

The Impact of the Enterprise Reorganization Process on the Efficiency of Human Resources- Case Study



Bedri Statovci¹, Gentiana Gega^{2*}, Gani Asllani², Simon Grima³

¹ Faculty of Business, University "Haxhi Zeka", Peja 10.000, Kosovo

² Finance Department, Faculty of Law, University "Haxhi Zeka", Peja 10.000, Kosovo

³ Department of Insurance and Risk Management, Faculty of Economics, Management and Accountancy, University of Malta, Msida MSD2080, Malta

Corresponding Author Email: Genitiana.gega@unhz.eu

<https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.180402>

ABSTRACT

Received: 12 November 2022

Accepted: 5 March 2023

Keywords:

*enterprise, reorganisation process,
human resources, banking sector,
performance*

The research aims to analyse the importance of the reorganisation process on the efficiency of human resources. The company cannot develop a successful business if it does not manage the reorganisation process effectively. Also, the importance of this topic consists of the role of the human resources department as the main carrier and developer of the efficiency of organisations and institutions. In addition to the theoretical side, the paper also has a practical side realised through research in the banking sector in Kosovo. The research was carried out using the questionnaire to collect primary data through which the raised hypotheses were tested. The collected data were coded in the SPSS program through which the necessary results were reached. Through the analysis of this research, we expect to get some positive results which can tell us that the reorganisation process positively impacts the efficiency of human resources. The findings and recommendations will firstly help the organisations participating in the research in improving the reorganisation process as well as in increasing the efficiency of human resources even wider. This scientific paper presents actual and consistent results about the relevant conclusions. It contributes to the knowledge of reorganisation processes and his importance at the company.

1. INTRODUCTION

Human resources in an enterprise or institution have the main role in performance, increasing efficiency and contributing to achieving certain objectives. The reorganisation is a process of implementing major changes in the organisational structure that include reducing the number of management levels and changing organisational components by transposing activities, even reducing the number of employees in the enterprise. The reorganisation is done for organisations to increase the quality of their products and services, create closeness with customers, reduce costs, and use the latest technologies. Rapid multidimensional and technological changes create new business needs, forcing businesses to reorganise their structure, accept new work and production techniques, and implement all modern business and personnel principles [1]. According to Laci, the departments subject to a reorganisation are production, marketing, sales, human resources, and logistics [2]. It is thought that these departments provide added value for an organisation which is the object of reorganisation. The human resources department is very important for any organisation that wants to carry out the reorganisation process. In the newly reorganised structures of the enterprise, it was observed that the human resources department was first reorganised, and the human resources processes were reorganised down to the smallest details. Therefore, the best way to understand the reorganisation of human resources depends on the proper

understanding of the reason for the existence of this department [3]. Sometimes the lack of operational responsibility in the management of a group can send the organisation into unjustified reorganisation. The structural reorganisation is often an attractive way, sometimes the only way for the group manager to show his skills and impress people in the organisation and improve the organisation's state [4]. Moving people to different positions is a good process for making any enterprise change. However, the main purpose of the reorganisation should be to promote the enterprise's success by reducing costs and improving the efficiency of human resources. Permanent reorganisation reflects an organisational change strategy to deal with the unforeseen turbulence of dynamic environments [5]. There are internal and external factors that cause the reorganisation of human resources. According to Kume, changes in the business strategy and ways of doing work, the existence or non-existence of candidates with the right characteristics for the labour market, the level of the current workforce, technological developments, practices and the structure of human resources of competitive enterprises, entering the markets of new, economic developments, changes in legislation, changes in employee expectations, expectations for cost reduction, sales and purchases between organisations (mergers), the influence that the human resources process is analysed especially compared to other departments of the organisation [6]. In addition to the good sides, the process of reorganisation can cause unintended and unexpected negative

