



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE,
ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIVENESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL
EFFECTIVENESS IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN IRAN***

GITI ASHRAF

FPP 2013 56



U P M
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA
BERSEKUTU BERTAMBAH

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE,
ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIVENESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL
EFFECTIVENESS IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN IRAN**



By

GITI ASHRAF

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti
Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy**

November 2013

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Dedicated with love to

My Dear Family



© COPYRIGHT UPM

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE,
ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIVENESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL
EFFECTIVENESS IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN IRAN**

By

GITI ASHRAF

November 2013

Chairperson : Suhaida bte Abd. Kadir, PhD

Faculty : Educational Studies

Empirical evidences indicate that if institutions of higher education are to survive and achieve long-run viability, they must be effective. Organizational culture and organizational innovativeness are viewed as important factors for improving the organizational effectiveness in these organizations. The aim of this study was to examine the correlations among organizational culture, organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness. Moreover, the mediating role of organizational innovativeness between organizational culture and organizational effectiveness was studied.

The method used in the study was survey research. Based on the cluster sampling method, all full time faculty members from five branches of Islamic Azad University (IAU), located in Region one, Pars Province, Iran, were included in the sample of the study. The number of respondents was 369 participants. For measuring organizational culture, the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) prepared by Cameron and Quinn (2006) was employed. Two new questionnaires were also developed for measuring organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness.

The findings indicated that the mean scores for the three organizational culture types of clan, market and adhocracy were all moderate. However, the mean score for hierarchy culture was low. The mean scores for organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness were also moderate. Furthermore, the adhocracy culture, market culture and clan culture were found to have significant positive correlations with organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness. However, hierarchy culture showed no significant relationship with either organizational innovativeness or organizational effectiveness. Additionally, organizational innovativeness was found to have a significant positive relationship with organizational effectiveness.

The results indicated that organizational innovativeness partially mediated the relationships among clan, adhocracy and market cultures with

organizational effectiveness. Adhocracy culture contributed to predicting organizational effectiveness positively significantly. Clan, adhocracy and market cultures were positive and significant predictors for organizational innovativeness. Both technical and administrative innovations predicted organizational effectiveness positively significantly. The findings of this study demonstrated that adhocracy culture type is the positive predictor for organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness. Therefore, adhocracy culture needs to be strengthened within IAU in Iran in order to enhance the innovativeness and effectiveness of universities.



Abstrak tesis ini dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi syarat keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

HUBUNGAN ANTARA BUDAYA ORGANISASI, INOVASI ORGANISASI DAN KEBERKESANAN ORGANISASI DALAM UNIVERSITI SWASTA DI IRAN

Oleh

GITI ASHRAF

November 2013

Pengerusi : Suhaida binti Abdul Kadir, Phd.

Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Banyak bukti empirikal menunjukkan bahawa jika institusi pendidikan tinggi ingin kekal dan mencapai kejayaan jangka panjang, mereka harus berkesan dan boleh dipercayai. Budaya organisasi dan inovasi organisasi merupakan faktor penting untuk meningkatkan keberkesanan organisasi dalam sektor ini. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji hubungan antara budaya organisasi, inovasi organisasi dan keberkesanan organisasi. Selain itu, kajian ini juga bertujuan mengkaji peranan inovasi organisasi sebagai pengantara bagi budaya organisasi dan keberkesanan organisasi.

Kaedah yang digunakan dalam kajian ini adalah kajian penyelidikan. Berdasarkan kaedah persampelan kelompok, ahli fakulti sepenuh masa (IAU) dipilih daripada lima cawangan *Islamic Azad University* yang terletak di *Region One, Pars Province, Iran*. Bilangan responden ialah 369 peserta. Soal selidik berdasarkan *Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)* yang disediakan oleh 'Cameron dan Quinn' (2006) diguna untuk mengukur budaya organisasi. Terdapat dua set soal selidik yang baru disediakan untuk mengukur inovasi organisasi dan keberkesanan organisasi.

Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa min skor bagi tiga jenis budaya organisasi iaitu *clan*, *market*, dan *adhocracy* adalah sederhana. Walau bagaimanapun min skor bagi budaya *hierarchy* adalah rendah. Min skor bagi inovasi organisasi dan keberkesanan organisasi juga sederhana. Selain itu budaya *adhocracy*, budaya *market*, budaya *clan* menunjukkan hubungan positif yang signifikan dengan inovasi organisasi dan keberkesanan organisasi. Walau bagaimanapun dapatan kajian menunjukkan tidak ada hubungan yang signifikan antara budaya *hierarchy* dengan inovasi organisasi dan juga keberkesanan organisasi. Kajian ini juga mendapati terdapat hubungan positif yang signifikan antara inovasi organisasi dan keberkesanan organisasi.

Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa inovasi organisasi menjadi pengantara separa bagi hubungan antara budaya *clan*, *adhocracy* dan *market* dengan

keberkesanan organisasi. Budaya *adhocracy* merupakan penyumbang kepada peramal positif yang signifikan bagi keberkesanan organisasi. Budaya *Clan*, *adhocracy* dan *market* pula menjadi peramal positif yang signifikan bagi inovasi organisasi. Inovasi teknikal dan inovasi pentadbiran merupakan peramal positif yang signifikan bagi keberkesanan organisasi. Dapatan kajian ini menunjukkan budaya *adhocracy* adalah peramal positif bagi inovasi organisasi dan keberkesanan organisasi. Oleh yang demikian, budaya *adhocaracy* perlu diperkukuhkan dalam IAU di Iran untuk meningkatkan innovasi dan keberkesanan universiti.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my greatest thanks to Gracious Allah. I firmly believe that through Him ALL things are possible. The thesis owes its existence to all those who gave me their kind assistance in different ways in its completion.

Special thanks go to my supervisor Dr. Suhaida Abd. Kadir, and also my committee members, Professor Dr. Zaidatol Akmaliah Lope Pihie and Associate Professor Dr. Abdullah Mat Rashid for their professional support and personal encouragement throughout this endeavor.

I extend my sincere gratitude to all my family who taught me faith and perseverance. To my late father whom I lost while I was at a great distance from home. I would also like to thank Professor Dr. Maimunah Ismail, Professor Dr. Murali Sambasivan, Dr. Soaib Asimiran, Dr. Mohsen Khademi and Dr. Mohammad Hassan Rezaie for their kind and professional assistance for developing the research instrument.

I owe appreciation to IAU, for providing facilities for collecting data and for granting me leave to pursue my studies. I also express gratitude to my colleagues and other friends for their camaraderie over these years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
APPROVAL	viii
DECLARATION	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
LIST OF ABBRIVATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Theoretical Background	4
1.3 Problem Statement	7
1.4 Research Objectives	8
1.5 Research Questions	8
1.6 The Significance of the Study	9
1.7 Limitation of the Study	10
1.8 Definition of Terms	11
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 Organizational Culture	13
2.2.1 Models of Organizational Culture	14
2.2.2 CVF versus other major Organizational Culture Models	19
2.3 Organizational Innovativeness	21
2.3.1 Organizational Innovativeness Approaches	22
2.3.2 A comparison between Type Approach and the other Organizational Innovativeness Approaches	26
2.4 Organizational Effectiveness	26
2.4.1 General Models of Organizational Effectiveness	27
2.4.2 Organizational Effectiveness Models at Higher Education	28
2.4.3 Comparison of Cameron's Model to other Organizational Effectiveness Models	34
2.5 Relationship between Organizational Culture and Organizational Effectiveness	37

