

Investigating the Status of Organizational Structure at Farhangian University in Integration Approach

Salman Mohammadi Babazeidi¹, Abbas Abbaspour^{2*}, Hamid Rahimian², Saeed Ghiasi Nadoshan³

1. PhD Student Student of Higher Education Management at Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Associate Professor, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.
3. Assistant Professor, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

Article history:

Received date: 2020/08/22

Review date: 2020/10/25

Accepted date: 2020/10/31

Keywords:

Education, Farhangian University, Integration

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to investigate the status of organizational structure in Farhangian University according to the integration approach.

Methodology: The present study was a survey research approach in terms of applied purpose and in terms of data collection approach. The statistical population of this study included managers and staff of Farhangian University. According to the latest statistics and information available in the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Information Technology of Farhangian University in the academic year 2017-18, a total of 890 staff and managers of Farhangian University in Tehran (all campuses with Headquarters) were working. In order to determine the sample size, Morgan table was used. According to Morgan table, 270 samples had to be selected. Also, due to the presence of the researcher in Kermanshah, Kermanshah city campuses were used and a total of 328 people were selected. The instrument used in this study was Robbins (1989) Organizational Structure Questionnaire which examines three dimensions of complexity, formality and focus in the organization, the reliability of which was calculated using Cronbach's alpha of 0.85. Data analysis was used at two descriptive levels (mean and standard deviation) and at the inferential level; one-sample t-test was used.

Findings: The results showed that the organizational structure of Farhangian University was moderate in complexity, low in formality and high in concentration. In other words, the sub-component of complexity (3.04) is moderate, the sub-component of formality (2.44) is lower and the sub-component of concentration (3.10) is higher than the average. All these results are calculated according to t And were statistically significant at the level of 0.05.

Conclusion: Organizations are known through their manpower and structure, so an organization that has a proper structure and decent manpower is ready for its effectiveness.

Please cite this article as: Mohammadi Babazeidi S, Abbaspour A, Rahimian H, Ghiasi Nadoshan S. (2020). Investigating the Status of Organizational Structure at Farhangian University in Integration Approach. *Iranian Journal of Educational Sociology*. 3(4): 66-71.

* Corresponding author: abbaspour@atu.ac.ir

1. Introduction

Doing any work and any activity requires determining an organization and a system to use the factors and facilities needed to effectively and efficiently. Creating a structure for optimal use of resources is the first priority of the managerial actions and activities of every manager in the organization (Jiang, 2012). Undoubtedly, today's world should be called the world of progress, because any society has to progress in order to participate in the world community, and anyone who has no share in the world community is doomed to decline; But how is progress made? Man has rightly realized that he alone cannot do anything, so according to his social nature, he also accepts the presence of others, and it is the thought-empathy and cooperation of others that tries not to fall behind the human caravan (Isaac, Kline, 2010). This brings together people to achieve a common goal of an organization; but is this where the work ends or how is an organization formed? Forming an organization is the most important issue of any organization and the way of organizing and designing its different aspects is the main stage of forming any organization. The design of any organization requires both experience and knowledge because it is possible for the growth curve of the organization to have an upward trajectory but its basis is based on illusions and false assumptions. Hence, there have been many organizations that have either disintegrated at the beginning of their formation or have never been able to achieve the expected success (Koochborfardhaghi, Altmann, 2017).

The changes, complexities, and dynamics that have arisen in the economic-political and social systems of the present age have caused the methods and strategies used in the past to manage organizations to lose their effectiveness, and organizations that continue to insist on They refrain from using previous methods, doomed to failure and destruction (Ekrami, Farajpour, 2016). Today, environmental and technological conditions have become so complex and ambiguous that organizations can no longer solve their managerial and administrative problems with traditional approaches and methods; Therefore, today's organizations must be able to ensure their long-term survival by understanding the fundamental changes in strategy, structure, methods and technology, while removing current nodes, ambiguities and complexities (Grande-García et al., 2014). According to Williams (2002), modern social conditions are exceptional in terms of change. Most organizations have agreed, at least theoretically, that they must either change or die. Ideas of contemporary change emphasize that managers must be skilled in working with planned organizational change. Workplace changes and complexities are forcing organizations to increase their ability to respond to environmental change. On the other hand, social changes, rapid and challenging technologies, and the emergence of new missions in organizations have made the need for flexibility and readiness to face new situations inevitable. According to a UK survey, 94% of organizations experienced planned organizational change in 1997 (Ogbonna, Lloyd, Harris, 2004).

