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The presents study aimed to investigate the relationship between the type of organizational structure and students’ perceptions of climate maturity in universities of Bandar Abbas. This study was conducted on all students of Bandar Abbas (over 16206) in the second semester of 2010-2011 and 385 students were selected using a stratified relative random sampling. Organizational structure scale (Torkzadeh & Mohtaram, 2011) and climate maturity scale (Torkzadeh, 2008) were research tools distributed and collected after calculating the validity and reliability. Results of the dependent t-test showed that the hindering structure is the dominant organizational structure in universities of Bandar Abbas (Bohshehr, Iran). In addition, results of the one-sample t-test indicated that the level of climate maturity is lower than the favorable efficacy level. In addition, results of the multivariate regression indicated that the enabling structure is a significant positive predictor of the level of climate maturity. Hindering structure was not significantly related to the level of climate maturity in universities of Bandar Abbas but was the significant positive predictor of the level of climate maturity in University of Medical Sciences.
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University mainly aims to address everyday issues of the society, of course from a scientific point of view to solve problems. The newfangled world requires a suitable higher education and social problems cannot be solved merely by relying on old achievements. University is not only a place for higher education but also a place for negotiation and discussion about different social and institutional issues to promote social communication skills. Therefore, it is necessary to give serious consideration to its management and functional structures, so that it becomes more prepared to understand and benefit from new developments in the contemporary world (Yamani Douzi Sorkhabi, 2009).

Considering the complexity of management and structures of the two compositions, the importance of study on management and structure of the university to achieve objectives being the first purpose of universities, as well as
the managerial structure being a manipulatable variable and changed so that it better serves the faculty and students, study on the structure of the university is considered an important study since it leads to better conditions to achieve objectives (Sinden & Sweetland, 2004). If structure is consistent with demands, input-to-output ratio will be optimized, work relationships will be facilitated, efficacy will be improved and individual skills will be used to create high flexibility and creativity. Therefore, structures should be changed from time to time (to enable organizations) (Jacobides, 2007).

According to Distelzweig (2012), the structure of methods to organize people and organizational jobs is such that measures are implemented and the objective is achieved. In another definition, it is defined as the formal attribution of job roles and managerial mechanism to control and correlate work activities (Abdul Ghani et al., 2002). Hoy and Sweetland believe that a continuum from structural enablement to structural hindrance may arise depending on the quality of design and implementation of the organizational structure. Structural enablement is a set of rules and regulations helping to solve problems instead of suppressing inadequacies (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000 & 2001; Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In enabling structures, rules and regulations are flexible guidelines for problem solving, not stress factors leading to problems. Instead of being a means strengthening management power, hierarchies and rules are mechanisms supporting masters (Hoy & Miskel, 2008) and masters consider managers as good listeners encouraging and supporting them, seeking their success and causing them to feel better. An enabling structure is a hierarchy of authority and a system of rules and regulations helping the university with its mission. In this type of structure, managers and masters cooperate with each other by observing boundaries of their authority and role differentiations and rules and regulations are considered as flexible guidelines, not barriers to problem solving. Hierarchy of authority and rules and regulations are mechanisms supporting masters instead of strengthening management power. This structure creates a climate of trust and commitment to university and its mission (Hoy, 2003 & 2005). An enabling structure creates a mutual communication, considers problems as opportunities for learning, valorizes differences and promotes trust, participation, consultative problem solving, cooperation, innovation and flexibility (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In enabling universities enjoying informal communication, decisions are made appropriately and according to time, are not cumbersome and most masters consider them as supporters (Sinden et al., 2004). Such a structure can fortify tasks and efforts of masters and improve students to achieve their goals (Hoy, 2003). In such structures, there are indices such as rewarding good performance (Sinden, Hoy & Sweetland, 2004), sense of trust in managers and humanity (Hoy, 2004), and this structure provides procedures affecting students’ measures, so that the presence of enabling managers and masters can improve student’s measures and the belief that we can and this belief improves achieving goals (Rhoads, 2009). Hoy and Miskel believe that the dimensions of enabling structure are as follows:

1. Formalization: Promotes flexible rules and regulations, considers problems as opportunities for learning, encourage creativity and promotes trust.
2. Concentration: Facilitates problem solving, improves cooperation, encourages openness and free expression, supports masters, promotes innovation and seeks participation.
3. Process: Decisions are commonly made and the focus is on problem solving.