effects detrimental to the quality of work and organisational effectiveness, thus questioning organisational sustainability [7].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Most company owners emphasise that people are the main key to the success achieved by their companies and even emphasise that people should be treated as human beings and not as things. Human resources have been and are always critical for the success of any enterprise. According to E. Kutllovci, human resources were initially considered an expense. Now they are considered a resource, and more are being called human capital. Human capital represents the human factor in business, the combined intelligence, skills and experience that gives the business its distinctive character. The enterprise's human resources represent the knowledge, ability and skill to work in addition to the realisation of the enterprise's objectives [8]. The modern company's success cannot be achieved without suitable human resources who have knowledge, skills and personal characteristics in the company's activity, business goals and market requirements [9]. The main and most valuable tools for enterprise management are people who, working within it, contribute individually and collectively to achieving set goals [10]. Human resources can provide a competitive advantage to businesses as long as they are unique and cannot be copied or replaced by competing enterprises. And here, it is not just about the behaviour of human resources but about the skills, knowledge, attitudes and competencies that support this and have a more lasting impact on long-term survival than the actual behaviour [11]. According to Ramosaj [12], some problems faced by human resources are the protection and health of employees, human values, retirement and replacement of employees. Human resources contribute to increasing organisational performance by providing knowledge on performance issues that affect the enterprise and its employees [13]. The role of human resources is seen as business-oriented - thereby contributing to achieving sustainable competitive advantage. Human resources can become a valuable strategic partner that helps the company achieve its goals [14]. The problem of human resources and their influence on the firm's strategy is difficult to see. It is the very quality that made it also a main source of sustainable competitive potential. However, to realise this potential, human resource managers must understand the firm's strategy, i.e. its plan for developing and maintaining a market advantage [5]. Human resources can create value and influence organisational outcomes in some organisations more than others [15]. Human resources can and should be a special part of any organisation, which means looking at people and their talents as an opportunity to create greater organisational competitive advantages [16]. This is why human resources in many companies have recognised the need to change even more to overcome negative images [12]. Employees are the necessary resources that businesses use to meet important business objectives. Having talented individuals employed in a company is the cornerstone of developing a competitive advantage [17]. The human resources department develops and coordinates policies that enable people to make meaningful contributions at work. Developing sound human resources activities can enhance the company's reputation as a desirable workplace. Human resources are the most important

asset and have the main role in any small, medium or large enterprise [18]. How effectively we will use these employees depends on the quality of the human resources program.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology uses primary and secondary sources to analyse comparative data. Besides the theoretical review of international and local literature and scientific articles related to this topic, the paper focuses on practical research based on primary data collected through the prepared questionnaire. As a purposive sample, the analysis of Kosovo's banking sector was taken; from a total of 11 commercial banks that were found, we chose to analyse how the reorganisation process affects the efficiency of human resources in TEB bank and Procredit as two of the most important banks. The data we collected will be analysed using the SPSS program using statistical analysis.

3.1 Research questions

1. Do internal and external factors influence the reorganisation of the organisation?
2. Does reorganisation have the effect of creating a new organisational climate?
3. Can the reorganisation of the human resources department be an added value for the business?

3.2 Hypotheses

1. *H_{A0}*: Internal and external factors do not influence the organisation's reorganisation.
2. *H_{A1}*: Internal and external factors have an impact on the reorganisation of the organisation.
3. *H_{B0}*: Reorganisation does not affect creating a new organisational climate.
4. *H_{B1}*: Reorganisation has the effect of creating a new organisational climate.
5. *H_{C0}*: The reorganisation of the human resources department does not affect the addition of business value.
6. *H_{C1}*: The reorganisation of the human resources department affects the addition of business value.

4. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

The key point of the paper emphasises the relationship that exists between the reorganisation process and the efficiency of human resources, or simply said, whether the reorganisation process that is carried out in the organisation affects or does not increase the efficiency of human resources. The work's methodology begins with preparing a questionnaire which was used as a research instrument, containing 25 questions in total. All questions are structured with the possibility of choosing an alternative. The questionnaires were sent to the banking sector in Kosovo electronically. After collecting data from the respondents, data analysis, comparison and verification of hypotheses were made with the help of the SPSS program. The population of this paper consists of the banking sector in Kosovo. According to the data from the Central Bank of Kosovo, there are a total of 11 commercial banks Procredit Bank, Raiffeisen Bank, Nlb Bank, Banka per Biznes, TEB

Sh.a, Banka Ekonomike, Banka Kombëtare Tregtare, Komercijalna Banka ad Beograd, Turkiye is Bankasi, Turkiye Cumhuriyeti Ziraat Bankasi, Banka Credins Kosovë Co. While as a sample we have selected ProCredit Bank and TEB SH.A. Out of 750 employees in both banks, 75 of them will be included in the questionnaire, 50 from TEB bank and 25 from ProCredit [19]. First, from the size of the population, we determined the size of the sample and based on the comparison, we calculated the margin of error. From the formula used, the number of respondents who answered the questionnaire was sufficient to analyse and interpret the data. The formula for calculating the margin of error [20-24]:

$$ME=Z\sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}} \quad (1)$$

where, n =sample size, z =confidence level according to the standard normal distribution (for a 95% confidence level, $z=1.96$), p =estimated percentage of the population.

$$ME=Z\sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}=1.96\sqrt{\frac{0.04(1-0.04)}{76}}=0.05 \quad (2)$$

A margin of error indicates by what percentage our results will differ from the true population value, where in our case, the results differ by 5%.

The following formula was used to calculate the sample:

$$n=\frac{\frac{z^2 * p(1-p)}{e^2}}{1+\left(\frac{z^2 * p(1-p)}{e^2 * N}\right)} \quad (3)$$

where, n =sample size, z =confidence level according to the standard normal distribution (for a confidence level of 95%, $z=1.96$), p =estimated percentage of the population, e =tolerable margin of error, N =population size.

$$n=\frac{\frac{z^2 * p(1-p)}{e^2}}{1+\left(\frac{z^2 * p(1-p)}{e^2 * N}\right)}=\frac{\frac{1.96^2 * 0.04(1-0.04)}{0.05^2}}{1+\left(\frac{1.96^2 * 0.04(1-0.04)}{0.05^2 * 750}\right)}=64 \quad (4)$$

Based on our case, the confidence level is 95%, the population size is 750, and the error rate represents the standard deviation rate of 5%. According to the formula, the adequate number of the sample turned out to be 64 respondents, while we managed to include 76 respondents, which is considered sufficient for the analysis and interpretation of the results obtained from the questionnaire.

4.1 Analyses of the results

Table 1 shows the demographic data of the participants

Table 3. The impact of reorganisation and its effects on creating an organisational climate

Questioner	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Has any organisational analysis been done for the reorganisation?				
Yes	34	44.7	44.7	44.7
No	4	5.3	5.3	50.0
I do not know	38	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
2. The aspect of the legal environment in the reorganisation of the company				
Very happy	19	25.0	25.0	25.0
Relatively	27	35.5	35.5	60.5
On the average	20	26.3	26.3	86.8

while Tables 2 to 4 show the questionnaire and the statistics of the responses.

Table 1. Demographic data for the respondent

Questioner	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Gender of respondents				
Female	44	57.9	57.9	57.9
Male	32	42.1	42.1	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
2. Age				
18-25	34	44.7	44.7	44.7
26-35	30	39.5	39.5	84.2
36-45	12	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
3. The status of the respondents				
Single	45	59.2	59.2	59.2
Married	31	40.8	40.8	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
4. Professional Education				
Bachelor	38	50.0	50.0	50.0
Master	38	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100	
5. Experience				
Less than one year	24	31.6	31.6	31.6
1-5 years	36	47.4	47.4	78.9
6-10 years	10	13.2	13.2	92.1
Over10 years	6	7.9	7.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
6. Position				
Staff	64	84.2	84.2	84.2
Manager	12	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