Organizational structure design is the framework that managers create to divide and coordinate the activities of members of the organization. Organizational structure of different organizations is different because the environmental conditions and strategies and goals that organizations pursue are different. Organizational structure is the set of patterns for relationships between members of an organization. It should be noted that as the organization grows and in which multiple departments are created (according to the pattern of the organization's life cycle) and its missions change, it is necessary to change its organizational structure. The division of large organizations into smaller units, in addition to economic effects, has a very clear effect on the adjustment of human resources of organizations (Rezaian, 2011).

The development of human societies and the delivery of small businesses to large organizations with more complex tasks and large human resources have made the coordination between their components and processes an increasing challenge. Today, the coordination of the components of an organization is the only factor in the leap and survival in tough global competition. Consider the organization's resilience to fundamental change and collapse, and at the same time show acceptable practical speed. Surveys and observations among various organizations have shown that using a comprehensive organizational integration approach is the best way to limit organizational risk. Although the specific approach used can vary based on

organizational values and applications; But all holistic approaches involve changing key processes across organizational segments (Kayes et al., 2007). Advances in information technology have unexpected consequences, the need for a comprehensive market presence, access to resources used, the development of new technologies, the highly competitive nature of markets, and two factors influencing the use of new organizations (Manourian, 2001). The importance of the organizational structural dimension has been demonstrated in past research. Farajollahi et al. (2016) in their research showed that Payame Noor University has a high degree of formality, complexity and focus in terms of structural dimensions and a somewhat unpredictable environmental dimension in terms of content, a somewhat strong cultural, successful strategy and complex technology. The results also showed that culture, environment, technology and strategy are good predictors of recognition, complexity and focus; Tamizi (2011) also showed in his research that the level of complexity and formality in libraries was low and the focus on organizational structure was high. Pertusa-Ortega et al. (2010) found that organizational complexity and focus have a positive and a negative effect on knowledge performance, respectively; but the recognition and implementation of knowledge do not have a confirmed positive relationship.

Most developed countries owe their progress to universities and research centers, and perhaps for this reason, in developing countries, academics and academics have played a major role in solving national problems and needs. Adapt its administrative structure and system to the conditions and complexities of the information age. If in this situation, a suitable structure is not designed for the university, the organization will deviate from its goals, the least damage of which will be the waste of the organization's resources. (Izadi et al., 2006). Organizations are known through their manpower and structure, so an organization that has the right structure and manpower is ready for its effectiveness (Prasad, 2005).

Extensive research, including thirty years of research at Harvard Business School, has shown that organizations with a high level of integration and alignment outperform their competitors in all respects. According to Farhangian University, as an influential university in the country, it should have a coherent organizational plan, a structure that can take into account all the dimensions of the organization and pay attention to the integrity of the dimensions in the organization; in such a way that a kind of balance is observed in the organization. Therefore, in this study, we seek the status of the organizational structure of Farhangian University in relation to the integration approach.

2. Methodology

The present study was an applied research in terms of purpose and a survey research approach in terms of data collection approach. The statistical population of this study included the managers and staff of Farhangian University. According to the latest statistics and information available in the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Information Technology of Farhangian University in the 2017-2017 academic year, 890 staff and managers of Farhangian University in Tehran (all campuses with headquarters Central) were working. In order to determine the sample size for the above statistical population, Morgan table was used, which according to Morgan table, 270 samples should be selected; Also, due to the presence of the researcher in Kermanshah, Kermanshah city campuses were used and a total of 328 people were selected. The instrument used in this study was Robbins (1989) organizational structure questionnaire which examines the three dimensions of complexity, formality and focus in the organization. This questionnaire has 24 questions with a 7-point Likert scale that questions 1 to 7 dimensions of organizational structure complexity, questions 8 to 14 dimensions of organizational structure and questions 14 to 24 questions related to the focus of organizational structure, the reliability of which in Omidi (2006) research. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to be 0.83 and in the present study the total reliability of the questionnaire was calculated to be 0.85 using Cronbach's alpha.

After the implementation of the project by the officials of Farhangian University, the consent of all participants to the implementation of the project

They were taken and assured that the questionnaires would be anonymous, the results were confidential, and at the end the results of the study would be announced to them. By giving these explanations, the researcher distributed the questionnaires and completed and collected them within two weeks. Data analysis was used at two descriptive levels (mean and standard deviation) and at the inferential level; one-sample t-test was used.