2.6	Relationship between Organizational Culture and Organizational Effectiveness at Higher Education	38
2.7	Relationship between Organizational Culture and Organizational Innovativeness	43
2.8	Relationship between Organizational Innovativeness and Organizational Effectiveness	44
2.9	Research Theoretical Framework	47
2.10	Research Conceptual Framework	49
3	METHODOLOGY	53
3.1	Introduction	53
3.2	Research Design	53
3.3	Location of the Study	53
3.4	Population and Sample	54
3.5	Instrumentation	56
3.5.1	Respondents' Socio - Demographics	56
3.5.2	Organizational Culture Questionnaire	56
3.5.3	Organizational Innovativeness Questionnaire	57
3.5.4	Organizational Effectiveness Questionnaire	58
3.6	Validity and Reliability	59
3.6.1	Pilot Study	59
3.6.2	Construct Validity	61
3.7	Data Collection Procedures	64
3.8	Data Analysis	65
4	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	68
4.1	Introduction	68
4.2	Socio - Demographics	68
4.3	Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA)	69
4.4	Research Questions	70
4.4.1	Research Question No.1	70
4.4.2	Research Question No.2	72
4.4.3	Research Question No.3	74
4.4.4	Research Question No.4	78
4.4.5	Research Question No.5	79
4.4.6	Research Question No.6	81
5	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	84
5.1	Introduction	84
5.2	Summary	84
5.3	Theoretical Implications	85
5.4	Practical Implications	86
5.5	Recommendations	87
	REFERENCES	89
	APPENDICES	113
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	125
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	A comparison between the dimensions of organizational effectiveness models in higher education	36
3.1	Summary of Organizational Culture Instrument	56
3.2	Summary of organizational innovativeness instrument	57
3.3	Summary of Organizational Effectiveness Instrument	59
3.4	Reliability estimates for the organizational culture	60
3.5	Reliability estimates for the organizational innovativeness	61
3.6	Reliability estimates for the organizational effectiveness	61
3.7	Results of KMO and Bartlett's test for organizational culture	62
3.8	Rotated component matrix for organizational culture	62
3.9	Results of KMO and Bartlett's test for organizational innovativeness	63
3.10	Rotated component matrix for organizational innovation	63
3.11	KMO and Bartlett's test for organizational effectiveness	63
3.12	Rotated component matrix for organizational effectiveness	64
3.13	Strength of relationship	65
3.14	Research questions and specific data analyses	66
4.1	Frequency distribution of the sample	68
4.2	Mean and SD for organizational culture types	70
4.3	Mean and SD for organizational Innovativeness	70
4.4	Mean and SD for organizational effectiveness	71
4.5	Bivariate correlations among six research variables	72
4.6	Partial correlations controlling for organizational Innovativeness	75
4.7	Results of the SPSS mediation analysis for clan culture	76
4.8	Results of the SPSS mediation analysis for adhocracy culture	76
4.9	Results of the SPSS mediation analysis for market culture	77
4.10	Estimates of coefficients for the model	79
4.11	Estimates of coefficients for the model	80
4.12	Estimates of coefficients for the model	81

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Competing values framework	16
2.2 Theoretical framework	49
2.3 Conceptual framework	52
5.1 The final research model with organizational innovativeness as mediators	86



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Location of the study (Pars Province)	113
B	Measures of Reliability for Research Instrument	114
C	Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA)	119



LIST OF ABBRIVATIONS

ANOVA	One - Way Analysis of Variance
CIP	Cultural Institution of Moghan
CVF	Competing Values Framework
EDA	Exploratory Data Analysis
EQUIS	European Quality Improvement System
IABC	International Association of Business Communicators
IAU	Islamic Azad University
IBM	International Business Machine
ISC	Islamic World Science Citation Center
OCAI	Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument
RHA	Residence Hall Associations
SPSS	Sciences Statistical Package for the Social
VIF	Variance Inflation Factor

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with a review of the background of the study. Next, the related theories are reviewed. The chapter continues with the statement of the research problem, followed by research objectives and questions. Subsequently, the significance of the study and its limitations are discussed. The final part of the chapter presents the definitions of some of the key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Organizational effectiveness is the ability of an organization to access and attract resources and consequently achieve its aims (McLuhan, 2006). Accountability and institutional effectiveness are expected from universities for several reasons, including the rising student enrollments, increasing costs of education, decreasing research grants, diminishing learning-teaching resources, as well as growing needs for skilled workers and economic development (Burke, 2005; Skolits & Graybeal, 2007). Organizational effectiveness should focus on human resources. The organizations must help individuals to achieve skills and self-esteem in order to control the new environment and find security and support (Vinitwatanakhun, 2002).

The review of literature shows that although organizational effectiveness of higher education organizations has other dimensions like structure, leadership style, and quality of work life, the organizational culture as the basic factor has considerable significance (Khoshbakhti, 2005). According to Arshad (2003), different factors of the organization like social recognition, monetary incentives, educational level, gender and experience of the employees will influence the organization's effective functioning. The contribution of culture and the role of the environment should be considered important for an organization to achieve success.

The crucial effect of culture on human resources has been investigated by different researchers in the field of human resource management. Mehralizadeh and Atabi (2006) state that culture will influence the improvement of organization and help determine the meaning of organizational effectiveness. Many aspects of organizational effectiveness are influenced by organizational culture. Such aspects vary from the way individuals do their work to the nature of an organization's strategy and key activity initiatives. The definition of organizational culture suggested by Cameron and Quinn (2006) overlaps the definition of success that characterizes an organization. It also covers expectations, collective memories, language and symbols, dominant leadership style and everything that is valued.