In contrast, hindering structure is a system of coercive rules and regulations. This hierarchy primarily aims to control and discipline masters. These universities assume that the managers’ behaviors should be closely monitored and hardly controlled. The hierarchy of authority and rules and regulations support the control and punish straying from it leading to hindering results and preventing masters’ performances. The role of authorities, rules, guidelines and policies is to ensure that reluctant and irresponsible teachers do what managers have recommended. In this structure, managers’ powers are increased, masters’ measures are suppressed, and conflict and reluctance replace the culture of trust and participation (Hoy, 2003 & 2005).
Unlike the enabling structure, an inhibiting structure leads to reluctance, incompetence, irresponsibility of people and acceptance of what managers say. Creating a one-way and top-down communication, the inhibiting structure requires blind obedience to rules, playdowns changes, suppresses mistakes and considers problems as obstacles (Hoy & Miskel, 2008); Managers of this structure use methods such as despising people, shouting, lying, being very critical, considering job demands uncaused, spending their credits on other things, behaving unfriendly and ill-treating (Blase & Blase, 2006). In an inhibiting structure, the structure’s dimensions are defined as follows (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

**Formalization:** Imposes bureaucracy, considers problems as stress factors, seeks consensus, punishes mistakes and develops distrust.

1. **Concentration:** Seeks acceptance, welcomes control, promotes distrust, punishes masters, playdowns changes and has despotic rules.

2. **Process:** Focuses on one-way decision-making, imposition and obligation.

3. **Context:** promotes distrust, twists the truth, and leads to conflict and sense of powerlessness in masters.

In addition, universities working environments (since they can lead the university to achieve its goals) have received the attention of educational organizations’ officials since long time before, but recently, the university researchers, reformers and operators have considered this issue. Working environment is considered and referred to through a variety of titles such as organizational features, climate, socio-cultural environment, ecology, content, and recently climate and culture (Hoy et al., 2010). Each university has a climate created over time, ensouled its statue, differentiated universities and affected the behavior of individuals within it (Heidarzadegan, 1996; Hoy & Miskel, 2008). The university climate includes decisions, policies and behaviors made together and creating the working environment in an academic unit (Siegel et al., 2003). In addition, climate is an environmental factor including interpersonal, educational and organizational dimensions (Roese et al., 2000), promoting social interactions and causing organizational dynamism (Landazuri et al., 2007). Long (2000) and Schneider (1990) defined the climate as common values, beliefs where work climate significantly affects employees’ behavior. Taguri et al. (1968) define climate as a moral perception consisting of four dimensions of ecology, socio-cultural environment, social system and culture. Ecology refers to physical and material aspects of universities, socio-cultural environment includes social aspects of people and groups in universities, social system is the pattern of relationships existing among individuals and groups, and finally culture refers to belief systems, beliefs, values and cognitive structures (Hoy et al., 2010).

Students’ personal experiences of the university climate can affect the actual effects of climate (Kuperminc et al., 2001) so that Loukas et al (2004) state that the person’s conception of the university climate helps to achieve goals. In addition, Mc Evoy and Welker (2000) believe that the students’ perceptions of the university climate affect goal achievement. Therefore, one of the major management challenges is to create a climate where everyone can grow, achieve maturity and satisfy his own needs while working for the success of his organization, a climate creating an interpersonal commitment and showing the reasons of decision-making and change of behavior in the organization if needs and goals of employees and organizations are consistent with each other and a more productive work is done (Haus, 2003).

