



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Ahmad Maleki

M.A, Educational administration, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Fariba Karimi[†]

Department of Educational sciences, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

ABSTRACT

This study explores the relationship between Perception of organizational structure and human resources development for the employees of Mobarakeh Esfahan Steel Company .For this study a descriptive method of a correlational nature was employed. The statistical population comprised all the Mobarakeh Esfahan Steel Company employees, from whom, using a systematic sampling technique and Cochran's Sample Size Estimation Formula, 375 employees were selected for the sample size. The data collection tool comprised two self-made questionnaires on the organizational structure with the aspect of formality, centralization and complexity and the other questionnaire for the human resources development inventory with the aspect of perceptual skills is self-confidence, occupational conscience, self-evaluation, occupational skills, creativity, shift-adaption and voluntary team work. Using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, the reliability coefficient for the organizational structure questionnaire was 0/79 and for the human resources development questionnaire was 0/90. There is an inverse relation between all three dimensions of formality, centralization and complexity with a number of Human Resources Development constructs i.e. occupational conscience, self-evaluation and occupational skills. There was a negative relation between formality, creativity and voluntary team work, centralization, self-confidence and creativity and complexity with perceptual skills, self-confidence and voluntary team work with Human Recourses Development. Step wise Regression findings showed that the best human resources development predictors among Mobarakeh Esfahan Steel Complex employees were complexity in the first stage and centralization combined with complexity in the second stage.

© 2014 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

Keywords: Organizational structure, Human resources development, Formality, Centralization, Complexity.

[†] Corresponding author
ISSN(e): 2224-4441/ISSN(p): 2226-5139
© 2014 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

Contribution/ Originality

The paper presents suggestions which can enable managers and researchers to better understand human development .

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational structure determines people's performance and this performance establishes the form of organizational structure. An organization is composed of three major parts: organizational structure, human energy and technology. A proper organization structure can improve the function of the organization (Akhavan, 2002; Henderson, 2008; Rezaeiyan, 2010).

In order to achieve the objectives and certain situations, the organization needs to divide the tasks between the individuals. Structures are necessary for influential performance of organization and supporting individuals' efforts. This is because the structure provides a framework for controlling and management. In fact this is the structure that operates and achieves the goals of an organization; therefore managers need to grasp the necessity of organizational structure and its design (Mullins, 2001).

Although there had been a general consensus on a particular set of aspects of a structure measuring the differences between structures, some proposals are formulated. Three main common aspects in researches and studies of an organizational structure are: formality, complexity and centralization (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1999). Formality is the amount of written documents like whatever written in instructional notebooks of strategies, processes and duties (Shani *et al.*, 2009). Robins (1999) believes that formality is the degree or scale of standardization of the organization's tasks. A person doing a very formality task has less possibilities .He should do the task in a particular way and in a definite time. Individuals are expected to do in the same way so that they can have the same specific results.

Centralization is another part of an organizational structure that indicates the distribution of authority in the organization. Van de Ven & Ferrv defines centralization as focus of optional decision making in the organization .Most of the decisions in centralized organizational units are made by command hierarchy, whereas in non- centralized units decision making is transferred to middle- managers or even with the involvement of other staff. Actually this is the centralization that determines the right of decision making also determines how broad it is. .The more centralized organizations are, the fewer decisions are made by lower staff. Moreover decisions are followed by certain rules and strategies (Moghimi, 2011).

Another part of an organization is complexity. Hag restates complexity in this way: proficiency in an organization is assessed by the number of engaged proficient people there .It is also assessed by education and necessary training for each person. The more the number of engaged people and the longer the training is, the more complex organization will be. The task can be divided into a vertical design of the organization. All organizations have certain hierarchy that consists of high- rank management (Gibson *et al.*, 2009). Traditional organizational structures; which have some properties such as centralization, severe task distributions, loss of flexibility against environmental changes, close and mechanical control, force its staff to be active and

dynamic. On the contrary, the dynamic, organic and network structures which have properties such as: customer- based , non- centralization in decision making, authority distribution , high flexibility ,self- environmental confidence and tends to self- control , provides a stronger milieu for better enhancement process (Vaezi and Sabzikaran, 2010).