One of the duties of higher educational institutions is to increase their effectiveness by using the experiences, talents, and moral capabilities of

their human resources such as students, faculty members, and staff. This duty can be easily fulfilled through organizational culture in which needs, expectations, knowledge, and capabilities of individuals, environment, and organization have been matched with each other. Thus, higher education management should pay special attention to investigation of organizational culture and its different dimensions (Ardalan, Salimi, Rajaeepour, & Molavy, 2008).

According to researchers like Deal and Kennedy (2000) culture plays a significant role in shaping organizational procedures. Yilmaz and Ergun (2008) hold that culture is a major part of an organizational activity and a key factor in solving organizations' problems. Culture is also considered the major factor which gathers all the abilities of an organization so as to make a united unit (Day, 1994) and to encourage or discourage an organization to reach its aims (Denison & Spreitzer, 1991).

It is not possible to duplicate the comparative benefits achieved through a culture-driven organizational capability because culture is socially complex and causally ambiguous. Thus, it is crucial to create a source of long-lasting competitive benefit as mentioned by Yilmaz and Ergun (2008). This point motivated researchers to conduct studies empirically to collect some features of the culture of an organization and the effect that it places on the processes, effectiveness as well as the outcomes of an organization (Carmeli & Tishler, 2004). In this respect, Processor (2000) states that some researchers suppose that organizational culture can be reshaped, making a unifying force that leads to organizational effectiveness.

Organizational culture can influence the ways of planning, organizing, staffing, leading and controlling that known as managerial functions (McLuhan, 2006). There is the fact that organizational leaders have the ability to impact the effectiveness of an organization by exercising control over elements related to organizational culture (Kwantes & Bolglarsky, 2007). In his attempt to identify the available organizational culture in higher education contexts, Eichotz (2004) found that organizational culture could influence motivation, job satisfaction and organization obligation. He believed that managers could strengthen organizational culture if they paid more attention to values, ideas, and norms of their organization.

Several decades ago, human resources, investment, technology, raw materials, production, and management skills were assumed as the factors which led to the organizational effectiveness. However, nowadays, organizational culture and organizational innovativeness are regarded as the two important factors which formulate and strengthen the organizational performance (Zarei Matin & Mahdavi, 2003).

Organizational innovativeness was first used to define the outlook and agreement that the consumers have toward new products in the literature of communication and innovation. Generally, the consumers who possess the attribute of innovativeness are more prone to accept and use new products in

the market in comparison with others. The organizational innovativeness means the extent to which an organization is ready to accept innovation and apply it in the organization (Rogers, 2003). On the whole, organizational innovativeness means the capability of an organization for innovation and its active ability to put new opinions, technology or products into practice (Lin, 2006). Organizations which are scientifically oriented, like laboratories and universities which carry out scientific research face increasing pressure. They have to present effective management and be responsible for optimizing their effectiveness despite their limited resources. Managers in these organizations are obliged to be innovative in their research, conduct, sponsorship as well as design and management (Baker & Branch, 2008).

The primary goal of innovation is to help maintain an organization's long-term performance and improve its short-term efficiency. The performance goal can be accomplished by offering new and improved services to existing or new users as well as introducing innovations in the internal systems of the organization (Walker, Damanpour, & Avellaneda, 2007). Innovation can not only enhance organizational adaptability but also improve organizational performance (Chen, Liu, & Wu, 2009). It helps higher education organizations to grow and maintain their roles in changes. It helps them initiate cooperation of researchers and professors that can bridge the gap between research, training and innovation (Ghorchian & Salehi, 2005).

In Iran, Islamic Azad University (IAU) is one of the largest nongovernmental universities in the world. It was founded in 1982 after Islamic revolution in Iran. Its slogan was "higher education for all". After three decades, the IAU now has over 4,000,000 graduates, 1,700,000 students, 35,000 faculty members and over 35,000 administrative staff across Iran. With over 400 university branches and educational centers, built on an area exceeding 21 million square meters (Vice president international affairs of IAU, 2012). The ability of institutions of higher education to respond to the constituents noted above is dependent upon the degree to which the institution is engaged in assessing organizational performance (Alexander, 2000). Universities that are known for outstanding research, quality education, and their economic contributions to a region understand and value the effectiveness of their constituents (Dela Cruz, 2011).

