

Competitive Study of Effects about Dimensions of Organizational Structure on Productivity

Mehrdad Goudarzvand Chegini¹, Samin Yousefi², Shabnam Rastad³

¹Associate Professor, Islamic Azad University Rasht branch, Iran

²Ph.D Student of public administration, Islamic Azad University Kerman branch, Iran

³M.A. Student Islamic Azad University Rasht branch, Iran

ABSTRACT

Whereas the term of survival and life constancy is developing of productivity in each organization, and in today disturbance condition, and what influences on developing productivity is organizational structure. Therefore, the object of this study is the significant searching of levels in different levels of dimensions in organizational structure with productivity in public and Islamic Azad universities of Guilan province- Iran. The method of this study is descriptive and analytic and the gathering device of data is questionnaire. Statistical community includes all official and educational managers in different sets of mentioned Universities that among all of them the statistical sample is chosen base on old table, Morgan and Kerjsay table. To validity and reliability test of measuring device, we used the method of content validity and Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. Achieved data of this study showed that there is a significant difference between various levels of organizational structure (contortion, formality and concentration) and productivity in Public University and Islamic Azad universities. Findings suggested that according to significant level of ANOVA, that its measure for all dimension of organizational structure (contortion, formality and concentration) with advantageous is lower than 0.05, we can say "there is a significant difference between various levels of organizational structure with productivity in Public and Islamic Azad Universities.

KEYWORDS: Organizational Structure, Contortion, Formality, Concentration, productivity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, universities in addition of their first function (extending knowledge and research) have wide activities in their objects to create a close relationship with surrounding community. According to this, the possibility of more advantageous of potential capacity and technology should be provided, and what has important function is developing productivity is organizational structure. It is clear that, according to content, dimensional and conditional features that effect on developing organization and in fact what makes difference a creative and efficient organization from other organization, are these organizational elements that is suitable for its place and condition. However, efforts to develop the organizational productivity, according to structure of organization provide the insufficiency exploration of hidden structure and prepare workers to perform better in official affairs. So, create a suitable structure with current condition that conditional changes are continuous, can have more effects on developing productivity. By choosing correct and suitable organizational structure, we can use the more percentage of abilities and expect more productivity (Erfani-Nia, 2004; p 3). Moreover, High Educational Centers as administrators have important function in education of genius and talented students in society and centers that produce new thoughts and knowledge; because future makers in each society educate in these centers and in view of "Mintzberg" the major role player in these organizations are genius people, experts and scholars. In other hand, knowledge is an important function in these organizations and brains are more important than hands and their emphasize is on their mental assets and always understand that genius people can control by satisfying method, not by heading. In these organizations, a culture is done in cooperating and alternative comprehension of universities. Because of these Mintzberg in introducing of various pattern in organizational structure, knows the professional structure suitable for professional people like universities students. (Mintzberg, 1995; p 294). So, the society brains need a situation that allow them to self-discovery, creativity and dehiscence and so organizational structure in High Educational Centers should form in a way to perform its risky mission. According to conditional situation extended responsibility of universities, promotion of advantageous and reforming of structure look important. In this direction, organizational structure in public universities as an experienced university and Islamic Azad university as a new university that has not much experienced have studied to provide a structure with a recognized productivity in university and give suggestion for reforming productivity.

*Corresponding Author: Mehrdad Goudarzvand Chegini, Associate Professor, Islamic Azad University Rasht branch, Iran.
E-mail: goodarzvand@iaurasht.ac.ir