A structure- that accepts the principles and characteristics of enhancement and also issues a proper content for its variables- is suitable for performing enhancement process. (Mihm *et al.*, 2010). Enhancement or human resources development is a process through which new skills are learned and the attitudes are changed, too. Human resources enhanced stands for situations where the staff can adapt themselves to new shifts and conditions of the organization. Enhancement is a subjective concept; therefore its measuring is obviously difficult. Enhancement has a humanistic nature and mainly is done in long term (Hassan Moradi and Arianfar, 2011).

Analysts believe that an enhancement human is a person who acts in a self- controlled way in all aspects of his existence."When a man improves and increases his own capacities, he gets to his enhancement and excels himself. While achieving this excellence, he gains independence, too (Toosi, 2003).

Human resources development means providing facilities for organizational improvement by educating people working in the organization who are the most advantageous assets. Lewin was the founder of this thought (Salehian, 2004).

Characteristics of human resources development are: perceptual skills, self – confidence, creativity, voluntary teamwork, occupational conscience, shift adaptation and self-assessment.

There is nothing to be created in perceptual skills by passing only an educational term, instead the staff's thought should change and actually perceptual thought should change to perceptual acts. Perceptual skills have two main parts: systematic thinking and systematic acting and being equipped for -philosophical mind (Soltani, 2007).

Self – confidence: A self- confident person is one who believes in himself and doesn't come off worse in any authority .He always values himself and anything that related to his real characteristics. He even has priority over others (Mahdavinejad, 2007).

Creativity: Most of researchers define creativity as a procedure of making an original, new and valuable product. In Torrance's latest citation, he analyses creativity in three aspects of art, research and life survival. He also says creativity is being away from the main path, breaking through and combining once again. He introduces creativity as a combination of four factors: fluidity, inventiveness, flexibility and extension (Zare and Akhoondi, 2010).

Csikszentmihalyi represents creativity as thinking about affairs and discovering new, unusual and unique ways and getting to unique strategies (Sternberg and Grigorenko, 2000).

Voluntary teamwork: Analysis explain a lot of definitions for the word involvement and all of them indicate role play, expressing opinions, making suggestions, giving solutions, improvement and work development. Personnel participation is an involving process and its goal is to encourage and persuade members to take part in organization's success and to be trustworthy (Robins and Judge, 2010). Participation is flowing possibility and authority from one level of the organization to another level so that it can result in increasing the level of the organization's ability (Taslimi, 2010). Occupational conscience: It is a factor that results in work disciplined and duty-bound

individuals. The attitude toward the personnel meaning reforming behavior is used to evaluate their tendency to obey the rules and standards of organization (Liaghatdar *et al.*, 2011). High occupational conscience people consider the purposes and values of the organization as their own aims and values and they try to achieve them (Pala *et al.*, 2008).

Shift adaptation: Kurt Lewin believes a shift is a movement from one state to a new state. A shift means putting new equipment's, restructuring an organization, applying a new system, evaluating performance and anything that can change the current activity and associations (Murhed and Grifine, 2009). The internal circumstances of the organization or environmental changes make the organization feel need to change (Boroomand, 2011).

Occupational skills: Discussing human resource, one aspect is job training. Individuals use this occupational training to do their duties and affairs well and skillfully. Doubtfully educated people and skillful personnel can better fulfill their functions than non- educated ones. Training helps the personnel use advanced plants, equipment and technologies (Soltani, 2007).

Self-assessment: This means self- control and contemplation. A man attempting to reform himself and improve his behavior, should contemplate his behavior and be self-examination. Self-leadership is a process in which the individuals influence on themselves in order to be self-motivated and self- starter. Human resources are the underlying assets of an organization. They are the sources of any restructuring and innovation. Human being is a variable existence with unlimited potential abilities and reformations. These abilities should be assessed and then potential talents should be developed by proper education. Finally human societies and their organs can use those high prospects. What should be gradually emphasized in the organizations enhancement is the result of training more than the mere training or quantity of the classes (MirSepasi, 2012).

The structure determines the people's performance and the individuals' performance establishes the form of the structure. The structure of the organization forms the organization's affairs but it is not always fixed. Also the organization's affairs can change the form of the structure of the organization. So it is proved that outset and birth of an organization is a continuous process (Kord Naeich *et al.*, 2009).