Table 2. Internal and external factors of reorganisation

Questioner	Responses N	Percent	Percent of Cases
1. The most influential internal factor			
Organisational structure	45	30.6%	70.3%
Organisational culture	37	25.2%	57.8%
Organisational resources	44	29.9%	68.8%
Size of the company	21	14.3%	32.8%
Total	147	100.0%	229.7%
2. The most influential external factor			
Economic factors	47	24.9%	72.3%
Political-legal factors	43	22.8%	66.2%
Socio-cultural factors	24	12.7%	36.9%
Technological factors	51	27.0%	78.5%
Educational factors and human capital	24	12.7%	36.9%
Total	189	100.0%	290.8%

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

In small measure	7	9.2	9.2	96.1
None	3	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
3. Are you satisfied with the way performance reviews are done?				
Very satisfied	24	31.6	31.6	31.6
Relatively satisfied	26	34.2	34.2	65.8
Averagely satisfied	16	21.1	21.1	86.8
A little satisfied	6	7.9	7.9	94.7
Not at all satisfied	4	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
4. Are you satisfied with the culture of teamwork and cooperation?				
Very satisfied	24	31.6	31.6	31.6
Relatively satisfied	26	34.2	34.2	65.8
Averagely satisfied	15	19.7	19.7	85.5
A little satisfied	7	9.2	9.2	94.7
Not at all satisfied	4	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
5. Does your manager share decision-making power with you?				
Yes, it considers our ideas	58	76.3	76.3	76.3
Yes, it consults with us but does not take into account our suggestions	15	19.7	19.7	96.1
No, he makes all the decisions by himself	3	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
6. Does reorganisation help prevent excessive monotony in performing routine tasks?				
Very	11	14.5	14.5	14.5
Relatively	22	28.9	28.9	43.4
On the average	26	34.2	34.2	77.6
Slightly	12	15.8	15.8	93.4
Nothing	5	6.6	6.6	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
7. Do other employees inspire you to do your best work?				
Very	18	23.7	23.7	23.7
Relatively	25	32.9	32.9	56.6
On the average	20	26.3	26.3	82.9
Slightly	10	13.2	13.2	96.1
Nothing	3	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
8. Does your company value and provide opportunities for conflict change?				
Very	11	14.5	14.5	14.5
Relatively	19	25.0	25.0	39.5
On the average	25	32.9	32.9	72.4
Few	17	22.4	22.4	94.7
Not at all	4	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
9. Has the application of technology-facilitated the achievement of effective company results?				
Very	27	35.5	35.5	35.5
Relatively	27	35.5	35.5	71.1
On the average	14	18.4	18.4	89.5
Few	6	7.9	7.9	97.4
Not at all	2	2.6	2.6	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
10. How often does the company provide opportunities for socialisation among workers, such as training?				
Frequently	52	68.4	68.4	68.4
Rarely	24	31.6	31.6	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

Table 4. The reorganisation of the human resources department can be an added value for the business

Questioner	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Does the reorganisation affect the efficiency of human resources?				
Very	24	31.6	31.6	31.6
Relatively	28	36.8	36.8	68.4
On the average	15	19.7	19.7	88.2
Few	6	7.9	7.9	96.1
Not at all	3	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
2. How satisfied are you as an employee of the company with the results of the reorganisation process?				
Very	24	31.6	31.6	31.6
Relatively	26	34.2	34.2	65.8
On the average	17	22.4	22.4	88.2