Theoretical frame and History of research

Today, productivity is one of the most important and major issues that all organizations face with it and all organizations benefit of all sources and facilities to gain more advantages. Existing a suitable structure in organization, useful performing method, suitable devices and equipment, stable work situation and the most important, the competency workers are necessary that is take for better productivity. Many elements influence on organizational productivity like as organizational structure factors. The ability of an organization for advantaging knowledge depends on three-knowledge device: its technology, organizational structure and special devices of knowledge (Birkinshaw, 2001). Organizational structures include formal in informal structures. A big part of managing knowledge is in relationship with making easy of natural and alternative reactions among people. Structures can provide physical plan for organizations to facilitate the social and alternative reactions or formal structures in knowledge. This new strategy of structure is as society's activities that refer to a group of people with general interesting and problems and spreads all over the organization (Adhikari, 2010). Organizational structure is a major content in forming organization. The pattern in organizational structure and the plan of relationships and interactions are among the parts of an organization (Cyert & March, 2007). Formal relationship of people, job positions in organizations, availability of frame information, function describing 9the method of performing), defining of jobs, allocation of sources, regulations, following mechanisms and performing regulations, creating unity between activities are the parts of results of creating and planning of organizational structure (Ergenli *et al.*, 2007). A useful organizational structure in working relationship between different factors of organizational develops the facilitation and competency in units of organizations. Therefore, organizations allow people to use individual skills to creativity (Daft, 2009, p 29).

Parameters of organizational structure are the most effecting parameters on competency, because it influences on other parameters. Therefore, if organizational structure afflicted with fault, naturally that organization cannot be effective (Claver *et al.*, 2011).

Organizational dimension categorize to two groups: structural and Content. Structural dimension show the internal features of an organization. They achieve a base that can measure and compare the organizations. Content dimension are introducer of organization position and influence on structural dimension (Daft, 2006). According to study of different theories of scholars managing and organizational science, factors like Strategy, size or largeness of organization, technology and environment (content dimension) determine the type of structure and contortion, formality and concentration (structural dimension) show the major foundation of structure. Contortion is a degree that separates or divides the activities in organization, whereas the more activity in organization have more parts, and be more complex, so the organization have more contortion (Alizadeh, 2007; p 42). In the gross, contortion is the degree of job title (job distribution in organization), number of hierarchy and managing levels, educational degree and the measure of geographical distribution of organizational units. In addition, contortion includes horizontal contortion, vertical contortion and geographical (Gresov & Drazin, 2007). Geographical contortion notices the separation of units' base on geographical position. Vertical contortion refers to the degree of organization levels and levels of managing in organization and horizontal contortion refers to separation and number of jobs in a group or in a same class in an organizational level (March & Simon, 2009). Formality consists of a degree that an organization emphasize on regulations and directions to direct its workers (Alizadeh, 2007; p 42). Formality has two parts: first part is the measure of recording in regulations, manners, and. In organization and second part is the degree that these regulations and directions follow, perform and control (March & Simon, 2009). Third element of organizational structure is concentration. Most of the theorists agree that concentration refers to decision making (financial, human source, program and exceptional cases of organization) in a concentration point. Beside this, side activities of decision-making have been influence (Child, 2008). Concentration is referred to the degree of independence for a job in choosing and making decision. Some of subsets in making decision can form the concentration area and they are consist of determining programs, allocating facilities, attracting sources, donating reward, employment and banishment, evaluating performance, development, setting and allocating finance, availability of information and controlling of process (Mihm *et al.* 2010). Organizations have different types of structure that use in term of necessity and according to condition. In a general classification, the structure of organizations divides to 2 structure, Mechanic structure and organic structure. Mechanical structure is used for stable and predictive environment and organic structure is used for turbulent and changeable environment (Gresov & Drazin, 2007). Organic and mechanical structures are structures that are placed in a spectrum and have more detailed and practical structures. Example of practical structures are based on five parts that presented by Henry Mintzberg. The structural plan of Mintzberg is one of the ideal structures (1979), his review in 1993 is one the most valuable, and common model in analysis of organizational structures plan. The models and frameworks that he introduced as a suitable organizing for organization and institutes, classified in seven pattern and plan (of course in most present papers, there are five organizational plans):

1. Simple organizational structure,
2. Mechanical Bureaucracy structure,
3. Professional Bureaucracy structure,
4. Dividend structure,
5. Adhocracy structure (special expert structure),
6. Missionary structure,
7. Political structure (Drago, 1998).

Mintzberg believe, in each framework, one of the mechanisms has dominance and a special part of organization plays important role. Kinds of practical structures (5 frameworks) and structural and content factors for each structure are shown in table 1.