Lestertaro believes that modern age is the organizations' period and their owners are humans. Human beings using the immense source of authority and thinking, make the organizations move, develop and improve. Active, creative and qualified human resources would guarantee taking advantages of organizations competition. Nowadays the developed human resources are the most important capacities of the organization in obtaining competition advantages. Also they are considered as the main invisible assets. Organizations believe that they should consider their staff as the basis of developing qualities and calibers of the whole organizational processes (Teymoorinejad and Dini, 2005).

Omidi *et al.* (2007) have done a study named "The relationship between organizational structure and creativity of managers of Sports Organization". The result showed that there was a significant relationship between organizational structure and creativity of managers of Sports Organization. But no significant relationship between complexity and creativity of the managers is observed. Moreover there is a significant relationship between formality, centralization and creativity of the managers and even a significant relationship between the level of education and

creativity of the managers. According to this study, the most important factors of decreasing creativity of managers of Sports Organization – are concentration on individual decision making instead of involving them in decision making and incoherence between job, field and education level.

Feizi and Esmi (2008) achieved the following results in a study called “A survey on the relationship between organizational structure and organizational creativity: a case study of Shiraz high schools”. The study was among high school managers. The results of Pearson’s correlation coefficient showed a negative and meaningful relationship between organizational structure and organizational creativity. It means the more centralized and complex organization is, the less creative it is and vice versa. The result of analyzing Regression’s showed that among three aspects of organizational structure, regarding organizational creativity prediction, complexity is in first order and centralization is in the next rank, regarding organizational activity. But the formality aspect hasn’t a significant level in organizational creativity prediction .Furthermore organic structures have more organizational creativity than mechanic ones. In other words they are more creative.

Alimardani et al. (2009) have studied “The Relationship between Organizational Structure and Organizational Innovation in Shahid Beheshti University”. It showed there is a negative relationship between centralization, formality and complexity of organizational structure and organizational innovation .It means the more paper work and strictness we have in organizational structure, the less innovation we can find. This complexity decreases the level of innovation in horizontal, vertical and geographical levels. If the managers make decisions alone and don’t let the staff take part in decision making, the staff won’t have any work spirit and then the result is decreasing innovation.

Yadolahi Farsi et al. (2009) In a study named “A research on The relationship between Organizational Structure and Organizational Innovation in Private Tehran Banks” have found that there is negative relationship between organizational structure aspects, i.e. centralization, formality and complexity and innovation organizational structure, i.e. innovation, taking risk and being pioneer.

Kessler (2007) carried out a study named “Organizational Structure Influences on the Ability of Job performance, Job satisfaction and workmates Behavior”. The result showed that the college members working in very organic department structure have a high job satisfaction. Besides, the active college members working in very mechanic department structure were rarely bad- tempered and their working environment was organic.

Bhargava and Kelkar (2001) carried out a study named “A research on The relationship between Organizational Structure, Job Involvement, Job satisfaction and Developing abilities ;Evidences on Human Resources Development” .This study investigates the relationship between organizational structure(centralization, formality and complexity)and some specific parts of improvement human resources(job involvement, job satisfaction and working at full capacity).The result showed a positive relationship between centralization and job involvement and a negative relationship with job satisfaction and working at full capacity.

Chen and Huang (2007) have done a study under the title of “How does Climate and Structure of an organization Effect on its Knowledge Management?-in a social viewpoint” and concluded that a creative and co-operative climate has a positive relationship with social involvement. In other words, if a structure is less formal and centralized but at the same time integrated, social involvement is more interesting issue. Group involvement is in positive relationship with knowledge management. Due to wide varieties in recent years, many crises and problems have appeared in a lot of fields. Therefore, organizations and their managers have to use adequate organizational tools .One of these tools is the organizational structure. Actually quick changes & shifts of the environmental situations make the organization improve its structure and work cycling. Three main bases of an organization are Organizational structure, human resources and technology. Consequently paying attention to proper organizational structure is one of the organizational factors to balance internal and external situations (Akhavan, 2002).

Nowadays organizations are challenging the bureaucracy template and moving away from it. Insisting on individuality, self-centeredness on one hand and man’s dissatisfaction of limited effects on the other hand are the reasons of this behavior. The Bureaucracy design overcomes on people, the individuals and the organization should find a solution for keeping up with each other and in these wide varieties. The solution can be found in new values which can satisfy effectiveness and consistency needs of the organization, individuality, reforming and improving needs of a new evoked human. Those who deal with organization theories and their development can play the basic role in finding this solution (Toosi, 2003). To achieve these characteristics -the most important resource and compatible factor- the human resources should be developed by the organizations (Ergenli et al., 2007).