3. Findings

In any research, descriptive statistics and the study of demographic variables is an important part of that process; which in turn is of great importance, so the analysis of this part of the data will be useful and effective in the research process. Accordingly, among the members present in the study, 126 were female and 202 were male, 115 of the participants in the study were between 30 and 40 years old, 165 were between 41 and 50 years old and 48 were over 50 years old, as well as 65 participants. In the study between 1 to 10 years, 145 people between 11 to 20 years and 118 people between 21 to 30 years of service and 21 people with a diploma, 47 people with a postgraduate degree, 170 people with a bachelor's degree and 90 people with a master's degree and They were higher

Statistical description of the scores related to the component and sub-components of the structure of Farhangian University organization with the integration approach, including the average indicators and standard deviation of the scores are presented:

Table1. Descriptive dimensions of the design model components of Farhangian University with an integration approach

Component	Sub-component	Average	The standard deviation
Structure	Complexity	21.29	5.478
	Official	17.10	5.343
	Focus	31.05	7.232
	Total	69.44	14.751

As can be seen in Table 1, the mean scores of the complexity subcomponent are 21.29, formality is 17/10, concentration is 21.05, and the total score of the structure component is 69.44.

In order to investigate the status of the components of the organization design pattern in Farhangian University, a one-sample t-test was used.

Table2. Kalmogorov-Smirnov test results to check the normality of the distribution of scores

variable	Z Kalmogorov-Smirnov	The significance level
Complexity	1/060	0/211
Official	0/969	0/304
Focus	0/855	0/457
Total	0/622	0/833

Based on the results in Table 2, the significance level of the calculated statistic for all variables is greater than 0.05, so the assumption that the distribution of scores is normal is accepted.

Table3. Results of one-sample t-test to check the status of the structure component

Statistical index	Average observed	Theoretical average	T	Df	Sig
Complexity	3/04	3	0/968	327	0/334
Official	2/44	3	13/22	327	0/001
Focus	3/10	3	2/619	327	0/009
Total	2/89	3	3/148	327	0/002

Table 3 provides descriptive information and the results of a single-sample t-test to examine the status of the structure component and its sub-components. Based on the obtained results, the mean scores of the complexity component (3.04) are moderate, the formality component is lower (2.44) and the

concentration component (3.10) is higher than the average. t was calculated and was statistically significant at the level of 0.05.

4. Discussion

The present study sought to investigate the status of sub-components of organizational structure (formality, complexity and concentration) in Farhangian University that the status of the variable organizational structure was not in a favorable condition. , Below the formality component is lower and below the focus component is above average.

Concentrating decision-making power in the upper echelons of the organization reduces the possibility of participation, coordination, and the creation of a common understanding of affairs in these universities. Decentralization in universities accelerates the response to environmental change, because it does not have to go through hierarchical information processing, and decisions are made by people who are closer to the issue being decided, and such decisions are more likely to be realistic. The results of Jackson (2007) showed that there is a strong relationship between decentralization and teachers' actual participation in group decision making. Decentralizes subordinates to higher performance and promotes their innovation, responsibility and morale through adequate and adequate delegation of managerial work. In this regard, the results of Safari, Tondnevis and Hadavi (2011) showed that focus is inversely related to innovation. At the same time, it increases the employee's lack of focus, participation and desire to face new challenges. The results of research by William, Bolens and Jang (2006) showed that the focus component has a negative effect on employee job satisfaction. Robbins considers a score of 12 to 15 appropriate for the concentration component in universities (Robbins, 1989). High concentration in the university slows down decision-making and deters decision-makers from acting. Less concentration accelerates the response to environmental changes; because the decision is made by managers and supervisors who are closer to the changes that have occurred. Also, high concentration in universities can frustrate low-level managers, including group managers, and may lead to an independence crisis. The low authority of the heads of units and departments also has an effect on increasing the conflict between subordinates; because, as a rule, employees have accepted their superior authority as a way of resolving conflicts, and even if they do not agree with his decisions, they may obey his decisions. Hijrati (1995), Chitsazan (1996), Taherpour et al. (2009) and Tamizi (2011) found in their research that the level of focus was high in the organizations under study.