The university management should create a climate in which everyone as a person has an opportunity for growth and prosperity and as a group’s member satisfies his personal needs while working for the success of his organization. Developing personal responsibilities is useful for both people and university, so that letting people grow and achieve maturity while implementing their measures helps them to satisfy needs beyond their physiological and safety needs and this motivates them to apply more capabilities and abilities to achieve organizational goals (Hersey, Blanchard, Johnson, 2002 & 2007). Studying organizations, Argyris investigated the effects of management doings and measures on individual behavior and personal development and believes that it is the only way to make an effective and lasting change in individual deep levels and a person should make seven changes to his personality to achieve maturity during years of development. He
assumes that these changes are in one continuum and the healthy personality is transformed along the continuum from underdevelopment (immaturity) into development (maturity) somewhat explaining the issue of maturity. He claims that despite the unwillingness of some people to take more responsibilities or face increasing problems causing responsibility, the number of people whose incentives can be improved through increasing or promoting the level of their responsibility is much more than what managers think. It is important to organize background factors and organizational climate so that it leads to the development of maturity in people and people perceive and believe the existence of such climate (Hersey, Blanchard, Johnson, 2002 & 2007). Developing the maturity-immaturity theory, Argyris states that people grow in different levels of complete immaturity in early childhood (being passive, dependent, superficial and a little active) to maturity (active, independent, enjoying deeper thoughts and more varied interests) and considering the fact that most organizations enjoy bureaucratic or hierarchical values developing the employees’ immaturity in many cases, people joining work force do not achieve maturity due to management measures implemented in organizations. Trust and creativity are rarely observed in these environments; while people will be more independent and will have more space to grow if the manager valorizes and respects employees (Hersey & Blanchard, 2009).

According to Argyris, a person should make seven changes to his personality to achieve maturity over the years. These changes are presented in the following continuum (Accel team, 2012):

Management measures affect the Argyris’s Maturity-Immaturity continuum as follows:

1. Changing passive state to active: If the organizations where people work limits and compels them to passively perform a limited range of tasks, they will become uninterested and disappointed.

2. Changing dependent mode to independent: If the work organization does not let people apply their independence through participating in decisions affecting their situation, their self-confidence and efficiency will be hampered.

3. Changing limited behaviors to multiple behaviors: If the organization does not provide an opportunity to play different roles, people’s incentives will be reduced and their interests will be lost.

4. Changing superficial interests to deep interests: If managers believe that thinking and decision-making should be accomplished by the elite at the top of the pyramid and power should not be distributed among employees within the organization, they won’t make synergistic decisions and create synergy and will feel isolated with no voting rights.

5. Changing short-term temporal perception to long-term temporal perception: If organizations do not let people participate in long-term strategies, both level of productivity and morale of employees will be decreased.

6. Changing from inferiority to equality: Employees react negatively towards the organization trying to train them as children and not relying on them as responsible people.

7. Changing shortage of self-awareness to a sense of self-awareness: Organizations losing these opportunities will perish and won’t take advantage of the great potential of work force (Haus, 2003).

According to mentioned subjects, it appears that the structure’s type can provide conditions for the maturity of people in the organization. In fact, the structure can lead to the formation and development of climate maturity in the organization considering people as mature, crescive and dependable people who can accept their responsibilities and prove them in interaction and cooperation with others. Accordingly, this study aims to assess the relationship between these two important variables in the survival and success of organizations. Therefore, this study investigates whether there is a relationship between the organizational structure and the level of climate maturity in universities of Bandar Abbas.