One of the important strategies to create these characteristics in individuals is human resources development and it is a new motivating factor in an active work environment. Not only technology usage is the major source of the competition advantages, but also creativity, innovation, bullish mood, quality, responsibility and personnel ability form the competition advantages. (Gresov and Drazin, 2007). Regarding the above points, this study tries to have a survey on the Relationship between Perception of Organizational Structure and Human Resource Development among the Employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company.

2. THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

1. There is a relationship between formality in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company.
2. There is a relationship between centralization in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company.
3. There is a relationship between complexity in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company.
4. Organizational structure can predict the human resources development.

3. METHOD

The research method was a descriptive one of a correlation nature. Research statistical population was the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company. The number of the sample size estimated 375 persons using Cochran's Sample size Estimation Formula. Sampling was done in a systematic sampling technique. The data collection tool in this research comprised of two self-made questionnaires on organizational structure with the aspects of formality, centralization and complexity and a questionnaire on human resources development with the aspects of perceptual skills: self – confidence, occupational conscience, self-assessment, occupational skills, creativity, shift adaptation, voluntary teamwork. The content and construct validity of the questionnaire were approved by a number of authorities. Also the factor analysis Method is used to approval of validity of structure through using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient.

The reliability coefficient for the organizational structure questionnaire was 0/79 and for the questionnaire of human resources development was 0/90. Interpretation of results was carried out in two levels of descriptive and prescriptive. Pearson's correlation coefficient, Variance analysis, step wise Regression and follow –up tests were used in prescriptive level.

4. RESULTS

The First Hypothesis: There is a relationship between formality in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company.

Table-1. Correlation coefficient between formality in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development

Predictable variable Statistical Value Criterion variable	Formality		Meaningful level
	Correlation coefficient	Correlation coefficient squared	
Human resources development	-0/217**	0/047	0/001
perceptual skills	-0/082	0/006	0/137
self – confidence	-0/072	0/005	0/180
occupational conscience	-0/145**	0/021	0/007
self-assessment	-0/214**	0/046	0/001
occupational skills	-0/242**	0/058	0/001
creativity	-0/178**	0/032	0/001
shift adaptation	-0/062	0/004	0/256
voluntary teamwork	-0/212**	0/045	0/001

p**<0/ 01

The finding of table 1 shows that there is a significant and negative relationship between human resources development, formality, and some of its aspect, occupational conscience, self-assessment, occupational skills, creativity, and voluntary teamwork. But the relationship between formality and perceptual skills, self – confidence, shift adaptation is not significant.

The Second Hypothesis: There is a relationship between centralization in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company.

The finding of table 2 shows that there is a significant and negative relationship between human resources development and its aspect, self – confidence, occupational conscience, self-assessment, occupational skills and creativity and centralization. But the relationship between centralization and perceptual skills, shift adaptation, voluntary teamwork is not significant.

Table-2. Correlation coefficient between centralization in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development

Predictable variable Statistical Value Criterion variable	Centralization		
	Correlation coefficient	Correlation coefficient squared	Meaningful level
Human resources development	-0/153**	0/023	0/006
perceptual skills	0/060	0/003	0/277
self – confidence	-0/117*	0/014	0/027
occupational conscience	-0/128*	0/016	0/017
self-assessment	-0/267**	0/071	0/001
occupational skills	-0/218**	0/047	0/001
creativity	-0/221**	0/049	0/001
shift adaptation	-0/045	0/002	0/404
voluntary teamwork	-0/082	0/007	0/126

p**<0/ 01

The Third Hypothesis: There is a relationship between complexity in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company.

Table-3. Correlation coefficient between complexity in organizational structure and aspects of human resources development

Predictable variable Statistical Value Criterion variable	Complexity		
	Correlation coefficient	Correlation coefficient squared	Meaningful level
Human resources development	-0/226**	0/051	0/001
perceptual skills	-0/158**	0/025	0/004
self – confidence	-0/217**	0/047	0/001
occupational conscience	-0/116*	0/013	0/031
self-assessment	-0/166**	0/027	0/002
occupational skills	-0/314**	0/099	0/001
creativity	0/086	0/007	0/114
shift adaptation	-0/022	0/004	0/689
voluntary teamwork	-0/188**	0/035	0/001

p**<0/ 01

The finding of table 3 shows that there is a significant and negative relationship between human resources development, perceptual skills, self – confidence, occupational conscience, self-

assessment, occupational skills and voluntary teamwork with complexity. But the relationship between complexity and creativity and shift adaptation is not significant.