Few	5	6.6	6.6	94.7
Not at all	4	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
3. How successful has the company historically been in implementing the reorganisation process?				
Very successful	21	27.6	27.6	27.6
Relatively	24	31.6	31.6	59.2
On the average	21	27.6	27.6	86.8
A little successful	7	9.2	9.2	96.1
Not at all	3	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
4. Has the reorganisation process affected the organisation to meet its goals?				
Very successful	22	28.9	28.9	28.9
Relatively	25	32.9	32.9	61.8
On the average	19	25.0	25.0	86.8
A little successful	7	9.2	9.2	96.1
Not at all	3	3.9	3.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
5. How do you evaluate the organisation after implementing the reorganisation process in the following situations?				
Agree	40	52.6	52.6	52.6
I partially agree	30	39.5	39.5	92.1
I do not agree	6	7.9	7.9	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
6. The situation of revenue growth after the reorganisation process				
Agree	28	36.8	36.8	36.8
I partially agree	41	53.9	53.9	90.8
I do not agree	7	9.2	9.2	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	
7. How would you go about making a reorganisation that works?				
I would consider what is in the best interest of the company and the majority of human resources	8	10.5	10.5	10.5
To be considered more ideas of the staff	13	17.1	17.1	27.6
Be delegating from the manager to the staff and considering the ideas of the staff since they are in contact with the customer	6	7.9	7.9	35.5
Talking with the staff about innovations in work and socialisation so that the work is more effective	4	5.3	5.3	40.8
Based on requests and needs	3	3.9	3.9	44.7
I would have changed the work environment, substitution of staff from one branch to another and changed positions	6	7.9	7.9	52.6
I consult more with the employees	5	6.6	6.6	59.2
There must be inclusiveness in decision-making	2	2.6	2.6	61.8
In the same way	16	21.1	21.1	82.9
Other	13	17.1	17.1	100.0
Total	76	100.0	100.0	

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

5. DISCUSSION

From the statistical interpretation of the data referred to in the tables, we can derive the results that test which the presented hypotheses and provide answers to the research questions. In the research question "How much has the aspect of the legal environment influenced the redefinition or reorganisation of your company?" which shows the extent of the influence of one of the external factors, the results show that these factors have had an impact on the reorganisation of human resources.

H_{A0}: Internal and external factors do not influence the organisation's reorganisation.

H_{A1}: Internal and external factors have an impact on the reorganisation of the organisation.

1. The result obtained from the T-test shows that the alternative hypothesis is accepted while the basic one is rejected because $\alpha=0.005$ and $0.005<0.05$.
2. T-test, based on the Table 5, we notice that the

assumed test statistic with equal variances is $t=0.989$, while the non-assumed test statistic is 0.875.

3. *df*- represents the degrees of freedom, where the assumed degrees of freedom are $df=39$, while the non-assumed ones are 20,371. As well as at the end, the confidence interval of the difference is presented, which completes the results of the significance test.

We also have the result from Chi-Square Tests (Table 6), taking into account the fact for the Chi-Square test that the Pearson Chi-Square value must be greater than 0.05 so that the null hypothesis is accepted. Otherwise, the alternative one is accepted. In our case, $\alpha=0.000$ and $0.000<0.05$, then as a result, we conclude that the null hypothesis is not accepted, but the alternative one is accepted, which means that internal and external factors have an impact on the reorganisation of the organisation. In this case, the statistical value of the test is 131.470.

Table 5. The first hypothesis

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
How much has the aspect of the legal environment influenced the redefinition of your company:	Equal variances assumed	8.805	.005	-.989	39	.329	-.246	.249	-.750	.257
	Equal variances not assumed			-.875	20.37	.392	-.246	.281	-.833	.340

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

Table 6. First hypothesis

Chi-Square Tests -				
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	131.470 ^a	16	.000	
Likelihood Ratio	76.765	16	.000	
Linear-by-Linear Association	37.685	1	.000	
No of Valid Cases	76			

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

In the second research question, does the reorganisation affect the creation of a new organisational climate? After testing the basic hypothesis and the alternative one, we obtained these results:

H₀: Reorganisation does not affect creating a new organisational climate.

H₁: Reorganisation has the effect of creating a new organisational climate.

1. The Table 7 shows that the statistical assumed with equal variances is $t=6.385$, while the statistical test not assumed is $t=5.673$.
2. Whereas the assumed degrees of freedom are $df=74$ while the non-assumed ones are $df=34,495$. As well as at the very end, the confidence interval of the difference is presented, which completes the results of the significance test.

3. The T-test result shows that the alternative hypothesis is accepted while the basic one is rejected because $\alpha=0.018$ and $0.018 < 0.05$. So, it is proven that the reorganisation affects the creation of a new organisational climate.