**Literature Review**

In his Ph.D. thesis in Mexico, Rhodos (2009) has investigated the structural enablement and collective efficacy from the viewpoint of teachers of primary schools in America. In this study, 260 teachers participated in an online survey. Research tools of enabling school structure of Hoy
and Sweetland (2000) and research tools of Hoy and Goddard (2000) were used to measure the variables of school structure and collective efficacy, respectively. This study supported the belief that the enabling school structure and collective study efficacy are positively correlated. Tylus (2009) investigated the relationship between bureaucratic structures in middle schools and changes caused by the individual educational classroom measures of the teacher along with membership guidelines in the professional learning community (PLC). Using the bureaucratic structure continuum from enablement to hindrance designed by Hoy and Sweetland (2001), all teachers have defined the type of bureaucratic structure in which they work, and participating teachers have answered the questionnaire showing the rate of their participation. This study included 11 collegiate members of this year’s PLC. They were asked whether membership in PLC has affected their educational measures. Regression analysis demonstrated that there is a statistically significant relationship between the enabling bureaucratic structure and the high rate of personal professional development of the teacher. In addition, regression analysis has confirmed a statistically significant relationship between the enabling structure and changes in educational measures in the classroom along with membership in PLC. Watts (2009) investigated the enabling school structure, mindfulness and teachers authorities. This study was conducted on 10100 teachers in 23 schools. Results showed that the enabling structure and mindfulness depend on each other and generally there is no significant relationship between these criteria although both enabling structure and mindfulness depend on the subscale of teacher’s authorities. Chen and Huang (2007) studied how the structure and climate affect the knowledge management from the social interaction perspective. To test the hypothesis, they used a sample of 146 people and findings of regression analysis showed that the participatory and creative climate is positively dependent on social interaction and when the organizational structure enjoys less officialism, more decentralization, interaction and integration, social interaction will be increased and this social interaction is positively associated with knowledge management. Empirical evidence has supported the view that social interaction plays the role of a mediator among organizational climate, organizational structure and knowledge management. Raub & Gobet (2008) stated whether the bureaucracy kills individual initiative and investigated the effect of structure on organizational citizenship behavior. Findings showed that high standardization and focusing to offer above-mentioned standardization services had negatively affected the organizational citizenship behavior as bureaucratic mechanisms and are essential for perfect clearance. Therefore, this study proved that the elements of organizational structure limiting the control scopes of employees had negatively affected their desire to show organizational citizenship behaviors and although organizational systems defining the role of each employee are important elements for organizational design, they were not enough to guarantee the success of the organization, since role-dependent behaviors should be completed using innovation and spontaneous behaviors from time to time. Clare (2007) investigated the effect of enabling and mindful structures as predictors of school effectiveness and analyzed 112 respondent schools and 1330 respondent teachers using statistical methods of regression and correlation. Findings have shown that both mindfulness and enabling structure have been associated with efficacy. Stewart (2008) investigated the effects of the characteristics of school structure, student effort, peers’ participation and parental interventions (individual and school factors) on academic achievement. According to results obtained aiming to promote academic achievement, it is required to consider the effect of individual level and school structural factors on students and their capabilities for success. Gage (2003) inquiringly analyzed the meaning and criterion of school mindfulness. Findings have shown that there has been an indirectly positive relationship between mindfulness, sense of trust in managers during structural enablement, sense of trust in clients during collective efficacy and sense of trust in classmates during structural enablement in school mindfulness. This model was tested with a sample of 75 people in Ohio middle schools. Results have partially supported the model and a significant relationship has been observed among school mindfulness, sense of trust and collective efficacy. There were significant results among sense of trust in managers, structural enablement...
and school mindfulness. Esmi (2006) analyzed the relationship between the structure type and the organizational creativity in Shiraz middle schools. Results have shown that among triple dimensions of organizational structure, complexity, concentration and officialism have played the highest, the moderate and the lowest roles in predicting organizational creativity. Feyzi and Esmi (2009) analyzed the relationship between organizational structure and organizational creativity in Shiraz middle schools. This was a correlational study conducted on all principals of Shiraz middle schools serving in the academic year 2007-2008. Using a random sampling among 160 middle school principals in four areas of Shiraz, results of Pearson correlation coefficient have shown that there is a significant negative relationship between organizational structure and organizational creativity, i.e. the more formal, centralized and complex the organization is, the less organizational creativity will be and vice versa. Alizadeh (2008) investigated the relationship between organizational structure and effectiveness in Southern Shiraz municipalities from the viewpoint of mayors and heads of municipal departments. Research findings showed that in small municipalities, there is a significant negative or inverse relationship between complexity and effectiveness as well as officialism and effectiveness, but there is a significant direct relationship between concentration and effectiveness. However, in medium municipalities, there is a significant negative and inverse relationship between complexity and effectiveness, officialism and effectiveness as well as concentration and effectiveness and in large municipalities, there is a significant positive or direct relationship between organizational structure and effectiveness in Southern Shiraz municipalities.