The large majority of Iranian students attend private universities. These universities play a central role by providing access to students who would otherwise be unable to obtain academic degrees (Altbach & Umakoshi, 2004). Although universities are essentially non-profit organizations, but to finance and re-investment in their training activities they have to make enough money. There is no doubt that universities face with a series of competitive - local, regional, international fields. The present age is customer focus and audience-centered to the organization. The success of any organization is directly related to the demands of clients and audiences. Therefore, private universities have to care about the quality of their services to survive (Amoopour, Asgari, & Azari, 2012). It can help them to don't waste human capital, financial and material resources needed and coordinate the

development of educational systems and their performance is essential (Taleghani, Soofi, & Fomani, 2012).

Jafari, Ghourchian, and Sadeghi (2013) evaluated components related to a sustainable university of IAU. Evaluated components of the study including: ideal ideas, mission and policy in university, organization structure and stakeholders corporation, education, research, sources management, food products and recycling, reconstruction and green construction, students life and partnership, transportation, standards, management information system, academic freedom and faculty appointment and promotion decisions, clear rights and responsibilities and finally accountability. Results have shown the university is in a desirable status in components of management information system, academic freedom, qualified appointment and promotion as well as accountability and the rest of components are in undesirable condition.

Based on important roles of culture and innovation in organizational performance improvement, this study is going to determine the relationships among organizational culture, organizational innovativeness, and organizational effectiveness in IAU. It is expected that research findings can help to improve and increase institutional effectiveness of IAU to achieve ideal situation for competing at a global level.

1.2 Theoretical Background

The present study is anchored on the excellent theory and the socio-technical system theory as well as three models related to these theories. They are: Competing Values Framework (CVF) model of organizational culture, the type approach of organizational innovativeness, and the organizational effectiveness model established on Cameron's (1978) framework. These theories and models are briefly presented in the next sections.

Organizational Culture

The introduction of the concept of organizational culture has generally been attributed to several individuals, including Hofstede (2001) and Schein (2004). Organizational culture has been defined in various ways for example, L.A. Gruning, J. E. Grunig and Dozier (2002) in their theory of excellence defined organizational culture as "the sum total of shared values, symbols, meanings, beliefs, assumptions, and expectations that organize and integrate a group of people who work together" (p. 482). They determined that organizational culture consists of the set of presuppositions that make up a worldview and also the products of that worldview. (Products might consist of values, stories, myths, artifacts, and rituals). According to excellence theory, organizational culture has several key characteristics that are:

- Authoritarian versus participative management style.
- Liberal versus conservative values.
- Cooperation versus domination in relationships with publics.
- System open versus closed to its environment.

- Innovation versus tradition and efficiency as organizational values.

In this theory, characteristics on the left would characterize participative cultures and those on the right authoritarian cultures. However, no organization is totally participative or totally authoritarian. In the current study, organizational culture is studied based on CVF that is one main approach in excellence theory. Cameron and Quinn (2006) made a framework for the organizational culture whose theoretical basis was referred to as the CVF. The mentioned model is useful when making a profile for the culture of an organization.

Generally speaking, this profile includes four types, namely clan, hierarchy, adhocracy and market. The clan focuses on the events happening inside the organization with a sense of flexibility; it pays attention to people and customers. The second type, hierarchy, concerns the internal maintenance with special attention to control and stability. The focus of adhocracy culture is on the external shapes with much concentration on individuality and flexibility. The fourth type of organizational culture is the market culture. It focuses on the outside stance. In this culture, control and stability are of significant values. In the current study, CVF is employed for studying the organizational culture of IAU in Iran.

Organizational Innovativeness

The adoption of innovation is a means for organizational adaptation and change to facilitate achieving the organization's performance goals, especially under the conditions of intense competition, rapidly changing market, scarce resources, and customer and public demand for higher quality and better products and services (Jansen, Van den Bosch, & Volberda, 2006). Based on the socio-technical system theory in effective organizations the technical and social systems operate in balance; that is, the adoptions of technological and administrative innovations are equally important (Damanpour, Walker, & Avellaneda, 2009).