The Forth Hypothesis: Organizational structure can prescribe the human resources development

Table-4. Multiple (Stepwise) Regression of predication human resources development based on organizational structure dimensions

		Non-standard Coefficients									
		Predictor variables	B	Standard Error	Beta	t	P	R	R2	F	P
human resources development	Step 1.	complexity	-1.293	0.291	-0.249	-4.445	0.001	0.249	0.062	19.757	0.001
	Step 2.	complexity	-1.191	0.292	-0.229	-4.080	0.001	0.282	0.080	12.902	0.001
		centralization	-1.124	0.469	-0.135	-2.395	0.017				
P<0.01											

As the results of table (4) shows; among the researching variables in the regression, the best predictable human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company has been complexity in the first step and besides complexity, centralization in the second step. Therefore in the first step coefficient of complexity aspect is 6/2 percent and in the second step coefficient of complexity and centralization aspects 8 percent of variance of human resources development.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The finding of table 1 shows that there is a significant and negative relationship between formality in the organizational structure and some aspects of human resources development; occupational conscience, self-assessment, occupational skills, creativity, and voluntary teamwork. These results are according to [Omidi et al. \(2007\)](#) and [Feizi and Esmi \(2008\)](#). They concluded that the relationship between formality and creativity of managers is negative. These results are according to [Bhargava and Kelkar \(2001\)](#) and [Chen and Huang \(2007\)](#). During these researches , they concluded if a structure is less formal and centralized but at the same time integrated, social involvement is more interesting issue and human resources development is increased.

In a very formal organization, where all the details have to be done exactly according to the instructions and directions or modern methods and the staff are expected to do them without any feeling, the creativity is decreased. Standardizing the tasks not only bans the personnel from acting in a different way, but it doesn't even let them think of different ways. The result of this research is approving this negative meaningful relationship. A person, who does his tasks with high occupational conscience, is being developed. He does his work consciously, in groups, self-starter and in a fine method .Such individuals are less found in more formal organizations. These more formal organizations are designed in such a way that the process of self-assessment is formed very rarely, there. This is because people are controlled and monitored out of the environment by the organization. But it is not consistent and influential.

The finding of table 2 showed that there is a significant and negative relationship between centralization in organizational structures and some of human resources development and its aspects; self- confidence, occupational conscience, self-assessment, occupational skills and creativity. These results are according to [Omidi et al. \(2007\)](#) and [Feizi and Esmi \(2008\)](#) saying there is a negative relationship between centralization and managers' creativity. These results are according to [Bhargava and Kelkar \(2001\)](#) and [Chen and Huang \(2007\)](#) and [Alimardani et al. \(2009\)](#). They concluded that there is a meaningful relationship between centralization factor (of the organizational structure) and organizational innovation and it's a negative relationship. It should be mentioned that creativity and anticipating shifts are the factors of innovations and it is the same as the results of this research. These results are according to [Yadolahi Farsi et al. \(2009\)](#). They got to the conclusion that there is a negative meaningful relationship between organizational centralization and aspects of organizational innovation including: innovation, taking risks and being pioneer. These results are according to [Bhargava and Kelkar \(2001\)](#) .They inferred that centralization has a positive relationship with job involvement and negative relationship with job satisfaction and developing. Also these finding are according to [Chen and Huang \(2007\)](#). During these researches they concluded that if the structure is integrated and non-centralized and less formality, social involvement is more interesting issue therefore human resources development is increased.