Table 1. Types of practical structure (5 frameworks) and structural and positional factors in each structure

Ideal Structure	Unity mechanisms	Major part	Planning parameters	Positional factors
Simple	Direct protection	Strategic head	Concentration-organic	Young, small, seeker, turbulent condition of technical system, amateur
Mechanical Bureaucracy	Standardize of work processes	Technical staff	Formality specialty, functional groups, Vertical concentration	Big, old, systematic, non-automatic simple system, environment, Static, outer control
Professional Bureaucracy	Standard of skill	Core of operations	Instruction, horizontal specialty of job, non-concentration	Contortion, static condition, disorder, non-automatic technical system
dividend	Standard of output	Middle line	Bazaar groups, system of practical control, non-concentration of vertical area	Separate parts, old, authoritarianism of middle managers
Adhocracy	Two sides adjustment	Supporting workers or practical core	Seeker relational tools, instruction. Horizontal specialty jobs	Contortion, seeker condition, young

Source: (Mintzberg, 1995; p 432)

Significant increase of human knowledge causes the need of technical skills and developing of industry base on knowledge in organizations that attract professionals to produce goods and services and causes the form of a new type of organizational plan that makes organizations to use experts for performing activities and attains works to standardize the activities. This organizational plan is called Professional Bureaucracy that is the components of standardization with non-concentrate phenomenon. Professional Bureaucracy is as organizational structure that classify with scholars and talented necessity and they can use their creativity power. These types of structures can create the ability of thoughts and creativity of experts with suitable condition and their needs. Universities prosper of elements, organizations include managers, science board, and ... that are interacted with each other to achieve objects. Universities elements, according to the type of power and their existing influence the organizational structure in universities. Science board includes of experts that are occupied production, pragmatic, saving and transferring knowledge (Etzioni, 1964). Generally, these experts emphasize on professional power and want more liberty of work. The members of this foundation know the managers careless in scientific and researching matters and accuse them for emitting orders that threaten the scientific and educational mode of university. On the other hand, managing structure in university emphasizes on formal methods and heirarchy, wants more concentration, and develops the organizational complexity for performing some missions. In addition, managers assert that scientific board does not prosper the necessary skills for programming, controlling, source allocation and analyses of sources and uses, by introducing the managers as professionals. These two control systems not only are separate from each other structure, but also each of them emphasizes on different systems of power and option (same reference). Managers tend to see and integrate of activities in people and groups for using the rewards and punishment power, but science board wants more freedom that is professional. Tendency of concentration and applying legal powers from managers, tendency of specialization for options and decisions have influences on the results of non-concentration among members of science board. This contrast among official and professional culture in universities can decrease the advantageous. In these organizations, a university culture is for cooperating and contrast comprehension. In fact, the organizational culture is a composition of professional and mechanical Bureaucracy for public university and Islamic Azad University. However, according to the results of this research, it seems that mechanical Bureaucracy in public university is overcoming the professional Bureaucracy in terms of complexity, formality and high concentration, whereas the mechanical Bureaucracy in Islamic Azad University is lower than

public university. Therefore, by contemplating that professional Bureaucracy is suitable with organizations like university, the more professional Bureaucracy makes more advantageous.

Creative universities are universities that their major concentration is on creativity and create the skills and abilities in creating and transferring science and combination of this development with creativity (Farhangi & Safarzadeh, 2007). In relationship with this researching issue that performs in and out of country, we mention some of them in below:

In research that performed by Kopelman & Carillo in 2008, with the title “the influence of organizational structure on productivity”, in America, the achieved results showed a clear relationship between the dimension of organizational structure and productivity (Kopelman, 2008). In addition, in a research that has done by Elizabeth in 2002, the relationship has done with “study of organizational structure in terms of complexity and its influence on productivity of organization” and results show the influence of complexity on productivity (Elizabeth, 2002). Gensler in a research that has done in 2005, on senior managers and mediate managers in all parts of organization, conclude that different levels of organizational structure influence on employment, productivity and finally the ability of organization (Barry, 2006). In research that has done by Abass Kolivand by the title “analysis of organizational structure and its influence on productivity of Railway offices” in Tehran university, results show the dimension of organizational structure (Complexity, formality and concentration) influence on productivity (Kolivand, 1998). Kreysing has done a study by the tile “organizational self-government, response and complexity in High education” about these 3 variable and conclude that to fast response of organizations to conditional changes and challenges and also because of more complexity of organizations, the self-government and decentralization should be increase (Kreysing, 2002). “Ogbonna” in his research by the title of “creative operation and organizational structure” resulted that the change of traditional structures to new structures have recognized with new features like development, responsibility, making power, cooperating and participation and destroy the organizational hierarchy (Ogbonna, 2003). In a study, that has done by Simin Abadkhoda about “study the relationship between the features of organizational culture and advantageous in chosen unit of broadcasting in Qom”, results showed that dimension of organizational structure effects on productivity (Abadkhoda, 2008). Hejrati in research by the title of “study of organizational structure in Tarbiyat Modarress University” concluded that the complexity in this university is low and the concentration and formality are high (Hejrati, 1995). In addition, Chitsazan in his study; “review the organizational structure in Jame Kashan University” resulted that complexity of this university and formality is low and concentration is high (Chitsazan, 1996).

