Donaldson (1987), Gersick (1991), Romanelli and Tushman (1994), Constantine J. Katsanis (1998), Robbins,S., and Coulter.M (1999) . Katsanis, C. J. (1998).Miller and Friesen(1977), Snow and Hrebeniak (1980)

Channon(1973), Rumelt(1974) ; Hambrick, 1983a,1983c, 1985; Hatten, Schendel, and Cooper, 1978, Milller and Friesen, 1986.

•*The standard model study the impact of fit (analyzer strategy / formal structure and environment) on organizational effectiveness for Algerian medium and large organizations.*

we will try to build model to examine this relationship:

- The relationship between fit (analyzer strategy / formal structure and environment) and organizational effectiveness.

The model is written by the following form:

$$y_i = a + bF_i \quad i=1,73$$

Where:

y_i : Variable organizational effectiveness of the institution i

F_i : Variable fit among analyzer strategy ,formal structure and environment of the organizations

Taking into account the fact that fit is the result of a linear combination among analyzer strategy , formal structure and environment It writes by the following form:

$$F_i = \alpha X_i + [1 - (\alpha + \beta)]z_i + [1 - (\alpha + \lambda)]w_i \quad i=1,73$$

α : Synthesis coefficient (0 < α < 1)

In order to verifythese models we also use hypotheses test and who writes as follows:

H_0 : null hypothesis.

H_1 : an alternative hypothesis.

The decision is as follows:

We reject H_0 and accept H_1 when the P-Value less than 0.05

We have a table (07) below, that shows the impact of fit among analyzer strategy, the formal structure and environment on the organizational effectiveness.

Table 7: fit among analyzer strategy, the formal structure and environment on the organizational effectiveness.

$$Y_i = 0,006 + 0,168 F_i$$

(0,054) (2,480)

$$R^2 = 0,067 \quad F\text{-Statistic} = 6,151 \quad P(F\text{-Statistic}) = 0,016 \quad DW = 2,266$$

According to the equation above we note that there is a significant impact on organizational effectiveness, by the fit among the analyzer strategy, formal structure and environment which was estimated at (0,168). This confirms the results that came in Study of Lex Donaldson (1987), R. T. Hamilton (1992), Yin, Xiaoli; Zajac, Edward J (2004), Geiger, S.W and all (2006), Where emphasized that fit is linked to a strong correlation with the behavior of the organizations (Performance*, efficiency**, effectiveness***), therefore, fit affect performance, the organizations with fit have a high performance as opposed to organizations without fit kerbouche, M & Bouhelal, F (2017). According to what came in a study N. Venkatraman (1989), R. T. Hamilton (1992), they also confirmed what Chandler (1962) brought in his thesis that the lack of fit between structure and the strategy leads to a lack of administrative efficiency or poor performance, and according to Miles & Snow (1994), the compatibility between the internal and external components such as strategy, structure and environment lead to business efficiency, the impact value of fit had a high effectiveness compared to the lack of fit, this result also reached by Chakravarthy (1982), It was found that the fit between strategic and structure produces high performance, In this regard Mintzberg (1979) confirmed that organizational effectiveness have results when there is a fit

*According to Kaplan & Norton (1992), the concept of performance is synonymous with the concepts of effectiveness and efficiency. According to the Berrah (2002), the performance is the effectiveness of the process and efficiency of use the resources.

**According to (Cohen, E (2000), the efficiency is variable of the effectiveness function variables.

***According to Koys (2001) and K.A. Abston and V.J. Stout, (2006) the performance of organizations corresponds to organizational effectiveness.

between the organization's strategy and structure. This is what was stated in the study (Eun Jin Hwang, 2005).

Conclusion

In our study we highlighted the relationship between the internal factors such as strategy and structure with environment and the extent to which these factors affect organizationaleffectiveness.

The study concluded a set of results as follows:

- The Algerian organization under study attach great importance to the analyst strategy and to the formal structure
 - There is a significant relationship between the environment formal structure and the analyst strategy
- The correlation between the formal structure, the analyst strategy and the environment has a positive and significant impact on organization effectiveness.

References

- Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., Meier, K. J., O'TOOLE, L., & Walker, R. M. (2008). *Strategic Fit and Performance: A Test of the Miles and Snow Model*. Paper presented at the Conference on Organizational Strategy, Structure, and Process: A Reflection on the Research Perspective of Miles and Snow.
- Bertram, D. (2013). Likert Scale is the meaning of life. *Yugoslavia: University of Belgrade. Recuperado de <http://poincare.matf.bg.ac.rs/~kristina/topic-dane-likert.pdf>*.
- Blackburn, R. S. (1982). Dimensions of structure: A review and reappraisal. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), 59-66.
- Blau, P. M., & Schoenherr, R. A. (1971). *The structure of organizations*: Basic Books (AZ).
- Bouhelal, F., & Kerbouche, M. (2016). Why do we consider Miles and Snow s model s one of the most important strategic ones? *Maghreb Review of Economic and Management*, 3(1), 23-34.
- Bourgeois, L. J. (1980). Strategy and environment: A conceptual integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 25-39.
- Brown, J. D. (2011). Likert items and scales of measurement. *Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter*, 15(1), 10-14.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1962). *The Management of Innovation* (London: Tavistock, 1961). *BurnsThe Management of Innovation1961*.
- Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and structure: The history of American industrial enterprise*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.(1977) *the visible hand*, Harvard University press, Cambridge, mass.(1980) *the growth of the transnational industrial firm in the United*