The value of the test statistic, according to the table below, is 35.760. We also have the result from Chi-Square Tests (Table 8), taking into account the fact for the Chi-Square test that the Pearson Chi-Square value must be greater than 0.05 so that the null hypothesis is accepted. Otherwise, the alternative one is accepted. In our case, $\alpha=0.000$ and $0.000 < 0.05$, then as a result, we conclude that the null hypothesis is not accepted, but the alternative one is accepted, which means that the reorganisation affects the creation of a new organisational climate.

Table 7. The second hypothesis

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Do other employees inspire you to do your best work:	Equal variances assumed	5.890	.018	-6.385	74	.000	-1.413	.221	-1.855	-.972
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.673	34.495	.000	-1.413	.249	-1.920	-.907

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

Table 8. Second Hypothesis

Chi-Square Tests-				
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	35.760 ^a	4	.000	
Likelihood Ratio	39.558	4	.000	
Linear-by-Linear Association	26.642	1	.000	
No of Valid Cases	76			

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

In the third research question, "Can the reorganisation of the human resources department be an added value for the business" after testing the hypotheses, we can derive the following results:

H0: The reorganisation of the human resources department does not affect the addition of business value.

H1: The reorganisation of the human resources department affects the addition of business value.

Based again on the rule for the Chi-Square test (Table 10), we see that in our case, $\alpha=0.000$ and $0.000<0.05$. Then, as a result, we conclude that the null hypothesis is not accepted, but the alternative is accepted, which means that the reorganisation of the human resources department in adding of business value.

1. The result obtained from the T-test shows that the basic hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted because $\alpha=0.015$ and $0.015<0.05$. As a result, we can conclude that the reorganisation of the human resources department affects the increase in business value.
2. Table 9 shows that the statistical test assumed with equal variances is $t=5.269$, while the statistical test not assumed (alternative) is $t=5.097$.
3. While the assumed degrees of freedom are $df=39$, while the non-assumed ones are $df=29.224$. As well as at the very end, the confidence interval of the difference is presented, which completes the results of the significance test.

Table 9. The third hypothesis

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Did the reorganisation affect the efficiency of human resources:	Equal variances assumed	6.090	.015	-5.269	39	.000	-.990	.188	-1.371	-.610
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.097	29.224	.000	-.990	.194	-1.388	-.593

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

Table 10. Third Hypothesis

	Chi-Square Tests		
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	166.609 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	90.054	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	47.082	1	.000
No of Valid Cases	76		

Source: Data extracted from questionnaires

6. CONCLUSIONS

From this research, we can conclude that internal and external factors influence the organisation's reorganisation process. These results were obtained by T-test and Chi-Square, according to $\alpha=0.005$ and $0.005<0.05$. After testing the second hypothesis that the reorganisation process affects the creation of a new organisational climate, it turns out that in the banking sector in Kosovo, the reorganisation process succeeds in creating a new organisational climate because of $\alpha=0.018$ and $0.018<0.05$. The results from the study of the third hypothesis show that the reorganisation of the human resources department affects the addition of business value. The T-test confirms this hypothesis and Chi-Square, which results in acceptance of the alternative hypothesis because $\alpha=0.015$ and $0.015<0.05$. The organisational analysis enables companies to understand how much the company needs to reorganise and in which department it needs it most, enabling them to improve the quality of the service they offer, organise the workload, and become as transparent as possible. We can also conclude that companies in the banking sector in Kosovo attach importance to the decision-making process and see it as a determining factor in the success or failure of their business.

6.1 Recommendations

Reorganisation can be implemented in different ways and can have different effects from one organisation to another. Therefore, it is recommended for all companies, regardless of their size, activity and profit, that:

1. Work plan to be adapted to the size of the organisation, its scope and available resources. This will affect the reduction of costs, more effective implementation of decisions, and opportunities for more professional development of employees.
2. The company's efforts for reorganisation must be tailored to improve organisational and people's performance in these organisations.
3. The organisational climate should be as well organised as possible because if it is not at the right level, it is the main factor of employee dissatisfaction.
4. The organisation should focus more than just on the realisation of the reorganisation process to have greater efficiency of human resources.
5. Information technology should be used as much as possible within human resources functions to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of human resources, which simultaneously affects the reduction

of time and costs. It also facilitates the distribution of information within the organisation.