Research Hypothesis

Major hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the different levels of dimension in organizational structure and productivity.

Minor hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant difference between the various levels of complexity and organizational productivity.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference between the various levels of formality and organizational productivity.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference between the various levels of concentration and organizational productivity.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

The method of research is descriptive-analytic, statistical community is 110 of official, and educational managers in different sets, in Guilan University and Islamic Azad University of Rasht-Iran that among them 71 managers are from Guilan University and 39 managers are from Islamic Azad university of Rasht. To estimate the statistical sample, 86 people determined by old, Morgan and Kerjsay tables. Collecting device of data is standard questionnaire in this research. Mentioned questionnaire has 40 questions that measure with Likert five-point spectrum. To evaluate the independent variable, it means organizational structure, Robins Questionnaire is used and it contains 1 to 23 questions that the questions 1 to 7 are about complexity, 8 to 13 related to Formality and 14 to 23 are related to concentration of organization. Questions 24 to 40 are for evaluating the dependent variable i.e. productivity. To determine the validity of questionnaire, the method of content validity is used; thus, questionnaires have edited after the evaluation of some professors and experts and after doing necessary changes. To determine the reliability of questionnaire by SPSS software, Cronbach's alpha coefficient has calculated. The value of Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each of dimension in organizational structure (complexity is 0.891; formality is 0.887; concentration is 0.841) and for productivity variable is 0.831, that shows the suitable reliability of evaluation device.

In the method of this research, non-parametric analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Duncan test had used and to analysis the data, SPSS software had applied.

Findings

According to performed tests, the result of data analysis from questionnaire, for each hypothesis is presented in table, separately.

Test of major hypothesis: there is a significant difference between the dimension of various levels in organizational structure and productivity in public and Islamic Azad university of Guilan.

Table 2. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and dimension of organizational structure in Public University

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	6.7201	2	3.360	6.774	0.004
In groups	7.9229	68	0.496		
total	14.64430	70			

Table 3. Duncan test for variable productivity and dimension of organizational structure in Public University

Levels of organizational structure	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	19	2.5677	
Medium	26		2.9922
Low	26		3.0665

Table 4. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and dimensions of organizational structure in Islamic Azad University

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	3.654	2	1.827	6.766	0.006
In groups	4.308	36	0.270		
total	7.962	38			

Table 5. Duncan test for variable productivity and dimensions of organizational structure in Islamic Azad University

Levels of organizational structure	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	10	2.3477	
Medium	14		2.8742
Low	15		3.5057

According to the achieved significant level that is lower than 0.05 for both universities, we can say that with 0.95 reliance, there is a significant difference between the various levels of dimension for organizational structure and productivity in Public University and Islamic Azad University of Guilan. In addition, according to the achieved measures of Duncan test in both universities we are observed that there is a difference between the levels of organizational structure (Low & medium) and high and in level (Medium & low) of organizational structure, the productivity is high.

Test of Hypothesis 1: There is a significant difference between the various levels of complexity and organizational productivity in Public University and Islamic Azad University of Guilan.