In centralized organization, decisions are made by managers and the lower rank managers just perform the senior managers' commands. Definitely there is no role for staff's creativity in these organizations and they are expected to follow the directions exactly. In this way, they are leading the staff to a low self- confidence and consequently decreasing their self- assessment. The outer characteristics designed by the senior managers evaluate the staff, not the inner staff's characteristics. The elements of self- confidence are: the ability of self-expression, the ability of making a bold, performance and taking responsibility, motivation of achieving success and life objective, self-realization, self-discipline, self-contained, self-esteem which are less found in centralized organizations. According to the finding of the third hypothesis, there is a significant and negative relationship between complexity of organizational structure and some dimensions of human resources development, i.e. perceptual skills, self – confidence, occupational conscience, self-assessment, occupational skills and voluntary teamwork. But the relationship between complexity and creativity and shift adaptation was not significant. These results are according to [Omidi et al. \(2007\)](#). They concluded that the relationship between complexity and managers' creativity is not significant. These results are not according to [Feizi and Esmi \(2008\)](#). They figured out the more complex organization is, the less organizational creativity is. An organization would be more complex if its activities are more extensive and divided into more parts. Professionalism and various works in complex organizations cause the staff not to communicate each other (horizontal complexity)and due to the high distance of the highest and the lowest responsible persons in the organization ,more potential possibilities exist to destroy the communication system (vertical complexity).Lack of proper communication and existing high distances among managers reduces the human resources development. The ability of self-expression, self-realization, and self-discipline, self-contained, ability of making bold and other parameters of self-confidence decreased

in such organizations. In the same way self-assessment of the staff, occupational conscience and voluntary teamwork is less observed.

The results of the forth hypothesis showed that among the researching variable in the regression , the best predictable human resources development among the employees of the Esfahan's Mobarakeh Steel Company is complexity in the first step and besides complexity , centralization is in the second step. These results are according to [Feizi and Esmi \(2008\)](#). In his research he figured out that complexity dimension predicts creativity in the first step and then centralization does so in the second step. And it is not according to [Alimardani et al. \(2009\)](#) since they say the best prediction for organizational innovation is formality in the first step and then complexity in the next step. Complexities in professional organizations, where individuals are taught professional training, make the number of the careers or tasks of the organization more various. Therefore people have to act independently and this causes them to be developed.

6. SUGGESTIONS

According to the achieved results of the research, some strategies are offered to the managers in order to decrease the formality, centralization and complexity of organizational structure:

Paying no hard attention to details of the work, drawing attention away from the exact form of the directions, instructions and modern ways and considering the instructions and directions as tools and means not objectives. The tasks standardization not only prevents different behavior or attitudes, but it doesn't even let them think of different ways.

Let the personnel do their affairs and activities freely as much as possible and decrease centralization of organizational structure under the authority of your organization.

Let executive managers make decisions themselves. Use other staff's opinions through suggestion system, quality circles and self- management groups.

Provide facilities to higher education and exchanging experiences for all the organization personnel and set training meeting and workshops.

REFERENCES

- Akhavan, A., 2002. Organizational organizing & designing in application approach. 1st Edn., Naraq: Naraq Azad Islamic University.
- Alimardani, M., M. Ghahremani and M. Abolghasemi, 2009. A study on the relationship between organizational structure and organizational innovation in Shahid Beheshti University. Quarterly Journal of New Approach in Educational Administration, Azad Islamic University- Marvedasht Branch. 2.
- Bhargava, S. and A. Kelkar, 2001. Examining the relationship between organizational structure, job involvement, job satisfaction, and empowerment: Implications for human resource development. International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management, 1(2/3/4): 150-161.
- Boroomand, Z., 2011. The organizational enhancement & restructuring. 8th Edn., Tehran: Jangal.
- Chen, C., J. and J.W. Huang, 2007. How organizational climate and structure affect knowledge management? The social interaction perspective. International Journal of Information Management, 27(2): 104-118.