6. More attention should be paid to the technological factor as one of the external factors with the greatest impact on influencing the organisation so that it can be reacted in time. The reorganisation of internal and external operations, as well as the change of structure, must be evaluated continuously so that there are optimal benefits for the company's performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amoako, R., Jiang, Y., Frempong, M.F., Tetteh, S., Adu-Yeboah, S.S. (2022). Examining the effect of organizational leadership, organizational structure, and employee technological capability on the success of electronic human resource management. *SAGE Open*, 12(2): 21582440221088852. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221088852>
- [2] Llaci, S.H. (2008). *Management*. Tirana. Publisher: "Alb Paper".
- [3] Kutlovci, E.A. (2014). *Human resource management - (Strategic approach)*. Pristina.
- [4] Karlof, B., Lovingsson, F. (2007). *Reorganisation*. Springer. Springer.
- [5] Becker, B.E., Huselid, M.A., Huselid, M.A., Ulrich, D. (2001). *The HR scorecard: Linking people, strategy, and performance*. Harvard Business Press.
- [6] Kume, V. (2004). *Strategic management*. Tirana. Publisher: "Pegi". Edition: 3rd edition.
- [7] Grant, A.M., Campbell, E.M. (2007). Doing good, doing harm, being well and burning out: The interactions of perceived prosocial and antisocial impact in service work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(4): 665-691. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X169553>
- [8] Garavan, T.N. (2007). A strategic perspective on human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(1): 11-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422306294492>
- [9] Çalişkan, E.N. (2010). The impact of strategic human resource management on organizational performance. *Journal of Naval Sciences and Engineering*, 6(2): 100-116. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jnse/issue/9992/123483>
- [10] Armstrong, M., Taylor, S. (2014). *Human resource management practice*. 13th edition. ISBN 9780749469641.
- [11] Torrington, D., Hall, L., Taylor, S. (2008). *Human resource management*.
- [12] Jackson, J., Mathis, L.R. (2010). *Human Resource Management*. 13th edition.
- [13] Brandl, J., Pohler, D. (2010). The human resource department's role and conditions that affect its development: Explanations from Austrian CEOs. *Human Resource Management*, 49(6): 1025-1046. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20392>. P.4
- [14] Bowen, D.E., Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM–firm performance linkages: The role of the “strength” of the HRM system. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2): 203-221. <http://doi.org/10.2307/20159029>
- [15] Jiang, K., Lepak, D.P., Hu, J., Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6): 1264-1294. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0088>
- [16] Jainh61, D.M. (2021). A comparison of nationalized and private banks' strategic human resource management practices. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(3): 711. <https://doi.org/10.47750/cibg.2021.27.03.098>
- [17] Mathis, L.R., Jackson, H.J., Valentine, R.S., Meglich, A.P. (2017). *Human Resource Management*. 15th Edition.
- [18] Laitinen, E.K. (2011). Effect of reorganization actions on the financial performance of small entrepreneurial distressed firms. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 7(1): 57-95. <https://doi.org/10.1108/18325911111125540>
- [19] Central Bank of Kosovo. (2022). <https://bqk-kos.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07.Lista-e-institucuneve-financiare-20.07.2022.pdf>.
- [20] Adam, A.M. (2020). Sample size determination in survey research. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 26(5): 90-97. <http://doi.org/10.9734/JSRR/2020/v26i530263>
- [21] Armstrong, M. (1999). *Human resource management practice*. BBM. Seventh Edition. British Library.
- [22] Becke, G. (2014). *Mindful Change in Times of Permanent Reorganization*. Berlin, Germany.
- [23] Ramosaj, B. (2013). *Management, Fundamentals of Management*. University of Prishtina, Prishtina.
- [24] Voca, Z., Havolli, Y. (2019). The impact of human resources development on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) performance. *Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 2(2): 45. <https://doi.org/10.30560/jems.v2n2p45>