Table 6. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and complexity (organization of Public University)

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	5.280	2	2.746	4.638	0.018
In groups	9.358	68	0.592		
total	14.638	70			

Table 7. Duncan test for variable productivity and complexity (organization of Public University)

Levels of complexity	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	15	3.5780	
Medium	30	3.4415	
Low	26	4.2193	

Table 8. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and complexity of organization (Islamic Azad University)

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	2.871	2	1.436	4.515	0.029
In groups	5.089	36	0.318		
total	7.960	38			

Table 9. Duncan test for variable productivity and complexity of organization (Islamic Azad University)

Levels of complexity	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	8	2.6075	
Medium	17	2.6655	
Low	14	3.1993	

According to the significant level for complexity that is lower than 0.05 for both universities, so we can say that with 0.95 reliance, there is a significant difference between the various levels of complexity and productivity for both universities. In addition, according to the achieved measures of Duncan test in Public University, there is a difference between levels of complexity (High & Medium) and low and in low level of complexity the measure of productivity is high. Whereas the results of this test in Islamic Azad University show that, there is difference between the levels of complexity (Low & Medium) and high and in level (medium & low) of complexity, productivity is higher. By considering of Duncan numbers, we can find that the measure of complexity in Public Universities is more than Islamic Azad University.

Test of hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference between the various levels of formality and organizational productivity in Public University and Islamic Azad University.

Table 10. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and organizational formality (Public University)

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	4.950	2	2.863	5.432	0.037
In groups	9.688	68	0.527		
total	14.638	70			

Table 11. Duncan test for variable productivity and organizational formality (Public University)

Levels of formality	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	11	3.4375	
Medium	30	3.5672	
Low	30	4.3024	

Table 12. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and organizational formality (Islamic Azad University)

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	2.692	2	1.557	5.444	0.041
In groups	5.268	36	0.286		
total	7.960	38			

Table 13. Duncan test for variable productivity and organizational formality (Islamic Azad University)

Levels of formality	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	6	2.2797	
Medium	16	2.8712	
Low	17	3.0427	

According to the achieved level of analysis of variance that is lower than 0.05 in both universities, we can say that with 0.95 reliance, there is difference between the levels of formality and productivity in both universities of Guilan. Also, according to the achieved measures of Duncan test in Public University and Islamic Azad University it is shown that there is difference between levels of formality (low & medium) and high; productivity is more in both universities, in levels (medium & low) of formality and the measure of formality in Public University is more than Islamic Azad University.

Test of hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference between the various levels of concentration and organizational productivity in Public University and Islamic Azad University of Guilan.

Table 14. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and organizational concentration (Public University)

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	4.834	2	2.417	3.943	0.025
In groups	9.804	68	0.613		
total	14.638	70			

Table 15. Duncan test for variable productivity and organizational concentration (Public University)

Levels of concentration	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	26	3.4763	
Medium	26		3.1586
Low	19		4.3567

Table 16. Analysis of variance test for variable productivity and organizational concentration (Islamic Azad University)

	Sum of squares	Freedom degree	Mean of squares	F	Significant level
Between groups	2.629	2	1.436	4.515	0.043
In groups	5.331	36	0.318		
total	7.960	38			

Table 17. Duncan test for variable productivity and organizational concentration (Islamic Azad University)

Levels of concentration	Numbers	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
High	14	2.5164	
Medium	15		3.0164
Low	10		3.0839

According to the achieved level of analysis of variance that is lower than 0.05 in both university, we can say that with 0.95 reliance, there is a significant difference between the various levels of concentration and productivity of Public University and Islamic Azad university. Also, according to the achieved measures of Duncan test in Public university, we see that there is difference between levels of concentration (high & medium) and low and the productivity is more in low level; whereas the results of Duncan test in Islamic Azad University show that there is difference between levels (medium & low) and high levels and in levels (medium & low) the productivity is more. Therefore, we can say that according to the Duncan test the concentration variable in each three level of concentration for Public University is more than Islamic Azad University.