**Research Questions**

1. What is the dominant structure of study universities?
2. How are the students’ perceptions of the level of climate maturity in study universities?
3. Which types of the university organizational structures and their dimensions significantly predict the level of climate maturity in the university and its septet dimensions?
4. Which types of the university organizational structures and their dimensions significantly predict the level of climate maturity in the university and its septet dimensions in terms of study universities?

**Methods**

This was a descriptive correlational study conducted on all students of Bandar Abbas universities (over 16206) among which there were 3180, 1426 and 11600 students of Hormozgan University, University of Medical Sciences, and Islamic Azad University, respectively. Using a relative stratified random sampling proportional to size, 385 students including 75, 40 and 270 students of Hormozgan University, University of Medical Sciences and Islamic Azad University were selected and studied as sample. Data were collected using two measures of the type of organizational structure (Torkzadeh & Mohtaram, 2011) consisting of 35 items (including two dimensions of structural enablement and hindrance) and the university climate maturity scale (Torkzadeh, 2008) including twenty one 5-point Likert items. Scales’ validity and reliability were calculated using item analysis and Cronbach’s alpha, respectively. The validities of the enabling dimension of the type of organizational structure (0.39-0.82) and the hindering dimension of the type of organizational structure (0.42-0.67) were obtained at a significant level of [0.0001-0.03] and [0.0001-0.02], respectively. The reliabilities of the enabling and hindering dimensions were calculated as 0.75 and 0.70, respectively. The validity and reliability of the university climate maturity scale were obtained using item analysis (0.35-0.81) and Cronbach’s alpha (0.76) at a significant level of [0.0001-0.03]. Data were analyzed using the statistical package of SPSS and Lisrel, dependent t-test (to answer question 1), one-sample t-test (to investigate question 2) and multivariate regression analysis (to answer questions 3 and 4).

**RESULTS**

**First question: What is the dominant structure of study universities?**

Table 1 shows that generally the average hindering structure is significantly higher than the average enabling structure in all universities
of the province and according to the value of t obtained in degree of freedom of 384, there is a significant difference between the enabling and hindering organizational structures. Therefore, the hindering structure is the dominant structure of these universities.

Table 2 comparing the enabling and hindering structures in terms of different universities of the province shows that the average hindering structure is significantly higher than the average enabling structure in Hormozgan university and according to the value of t obtained in degree of freedom of 74, there is a significant difference between the enabling and hindering organizational structures at a level of 0.0001 from the viewpoint of sample students of Hormozgan University. The average hindering structure is significantly higher than the average enabling structure in Azad University and according to the value of t obtained in degree of freedom of 269, there is a significant difference between the enabling and hindering organizational structures at a level of 0.0001 from the viewpoint of sample students of Azad University. In addition, findings of the table indicate that the average hindering structure is significantly higher than the average enabling structure in Medical University of Sciences and according to the value of t obtained in degree of freedom of 39, there is a significant difference between the enabling and hindering organizational structures at a level of 0.0001 from the viewpoint of sample students of Medical University of Sciences.

Second question

How are the students’ perceptions of the level of climate maturity in study universities?