In reference to the socio-technical system theory; this study utilizes the two innovation types, namely technical innovation and administrative innovation that are most widely used in conceptualizing and operationalizing innovation (Damanpour, 1987; Jaskyte, 2002; Obenchain, 2002; Perri 6, 1993; Shin, 1996). Damanpour (1987) placed a distinction between innovation in administration and in technology. The administrative innovation includes changes in the processes of the administration and structure of an organization. According to Schin and McClomb (1998), administrative innovation consists of regulations, roles, structures, and procedures which depend on the interactions of employees with one another. It has a direct relationship with the management of the organization.

In contrast, technical innovation introduces some reform in the services or products. This takes place when a new technique, instrument, or a different system is utilized (Damanpour, 1987). Technical innovation can lie in: (1) the

unprecedented new technological content present in the newly introduced products or (2) the process that uses new instruments of the technological development (Wang & Ahmad, 2004).

Organizational Effectiveness

A variety of definitions of organizational effectiveness have been proposed during the last half century. For example, J.E. Gruning and L.A. Gruning (2008), in their theory of excellence defined organizational effectiveness as occurring when an organization achieves goals chosen in consultation with stakeholders. According to L.A. Gruning, J. E. Grunig and Dozier (2002), theory of excellence synthesized the four main approaches of effectiveness that help to explain why some operations are considered successful and thrive, whereas others are seen as ineffective. These perspectives are competing values, systems, strategic constituencies and goal attainment. In the present study, the competing values approach was discussed previously related to organizational culture. The systems perspective emphasizes the interdependence of organizations with their environments, or the system with its suprasystem. The strategic constituencies perspective, like systems theory, acknowledges interdependencies within the organization and, especially, between the organization and its environment. However, it focuses on those elements of the environment most critical to the organization. Finally, the goal attainment perspective proposes that the effective organization realizes its goals. The emphasis is on ends, rather than any balance between means and ends. Its attraction is the acknowledgment of purposeful action.

In the current study, organizational effectiveness is studied based on Cameron's (1981) model which can be related to organizational effectiveness approaches in the excellence theory. In an effort to address the need for a meaningful model for effectiveness in educational institutions, Cameron (1978) identified nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness. These dimensions can be used to evaluate the performance of all forms of postsecondary institutions.

The first four dimensions focus on students, including students' educational satisfaction, professional development, academic development, and personal development. Effectiveness in the above-mentioned dimensions means to determine to what extent the students are satisfied with their studies and to what extent they are scientifically, professionally, and individually proficient.

The fifth dimension in organizational effectiveness is the satisfaction of the faculty and the administrators with their employment. It indicates that the members of the faculty are satisfied with the situations they are in. The next dimension is progress in profession and efficiency which the faculty bears. It means to identify how much the faculty members have improved in their profession and how well the faculty has gained progress. Furthermore, the incentives which the institution provides for the members can be identified, too.

The seventh dimension is system openness and community relationship. It indicates the focus on the relationship and compatibility with and working inside and outside the setting. The next dimension is the capability in attracting resources. It deals with identifying to what extent the organization has access to outside resources such as financial resources and legal support. This dimension also seeks to identify to what extent the organization can attract well-qualified students and faculty members. The last dimension is organizational health that will determine to what extent the organization supports its staff and faculty members.

1.3 Problem Statement

Quality assessment in higher education is both a national and a global concern for academic leaders (O'Brien, 2009). It is the main subject in the area of quality education and concerns accomplishing institutional goals and meeting financial obligations (Maguad, 2007). Over the past decade, challenges and demands for higher education institutions to demonstrate institutional effectiveness and accountability from the government as well as the nongovernment sectors have steadily increased (Behr & Walker, 2009; Middaugh, 2009).

Islamic Azad University as a major private university in Iran is expected to fulfill the following aims: to increase the professional satisfaction of the academic and non-academic staff along with improving their performance; to improve the academic satisfaction of the students, to promote educational quality and organizational activities, to make the administration of the university more effective through training creative and responsible individuals, to pay more attention to technology and present electronic services to increase clients' satisfaction, and to make a refreshing, innovative, spiritual, and effective environment (Jafarzade Kermani & Fatahi, 2004; Rahnama, et al., 2011; Zand, et al., 2011). Based on these expectations, IAU has struggled to develop processes and strategies to promote the effectiveness of their institutions.