Conclusion and Suggestion

This research with a plan of a major hypothesis and three minor hypotheses and by using of descriptive and deductive statistics tries to study the effect of dimension for organizational structure on productivity and compare it in Public University and Islamic Azad University. According to the achieved results of major hypothesis, we can find that by 95% probability there is a significant difference between various levels of dimension in organizational structure and productivity in Public University and Islamic azad University. Also, results of Duncan test in relationship with both universities showed that in low and medium levels of organizational structure the productivity is more and there is a significant difference between low and high levels. Achieved results of hypothesis 1 in minor hypothesis show the significant difference between public University and Islamic Azad university in relationship with the effect of various levels of complexity on productivity. The results of Duncan test for this research showed

that productivity is more in Public University in low level of complexity. Whereas the productivity is more in Azad University in levels (medium & low) of complexity. This is parallel with other results of other research. The number of job title, percentage of educated workers, number of organizational levels, and number of hierarchy levels between director and science board and separate distances from central office are the factors that increase the complexity by increasing them and in conclusion the productivity decreases. Therefore, because of these factors, the difference of various levels of complexity with productivity in both universities is more significant and according to the results of tests, this measure in public university is more than Islamic Azad University. Achieved results of minor hypothesis 2 showed that there is a significant difference between various levels of formality with productivity in both universities. Also, the results of Duncan test in relationship with this hypothesis is shown that by high levels of formality in public and Azad universities, the advantageous is lower. Description of compiled and available job, the following of workers from directions, and the control of operation conforming of members with job standards are the factors that increase the formality. So, according to the more regulations and directions in public university, the formality is more in them and the difference between various levels of formality with advantageous in both universities is significant. The results of minor hypothesis 3 show that there is a significant difference between the levels of concentration and productivity in both universities. The result of Duncan test in relationship with this hypothesis show that for low level of concentration in public university, the advantageous is more and this is in condition that the levels (medium & low) for Azad University, productivity is more. Participation of workers in determining the object, programs, and conferring options are the features that cause decreasing concentration and increase the organizational flexibility. To response, the organizations to changes and challenges and because of increasing the complexity of organizations, the self-government and non-concentration should be increase. Therefore, according to the results, we can say that in public university, the conferring of options is low because of depending to the government and senior managers of organizations are responsible for most of the decisions and important affairs. Therefore, the existing of significant difference between levels of concentration and productivity for both universities is logical. In addition, according to the universities as the active centers that are in relation with other organizations and execution system, so mission, culture, strategy and condition of universities are different from other official systems. Therefore, the structure of universities in public and individual parts need to liberty, response, diagonal (non-hierarchy) culture, long-lasting programs in proportion of executive systems in country and selection and attraction of system that can response to suitable needs base on mission in flat structures (Non-hierarchy). Some suggestions that provide about organizational structure for increasing productivity:

- According to the seeking condition that universities are active in them, it seems flexible and organic structures are more effective because these structures influence on teachers and students creativity and in conclusion increase the productivity.
- As achieved by research results, increasing complexity in organizations causes decreasing in productivity. Therefore, we can decrease the horizontal complexity for increasing advantageous by creating work groups in different jobs and using of creativity. For decreasing vertical complexity, can use human investment instead of human source and by enriching jobs can decrease vertical complexity. To decrease geographical complexity can use conferring options for affairs that have more committing. Whereas more complexity causes problems about harmony, communications and control, so it is suggested that university directors collect the necessary information by suitable using of information technology and control the organizational activities more precious.
- According to the results, we found that whatever the formality is lower, productivity is more. So, to decrease formality in organizations some executions like giving freedom to educational managers, review, adjust and omit the additional cases from manners and directions. Imposition of regulations is not necessary for workers who are in high level of expertise about their work, so it suggested that best managers decrease the high formality of universities.
- Results in relations with concentration showed that whatever the concentration increases in organization, productivity decreases. Therefore, according to organizations necessity that adapted with conditional situation rapidly and decrease against changes, non-concentration causes facilitation of adaption with condition. The best method for non-concentration of organization is participation of workers in decisions and conferring options.
- Create an organizational structure needs to have knowledge in this connections by director, so observing periods while working is suggested in organizational structure.

Mainly, universities have expert people. Professional and expertise structure in universities is a systematic and organized structure. Therefore, university with advantaging structure should have flexible structure in developing moral, cultural and training Entrepreneur talent in addition to inner functions and have constant relation with challenging Bazaar.