The optimal structure of a university is one in which high complexity (specialization), balanced formalism; low centralism, high trust, high interactive relationships and high emotional relationships prevail. Therefore, university officials are suggested to reduce the levels of the organization, the number of departments and job titles. Greatly reduce formal regulations and to some extent allow members to exercise authority over their work and activities. Leave some decisions to others and make more important decisions themselves, involve members in academic decisions and create creativity and innovation in members by creating an emotional relationship with them and institutionalizing it in the organizational structure. They pay due attention to the relationship between the university and the society and the university and the industry. Universities can play a prominent role in scientific research and development through activities such as setting research priorities and accepting and implementing research needed by society and organizations and making its results applicable. Scientific policies at the community level, communication with the community, and promotional activities such as communications with the broadcaster and scientific lectures at other institutions can be examples of the presence of faculty members at the community level. Other researchers are also advised to study the organizational structure of the university from the perspective of other divisions such as (organic and mechanical structure). Among the limitations of this study were the mere use of a questionnaire to evaluate the variables, the limitation of the research sample to the city of Tehran and the cross-sectional review and collection of data.

References

- Chitsazan A H. (1996). Investigating the existing organization and designing the optimal organizational structure of Kashan University. Master Thesis in Management, University of Tehran.
- Ekrami M, Farajpour A. (2015). Predicting the components of organizational learning based on the insights of Payame Noor University staff. *Quarterly Journal of Research in School and Virtual Learning*, 4(14): 53-64
- Farajollahi M, Hassani K, Safari S, Moeini Kia M. (2016). Designing the organizational structure of open and remote universities (Case study of Payame Noor University). *Journal of Research in School and Virtual Learning*, 4 (3): 49-64.
- Grande-García A, Lallous N, Díaz-Tejada C, Ramón-Maiques S (2014). Structure, functional characterization, and evolution of the dihydroorotase domain of human CAD. *Structure*, 22(2):185-198.
- Hijrati M. (1995). Investigating the structure of Tarbiat Modares University organization according to the objectives of the development program of the Islamic Republic of Iran and presenting an appropriate model. Master Thesis in Management, Tarbiat Modares University
- Isaac R G, Kline T J. (2010). Intellectual capital management enablers: a structural equation modeling analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(3): 373-391.
- Izadi A, Yazdanabadi F, Behrangi M R. (2006). Review and analysis of organizational structure of Tarbiat Moallem University. *Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 12 (2).
- Jackson J M. (2007). An examination of the relationship between elementary school principals' perceptions of shared decision making and three organizational structures. (Doctoral dissertation). Wayne State University. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No.1407499351).
- Jiang K. (2012). Clarifying the construct of human resource systems: Relating human resource management to employee performance. *Human resource management review*, 22(2), 73-85.
- Kayes D C, Stirling D, Nielsen S. (2007). Building organizational integrity. *Business Horizons*, 50(1): 61-70.
- Koohborfardhaghghi S, Altmann J. (2017). How organizational structure affects organizational learning. *Journal of Integrated Design and Process Science*, 21(1): 43-60.
- Manourian A. (2001). Integrated quality management or business process reengineering: providing an integrated model. *Development and Management Process*, 3(53): 20-1.
- Ogbonna M, Lloyd C, Harris R. (2004). Innovative organizational Structures and Performance: A case Study of Structural Transformation to "Groovy Community Centers, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(5): 512-533.
- Omidi A. (2006). The relationship between organizational structure and creativity of staff managers of the Physical Education Organization. Master Thesis. University of Tehran.
- Pertusa-Ortega E M, Zaaragoza-saez P, Claver-Cortes E. (2010). Can formalization complexity and centralization influence knowledge performance? *Journal of Business Research*, 63(3): 310-325.
- Prasad A. (2005). *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rezaian A. (2011). *Fundamentals of Management Organization*. Tehran: Samt.
- Robbins S P. (1989). *Organization theory (organizational structure and design)*; Translated by Mehdi Alwani, Hassan Danaeifard. Tehran: Saffar.
- Safari S, TondNevis F, Hadavi F. (2011). Relationship between organizational structure and innovation of staff experts of Iran Physical Education Organization. *Research in Sports Management and Motor Behavior*, 1 (1): 53-62
- Taherpour F, Rajaipour S, Shahbazi Z. (2009). Investigating the organizational structure of teacher training centers and public universities in Isfahan province. *Management Perspective*, 8 (30). 180- 161.
- Tamizi Z. (2011). Investigating the organizational structure of Iranian university libraries based on Stephen Robbins model. Master Thesis in Library and Information Science, University of Isfahan.
- Willem A, Buelens M, Jonghe I D. (2006). Impact of organizational structure on nurse's job satisfaction: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44 (2007): 1011-1020.