Based on literature, it was found that the type of organizational culture has a significant association with organizational effectiveness (Anderson, 2000; Cameron, 1984; Dela Cruz, 2011; Lejeune & vas, 2009). A few studies explored variables that moderated or mediated the relationship between organizational culture and organizational performance. For example communication (Garnett et al., 2008), Leadership (Chen, 2004), and human resource-related performance (Ngo & Loi, 2008).

There are researches concerning the link between organizational culture and organizational innovativeness (Bratianu & Vasilache, 2009; Duréndez & Garcia, 2008; Obenchain, Johnson, & Dion's, 2004). A number of researchers have demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness. (Gopalakrishnan, 2000; Lin, 2006; Tajeddini, 2011; Wang, 2005). A few studies support the important role of organizational innovativeness as a

partial mediator between environmental and organizational variables and organizational performance (Vincent, Bharadwaj and Challagalla, 2004).

Considering all above points, there is a lack of understanding surrounding the relationship between the organizational culture, organizational innovativeness, and organizational effectiveness. Moreover, these relationships have yet to be empirically investigated together. In the current study, the gap in the literature leading to the study on whether organizational innovativeness has a mediating effect on relationship between organizational culture and organizational effectiveness? By addressing this concern, via the proposed objective, this investigation provides more insight to the organizational culture and organizational effectiveness literature.

1.4 Research Objectives

This research pursues the following objectives:

1. To determine the organizational culture, organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness levels in IAU as perceived by the faculty members;
2. To determine the relationship between organizational culture types, organizational innovativeness and organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members;
3. To determine the mediation effects (if any) of organizational innovativeness between organizational culture types and organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members;
4. To determine the organizational culture type that best predicts the organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members;
5. To determine the organizational culture type that best predicts the organizational innovativeness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members; and
6. To determine the organizational innovativeness type that best predicts the organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members.

1.5 Research Questions

This study addresses six research questions as follows:

1. What are the organizational culture, organizational innovativeness, and organizational effectiveness levels in IAU as perceived by the faculty members?
2. What are the relationships among organizational culture types, organizational innovativeness, and organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members?
3. Does organizational innovativeness mediate the relationship between organizational culture types and organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members?
4. Which type of organizational culture is the best predictor of organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members?

5. Which type of organizational culture is the best predictor of organizational innovativeness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members?
6. Which type of organizational innovativeness is the best predictor of organizational effectiveness in IAU as perceived by the faculty members?

1.6 The Significance of the Study

In the twenty-first century, the leaders of higher educational institutions encounter growing demands for organizational effectiveness, accountability, efficacy, and outcomes with added values. In addition, higher educational institutions need graduates with high levels of standard. On the other hand, training courses are demanded by both private and governmental businesses, industries and organizations (Anderson, 2000). Defining organizational effectiveness in higher educational institutions is a complicated matter. This is due to the nature of the institutions themselves; they are very different from profit-driven organizations (Kwan & Walker, 2003). As noted by Cameron and Whetten (1983), the loosely coupled nature of higher educational institutions and the lack of precise effectiveness indicators for success make the evaluation of effectiveness difficult.

Colleges and universities use various measures of institutional performance to assess quality, such as persistence, graduation, and employment rates, endowment level, faculty/student ratio, average admissions test scores, physical plant facilities, and technological resources (Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2011; Klein, Kuh, Chun, Hamilton, & Shavelson, 2005). Clearly, not only are the range of activities used to ensure institutional effectiveness varied, but these measures of institutional quality are also diverse and complex (Dela Cruz, 2011).

A key to achieving organizational effectiveness is faculty support and participation in all institutional effectiveness initiatives. Despite their multiple roles and responsibilities, faculty members, in any type of university, engage in three primary types of activity, including teaching, research, and service (Middaugh & Isaacs, 2003). Clearly, faculty involvement in effective institutional activities requires examination of faculty perceptions to improve institutional productivity, an idea earlier supported by K. M. Schilling and K. L. Schilling (1998).

On the other hand, over the last three decades, organizational culture has been considered significantly related to organizational effectiveness. Beside organizational hierarchy, managers should focus on organizational culture in order to achieve organizational goals and enhance organizational effectiveness and productivity (Shariatmadari, 2008).