Table 3 shows the average climate maturity and its different dimensions from the viewpoint of sample students of study universities as well as its comparison with the criteria of favorable efficacy (Q3) and acceptable efficacy (Q2). It is observed that the total average of climate maturity and its different dimensions are significantly lower than the favorable efficacy (Q3) and according to the value of t obtained in degree of freedom of 384, there is a significant difference between the average university climate maturity and its different dimensions and the average criterion at a level of 0.0001. In addition, it is observed that the average university climate maturity and active, independent, temporal viewpoint, awareness and control dimensions are higher than the acceptable efficacy (Q2) and according to the value of t obtained in degree of freedom of 384, there is a significant difference between the average university climate maturity and these dimensions and the average criterion at a level of 0.0001-0.02 but ability, intense interests and situation dimensions are equal to the acceptable efficacy.

Third question

Which types of the university organizational structures and their dimensions significantly predict the level of climate maturity in the university and its septet dimensions?

To answer this question, relevant data were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) and results are presented in Figure 3 below. Type of the university organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity are considered as independent and dependent variables, respectively. Figure 3 shows that the level of university climate maturity is predicted using the variable of the type of the (enabling) organizational structure. There is a significant positive relationship between the enabling organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity (β = 0.74 and P ≤ 0.01), but there is no significant relationship between the hindering organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity (β = 0.05).

According to Figure 3, officialism, process, background and concentration dimensions of the enabling structure have factor loadings 0.82, 0.77, 0.76 and 0.63, respectively and the hindering structure is specified by concentration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Structure</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindering structure</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(factor loading 0.76), officialism (factor loading 0.64), background (factor loading 0.59) and process (factor loading 0.30) dimensions. In addition, it is observed that the dimensions of climate maturity interests, climate maturity viewpoint, climate maturity awareness, active climate maturity, independent climate maturity, climate maturity behavior and situation enjoy the decreasing amount in specifying the level of university climate maturity.

**Fourth question**

Which types of the university organizational structures and their dimensions significantly predict the level of climate maturity in the university and its septet dimensions in terms of study universities?

To answer this question, relevant data were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) and results are presented in Figures 4, 5 and 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Acceptable efficacy (Q2)</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Favorable efficacy (Q3)</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Average variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hormozgan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling structure</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.05</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>Climate maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hindering structure</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Azad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling structure</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hindering structure</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical University of Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling structure</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hindering structure</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intense interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness and control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Results of the dependent t-test to separately compare dimensions of the enabling and hindering organizational structures among the universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant level</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Acceptable efficacy (Q2)</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Favorable efficacy (Q3)</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Average variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>59.05</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>87.75</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>Climate maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>Intense interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Temporal perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Awareness and control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Argyris’s Maturity-Immaturity continuum Resource: Hersey, Blanchard, Johnson, 2002

Fig. 2. Conceptual model of research
Fig. 3. The relationship between the type of the organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity

Fig. 4. The relationship between the type of the organizational structure and the level of climate maturity in University of Medical Sciences
Fig. 5. The relationship between the type of the organizational structure and the level of climate maturity in Hormozgan University

Fig. 6. The relationship between the type of the organizational structure and the level of climate maturity in Azad University
Figure 4 shows that the level of climate maturity in University of Medical Sciences is predicted using the variable of the type of the (enabling, hindering) organizational structure. There is a significant positive relationship between the enabling organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity ($\alpha=0.67$ and $p \leq 0.01$) and a significant positive relationship between the hindering organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity ($\beta=0.18$ and $p \leq 0.05$).

It should be noted that according to Figure 4, formalization, process, context and concentration dimensions of the enabling structure have factor loadings 0.82, 0.74, 0.71 and 0.43, respectively and the hindering structure is specified by concentration (factor loading 1.13), formalization (factor loading 0.64), context (factor loading 0.31) and process (factor loading 0.04) dimensions. In addition, it is observed that the dimensions of climate maturity interests, climate maturity awareness, climate maturity viewpoint, active climate maturity, independent climate maturity and climate maturity behavior enjoy the decreasing amount in specifying the level of climate maturity in University of Medical Sciences.