- States and the United Kingdom: A comparative analysis. Economic History Review*, 33, 396-410.
- Channon, D. F. (1973). *The strategy and structure of British enterprise*: Harvard Business School Press.
- Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *sociology*, 6(1), 1-22.
- Child, J. (1974). Managerial and organizational factors associated with company performance part I. *Journal of Management studies*, 11(3), 175-189.
- Daft, R. (2001). *Essentials of organization theory and design*: South Western Educational Publishing.
- Daft, R. (2012). *Organization theory and design*: Nelson Education.
- Davies, S. W., & Lyons, B. R. (1982). Seller concentration: the technological explanation and demand uncertainty. *The Economic Journal*, 92(368), 903-919.
- Dess, G. G., & Beard, D. W. (1984). Dimensions of organizational task environments. *Administrative science quarterly*, 52-73.
- Dess, G. G., & Davis, P. S. (1984). Porter's (1980) generic strategies as determinants of strategic group membership and organizational performance. *Academy of Management journal*, 27(3), 467-488.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26): Sage publications.
- Downey, H. K., Hellriegel, D., & Slocum Jr, J. W. (1975). Environmental uncertainty: The construct and its application. *Administrative science quarterly*, 613-629.
- Ford, J. D. (1979). Institutional versus questionnaire measures of organizational structure: a reexamination. *Academy of Management journal*, 22(3), 601-610.
- Galbraith, J. R. (1973). *Designing complex organizations*: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc.
- Geiger, S. W., Ritchie, W. J., & Marlin, D. (2006). Strategy/structure fit and firm performance. *Organization Development Journal*, 24(2), 10.
- Hage, J., & Aiken, M. (1970). *Social change in complex organizations* (Vol. 41): Random House Trade.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1983a). An empirical typology of mature industrial-product environments. *Academy of Management journal*, 26(2), 213-230.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1983b). High profit strategies in mature capital goods industries: A contingency approach. *Academy of Management journal*, 26(4), 687-707.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1983c). Some tests of the effectiveness and functional attributes of Miles and Snow's strategic types. *Academy of Management journal*, 26(1), 5-26.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1985). Strategies for mature industrial product businesses. *Strategic Management Frontiers*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 320-356.
- Hatch, M. J., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2013). *Organization theory: modern, symbolic and postmodern perspectives*: Oxford university press.
- Hatten, K. J., Schendel, D. E., & Cooper, A. C. (1978). A strategic model of the US brewing industry: 1952-1971. *Academy of Management journal*, 21(4), 592-610.
- Hill, R. (1998). What sample size is "enough" in internet survey research. *Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An electronic journal for the 21st century*, 6(3-4), 1-12.

- Hofer, C. W. (1975). Toward a contingency theory of business strategy. *Academy of Management journal*, 18(4), 784-810.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Joyce, W. F. (1985). Organizational adaptation: Strategic choice and environmental determinism. *Administrative science quarterly*, 336-349.
- Hwang, E. J. (2005). *Strategic Management and Financial Performance in South Korean Apparel Retail Stores*. Virginia Tech.
- Jablin, F. M., & Robichaud, D. (1992). Communication et structure formelle de l'organisation: une revue de la littérature. *Communication et organisation*(2).
- Jones, G. R. (1999). *Organizational theory: text and cases*: Pearson Education India.
- Kerbouche, M., Belmimoun, A., Bouhelal, F., & Imen, K. (2015). The Impact of Organizational Characteristics in Effectiveness (Algerian's Empirical Study of Small and Medium Enterprises). *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 277.
- Kerbouche, M., Bouhelal, F., Belmimoun, A., & Adouka, L. (2017). The Fit between Strategic Choice and Organizational Structure and their Impact on the Effectiveness of the Organization: Study of a Set of Medium and Large Institutions in Algeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 8(1),1-9.
- Koontz, H., & O'donnell, C. (1972). Principles of management: an analysis of managerial functions.
- Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M., & Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria what did they really say? *Organizational research methods*, 9(2), 202-220.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Organization and environment: Managing integration and differentiation. *Irwin, Homewood, IL*.
- Linacre, J. M. (1999). Investigating rating scale category utility. *Journal of outcome measurement*, 3, 103-122.
- Miles, R. E., Snow, C. C., Meyer, A. D., & Coleman, H. J. (1978). Organizational strategy, structure, and process. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(3), 546-562.
- Miller, D. (1988). Relating Porter's business strategies to environment and structure: Analysis and performance implications. *Academy of management Journal*, 31(2), 280-308.
- Robbins, S. P. (1990). Organisation theory: Structure, design and applications. *Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ*.
- Rothbard, N. P., & Edwards, J. R. (2003). Investment in work and family roles: A test of identity and utilitarian motives. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(3), 699-729.