- Ergenli, A., G. Saglam and S. Metin, 2007. Psychological empowerment and its relationship to trust in immediate managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(1): 41-49.
- Feizi, M. and F. Esmi, 2008. An analyzing survey on the relationship between organizational structure & organizational creativity case studies: Shiraz Middle School Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Creation Recognition & Engineering of Innovation Management in Iran Tehran: Science Research Institute Creativity and Innovation.
- Gibson, L., J.M. Ivancevich, J. Donnelly and R. Konpaske, 2009. *Organizational behaviour, structure, process*. New York: Mac Graw-Hill.
- Gresov, C. and R. Drazin, 2007. Equifinality: Functional equivalence in organization design. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2): 403-428.
- Hassan Moradi, N. and M. Arianfar, 2011. *Employee training & improvement* Tehran; Aijj Publishen.
- Henderson, I., 2008. *Human resource management for MB Astudent*. Londen: CipdHenry Mintzberg, The structuring of organizations. New Jersey: Prentice – Hall
- Ivancevich, J.M. and M.T. Matteson, 1999. *Organizational behavior and management*. 5th Edn., Boston, Mass: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
- Kessler, S.R., 2007. The effects of organizational structure on faculty job performance, job satisfaction, and counterproductive work behavior. University of South Florida.
- Kord Naeich, A., M. Moghimi, S. Ghanati and H. Yazdani, 2009. A research on the relationship between the elements of organizational structure & innovational culture in Tehran University, P.H.D Thesis. *Public Management Journal Management Tehran University*. pp: 119- 134.
- Liaghatdar, M.J., H.A. Bakhtiar Nasrabadi, F. Samiee and B.V. Hashemi, 2011. The study of effective factors on work commitment based on students' perceptions in Isfahan University. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 22(1 (41)): 27-40.
- Mahdavinejad, G., 2007. The strategies of increasing self- confidence in scientific & university congeries in quran & ahadis point of view. *A Quarterly Islamic University Journal*, 11th Year, 34: 81-99.
- Mihm, J., W. Lochch, H. Dennis and B.A. Huberman, 2010. Hierarchical structure and search in complex organizations. *Management Science*, 56(5): 831-848.
- MirSepasi, N., 2012. *The strategic management of human resources & work relations*. Tehran: Mir Publication.
- Moghimi, M., 2011. *Organization & management research approach*. 8th Edn., Tehran: Termeh Publication.
- Mullins, L., 2001. *Management and organizational behavior*. 6th Edn., London: Prentice- Hall.
- Murhed and Grifine, 2009. *Organizational behavior*, translated by Alvani, M. Memarzade, Gh. 14th., Tehran: Morvarid Publication.
- Omidi, A., M. Hamidi, M. Khabiri and S. Safari, 2007. The relationship between organizational structure & creativity of the managers in the physical education organization. *The Harkat Journal* (32): 105-117.
- Pala, F., S. Eker and M. Eker, 2008. The effect of demographic characteristic on organizational commitment and job satisfaction: An empirical study on turkish health care staff. *The Journal of Industrial Relation and Human Resources*, 10(2): 54-75.
- Rezaeiyan, A., 2010. *The principles of organizational behavior management*. Tehran: SAMT.
- Robins, A. and T. Judge, 2010. *Organizational behavior* translated by Zare M, and Tehran: NS Publication.
- Robins, S.P., 1999. *Organization theory: Structures, designs, and applications*. 3rd Edn.: Prentice Hall.

- Salehian, A., 2004. Productivity of human resources its affecting factors. Journal of Management, 14(85-86): 32-38.
- Shani, A., D. Chandler, J. Coget and J. Lau, 2009. Behavior in organization: An expellential approach. 9th Edn., Boston: McGraw – Hill.
- Soltani, A., 2007. Training human resources in standard approach. 2nd Edn., Isfahan: Arkan Publication.
- Sternberg, R.J. and E.L. Grigorenko, 2000. Teaching for successful intelligence. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight.
- Taslimi, M., 2010. Managemnt of the organizational revolution. 9th Edn., Tehran: The organization of Studying & Publishing humanism University Books (SAMT).
- Teymoorinejad, H. and G. Dini, 2005. The qualified human resources; the competence golden key. Tadbir Journal (160): 23-31.
- Toosi, M., 2003. Organizational development. 2nd Edn., Tehran: The Center of Edition & Publication of Planning & Management References.
- Vaezi, R. and A. Sabzikaran, 2010. A study on relationship between organizational structure and personnel empowerment in NIOPDC-Tehran area (Change). Management Research Journal, 2(3).
- Yadolahi Farsi, J., A. Azizi Ziarat and H. Khastar, 2009. Relationship between organizational structure and corporate entrepreneurship (Case study: Private banks in the city of Tehran). Journal of Entrepreneurship Development, 2(3): 55-80.
- Zare, H. and N. Akhoondi, 2010. The relation of thinking styles to the creativity of students of Payam-e-Noor University. Quarterly Journal of Psychological Studies, 8(1): 141-159.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the authors, International Journal of Asian Social Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.