Figure 5 shows that the level of climate maturity in Hormozgan University is predicted using the variable of the type of the (enabling) organizational structure. There is a significant positive relationship between the enabling organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity ($\beta=0.56$ and $p \leq 0.01$) but there is no significant relationship between the hindering organizational structure and the level of university climate maturity ($\beta=0.005$).

According to Figure 6, officialism, context, process and concentration dimensions of the enabling structure have factor loadings 0.78, 0.77, 0.71 and 0.64, respectively and the hindering structure is specified by concentration (factor loading 0.74), officialism (factor loading 0.63), context (factor loading 0.63) and process (factor loading 0.30) dimensions. In addition, it is observed that the dimensions of climate maturity awareness, climate maturity interests, climate maturity viewpoint, independent climate maturity, active climate maturity, climate maturity behavior, and climate maturity situation enjoy the decreasing amount in specifying the level of climate maturity in Azad University.

Generally speaking, it seems that in universities of Bandar Abbas, the enabling structure could lead to the climate maturity but the hindering structure could not prevent the climate maturity.

**DISCUSSION**

According to research findings, students think that the hindering structure is the structure governing educational environments of universities in Bandar Abbas, according to available evidence the hindrance of which in Hormozgan University is more than that in other universities, University of Medical Sciences and Islamic Azad University, respectively; i.e. in these universities, the behaviors of individuals are closely monitored and hardly controlled, straying from rules and regulations are punished, blind obedience to rules is required, problems are considered as obstacles, changes are played-down (Hoy & Miskel, 2008), communication, innovation and trust are reduced
(Hoy and Sweetland, 2001) and managers feel powerless (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In such a structure, managers behave unfriendly and very critically and use methods such as ill-treating, lying (Blase & Blase, 2006) and twisting the truth (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In addition, results of this study showed that the students’ perceptions of the level of climate maturity in universities are lower than the favorable efficacy level. This means that in these universities, people are not allowed to naturally and freely express their feelings, relationships are superficial and weak and there is trustlessness (Accel Team, 2004). In these universities, only a limited part of individual capacity and capability is used, individuals are dependent on managers and intense control leads to less freedom for self-control, limited work (Jane et al., 2008, Feigenbaum, 2012) and imposition of these limitations by managers (Witzel, 2004) causing individuals to feel frustrated and suppressed leading to disbelief, trustlessness and lack of individuals’ commitment to their work (Witzel, 2004), reduced potential for productive activities (Jane et al., 2008, Feigenbaum, 2012) and consequently, graduates enjoying limited viewpoints, lack of creativity (Tremblay, 2005), autonomy and self-leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 2002 & 2007). However, a leading society in accordance with changes and global competition is a society enjoying creative and self-confident human force acting based on their creative efforts (Abedzadeh, 2008).

The answer to the third question revealed that the enabling organizational structure and all its dimensions are significant predictors of the level of climate maturity and all its dimensions in universities of Bandar Abbas. Obtained results are consistent with the results of Tylus study (2009) where there is a significant relationship between the enabling bureaucratic structure and the teacher’s professional development. According to the results of this study, we can say that mutual communication (characteristic of the enabling structure) being a reciprocal process requires continuous discussions and exchanges and is an activity leading to new discovery and perception, increased knowledge and intuition and letting people learn and interact (the enabling concentration dimension) (Hoy & Miskel, 2008) leading to increased incentive and responsibility (Mir Kamali, 2009). Therefore, multiple behaviors and equal situation (climate maturity dimensions) lead to people’s development (Haus, 2003). According to Mirabi (2009), proper relationships among the members of an organization reduce disagreements, make managers aware of the organization’s problems and make them trustee (the enabling context dimension) and Haus (2003) believes that trust people leads to their development. These communications aim to create consultation and interlocution and familiarity with the method of interaction analysis of the enabling structure (the enabling process dimension) (Hoy & Miskel, 2008) helps people to examine problems with mental maturity and solve them rationally and logically (Mirabi, 2009). When people work cooperatively (Hoy, 2003 & 2005), they will apply their independence participating in decision-making and their maturity will be promoted (Haus, 2003; Accel team, 2012). In a structure in which people participate in decision-making and problem-solving (process dimension) and feel power (context dimension) with voting right (Hoy & Miskel, 2008), their interests will become deeper and directed towards the maturity continuum. In the enabling structure enjoying trust, amenability (officialisma and concentration dimensions) (Stearate et al., 2004) and commitment (Hoy, 2003 & 2005), people will be placed in an equal (not inferior) position to others and achieve maturity (Accel team, 2012; Haus, 2003). According to Rhods (2009), cooperation among people (managers and masters) leads students to their maximum potential and the belief that they can; subsequently, they achieve self-awareness and (Haus, 2003) move towards the continuum maturity.