REFERENCES

1. Abadkhoda, S (2007). Study of relations between organizational structure features and advantageous in chosen broadcasting units of Iran, Maaref radio, Qom Center radio, MA thesis, Tehran University.
2. Adhikari, Dev. Ray (2010). Knowledge Management in academic institutions, International Journal of Educational Management, 24(2), 94- 104.
3. Alizade, E. (2006). "Function of organizational structure in advantageous systems of management in human source (employ and imply) in Electricity firm of Ardebil", MA thesis, Islamic Azad University of Rasht.
4. Amiri, A. N., Ramezan, M., and Omrani, A. (2010). Studying the impacts of organizational organic structure on knowledge productivity effective factors case study: Manufacturing units in a domestic large industrial group. European Journal of Scientific Research, 40(1), 91-101.
5. Barry, P. Haynes (2006). The Impact of office layout on productivity, Shetteld hallam university.
6. Birhinsaw, J., (2001) , " Why Knowledge Management So difficult", Business Strategy Review, 12(1), 11-18.
7. Child. J. (2008). "Organization structure, environment, and performance: the role of strategic choice", Sociology, Vol. 6, PP 1-22.
8. Chitsazan, A (1995). Study of existence organizations and plan the best structural organization for Jame University, MA thesis in management college, Tehran University.
9. Claver.E, Pertusa, E.M, Molina, J.F(2011). Characteristics of organizational structure relating to hybrid competitive strategy: Implication for performance, Journal of business research, Doi, 10.1016.
10. Cyert. R. M and March. J. G, (2007). A behavioral theory of the firm, Prentice hall, Upper saddle river, NJ, PP 128-287.
11. Daft R. L., (2006). The New era of Management, India Edition, Thomson, south.
12. Daft, Richard L (2008), "theory and plan of organization", first book, Translation of Ali Parsaeyian and Mohammad Arabi, tenth edition, Cultural research office, Tehran.
13. Drago William (1998). "Mintzberg Pentagon & Organization Position". *Management Research News*, 21(4/5), 30-40.
14. Elizabeth, MC Millan, (2002), " Complexity, Organizations and Change.
15. Erfani-Nia, Mohammad (2003). "effect of organizational structure factors on advantageous human source", Tadbir Journal, No. 146.
16. Ergenli. A. Saglam. Guler and Metin. S (2007). Psychological empowerment and its relationship to trust in immediate managers, Journal of business research, Vol.60: 41-49.
17. Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
18. Farhangi, Ali akbar and Hossein Safarzade (2006), "enterpriseurship, content, theories, models and implementation", labor and social security institute and entrepreneur center of Tehran University, first edition, Tehran.
19. Gresov. C and Drazin. R, (2007). "Equifinality: functional equivalence in organization design", Academy of management review, Vol.22, PP 403-428.
20. Haji veisi (2007); "advantageous of human source in Public organizations", site of economical and financial ministry.
21. Hejrati, Monir (1994), "study of organizational structure in Tarbiyat Modares University, according to second developing programs of Islamic Republic of Iran, for objects and providing suitable pattern", MA thesis, Management college, Tehran, Tarbiyat Modares University.
22. Kolivand, Abbas (1997), "study and analysis of organizational structure and its effect on organizational advantageous (Railway center company J-1-1)", MA thesis, management college of Tehran University.
23. Kopelman Richard E , Phoebe M Carillo, (2008), " Organization Structure and Productivity".
24. Kreysing, M. (2002), In Search of Structural Excellence Aelita, Journal of Educational Administration, 40(6), 552-560.
25. March, J. and Simon, H, (2009). "Organizations", Blackwell, Cambridge, MA, PP 195-324.
26. Mihm. Jürgen, Loch. Christoph. H, Wilkinson. Dennis and Huberman. Bernardo. A, (2010). "Hierarchical structure and search in complex organizations", Management science, 56(5), 831-848.
27. Mintzberg, Henry (1994), "organization of 5 useful patterns", Translation of Abol-hasan Faqih and Hossein Vaziri sabeqi, fourth edition, Tehran: Educational center of public management.
28. Nonaka, I., (2008). Structure of Knowledge-creating organization: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Ogbonna, M. and Lloyd, C. Harris(2003), Innovative organizational Structures and Performance: A case Study of Structural Transformation to "Groovy Community Centers, Journal of Organizational Change Management :Volume: 16(5), 512-533.