If leadership (and structure as one of its determinant factors) (Hoy & Miskel, 2008) and bureaucracy (Hoy, 2003) do not limit people, problems are considered as opportunities (officialism dimension) (Hoy & Miskel, 2008) and people are free to innovate (Rhods, 2009) (concentration dimension), they won’t become uninterested and will become active (Accel team, 2012; Haus, 2003). According to Mir Kamali (2007), human relationships provide conditions for incentive, development, mutual perception and trust. In addition, investigating the relationship between the type of structure of the climate maturity in terms of universities (fourth question) indicated that: 1 – In University of Medical Sciences, there is a significant positive relationship between the enabling structure and...
the level of climate maturity and there is also a significant positive relationship between the hindering structure and the level of climate maturity in this university. Considering the specific characteristic of the fields of medical sciences such as fields of medicine, dentistry, nursing, obstetrics, operating room, hygienic and anesthesiology in University of Medical Sciences where students spend many times (especially in higher semesters) in the university hospitals, contact with patients with special characteristics and situations, as well as the emergency issues, necessary flexibility and participation and cooperation requiring special initiative, creativity, autonomy and multiple behaviors, it can be said that the results obtained from this university and the positive relationship between the hindering structure and the climate maturity in the above-mentioned university are caused by the effect of the participatory and interactive space and relative autonomy in hospitals and training environments in terms of the features of their fields.

2- In Hormozgan University, the enabling structure was the significant positive predictor of the climate maturity but the hindering structure was not the significant predictor of the climate maturity due to participation and cooperation in problem-solving, existence of conditions for the development of creativity and innovation, providing opportunities to apply new ideas, exchange of ideas and experiences, group-activities, university’s commitment to its promises, promotion of honesty and integrity among people, existence of informal and team organizations and the role of social factors.

3- In addition, in Azad University like Hormozgan University, the hindering structure has not prevented the climate maturity and this can be explained by the role of other factors affecting individual maturity such as the existence of informal organizations, individual factors and social interactions. Comparison of the predictive ability of the enabling structure for the level of climate maturity in three universities showed that Azad University, University of Medical Sciences, and Hormozgan University are at the highest, middle and the lowest position, since the majority of Azad University students are native whose work potentials should be used in their provinces in the future. Considering the fact that this university is private as well as considering the increasing competitions between this university and other universities (with regard to the increased capacity of nationwide and non-profit universities in past years) to attract students and consider the satisfaction of them and their families, it can be said that management, flexibility, educational environment, interaction between masters and students as well as students with each other have played more important roles for climate maturity in this university. To improve the structure of the university (changing it to an enabling structure) and consequent to the governance of the climate maturity, it is recommended to do the following measures:

- Encouraging group activities, participating in decision-makings, supporting creativity and innovation, being confident in people’s skills and abilities, emphasizing goals and views of the university instead of emphasizing procedures and regulations, promoting honesty, integrity and properly dealing with mistakes, turning threats into opportunities, applying flexibility in laws and regulations depending on surrounding conditions, encouraging open communications, empowering individuals, devolving authorities to them, and employing God-centered leaders being relatively mature (as a determinant factor of the structure).
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