Organizational culture is seen as affecting individual intrinsic motivation that influences organizational innovation. An organization that values creativity and innovation is oriented toward risk. It creates in its employees a feeling of

self-esteem and interest in what they are capable of doing; employees' involvement in innovation is highly valued in such an organization (Amabile, 1996). Innovative universities can attract new and various human, knowledge, and financial resources. Knowledge originating from other sources is adapted to local conditions in innovative universities. Such organizations can integrate previously separate areas of technological activity as well as unlock and redirect knowledge that is already present in the region but not being put to productive use (Lester, 2005).

Many studies have investigated organizational culture in industrial or commercial organizations, but few researchers have focused on educational issues, especially higher education (Ferreira & Hill, 2008). Moreover, most of the studies on organizational culture in higher education have been done in developed countries like USA, UK, and Australia which highly support the CVF. Researchers in Asian countries have paid less attention to this issue (Kwan, 2002).

In Iran, the studies on higher education have focused on the correlation between organizational culture and different factors such as faculty members' job satisfaction (Sardari, 2005), mental stress and job stress of faculty members (Danesh Pajooh, Hossieni, Dehbozorgi, & Zare, 2005), leadership methods (Amin Mozaffari, Pardakhtchi, Yamini Douzi, & Zokaee, 2008), unity of individual and organization (Ardalan et al., 2008), ethical behavior of personnel (Safarpour & Siadat, 2012), organizational learning (Ghorbani & Sabbagh, 2011), and selecting faculty members (Sorayaei, Seifi-Divkolaii & Far, 2007). As the review of the literature shows, in Iran less attention has been paid to the impact of organizational culture on the innovativeness and effectiveness of higher educational institutions.

Based on studies from Ferreira and Hill (2008), governmental and private universities have remarkable differences in their procedures and structures. They may also be different in organizational culture. Universities, which are economically and managerially independent, may have closer relation with needs and external situations. With respect to the role of IAU in higher education in Iran and its economic and managerial independence, it seems necessary to investigate the organizational culture as an important factor related to organizational innovativeness and effectiveness.

Islamic Azad University needs to upgrade its organizational effectiveness to be able to survive and compete with governmental universities in Iran and foreign universities abroad (Kazemi, 2005). It is expected that the findings of this study can help IAU administrators in identification and application of factors that can increase the effectiveness of the organization.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

In the present study, three variables are investigated based on the perception of faculty members. Hence, the respondents' degree of accuracy in answering the questions related to four student-centered dimensions of

organizational effectiveness may affect the precision in measuring this variable. Another limitation of the study is that it is to be carried out at IAU in Pars Province. As a result, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to IAU branches in other provinces.

1.8 Definition of Terms

Prior to reviewing the related literature in the next chapter, the key words related to the study are defined both conceptually and operationally.

Organizational Culture

Cameron and Quinn (2006) defined organizational culture as some valuable notions such as the language and symbols, the dominant leadership styles, the definition of success, the procedures, and routines that make an organization unique. In this study, organizational culture refers to the perceptions held by university teaching staff as regards their organizational context. It is conceived of four culture types: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market. The focus of attention of clan is the inside maintenance with flexibility, attention and sensitivity to customers and people. Adhocracy stresses external focus with a high degree of individuality and flexibility. Hierarchy culture emphasizes the internal maintenance requiring control and stability. Finally, the market culture concentrates on outside positioning requiring control and stability. In the current study, for measuring organizational culture, the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) developed by Cameron and Quinn (2006) was translated into Persian.

Organizational Innovativeness

According to West and Farr (1990), the organizational innovativeness is the deliberate use of procedures, products, processes and ideas inside a group or organization to the intended unit of adoption which is supposed to be significantly beneficial for the person or group or any other bigger organizations. In the present study, the organizational innovativeness is defined as the frequency of times each type of innovation (technical and administrative) is actually implemented in the organization during the past 3-year-long period. Administrative innovation in this study refers to the implementation of a structure, procedure, system, or process in the administrative core of an organization that is new to the prevailing organizational practices. On the other hand, technical innovation is defined as the implementation of a service, program, or product that is new to the prevailing organizational practice. Organizational innovativeness is measured by a 17-item questionnaire. This instrument was developed by the researcher based on studies from Bordia, Kronenberg and Neely (2005), Jaskyte (2002) and Obenchain (2002).

Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness can be defined as capability of an institution in reaching its set aims and the individual objectives together with the final goals of the organization (Slack, 1997). A unit which is individually ineffective in terms of cooperation with the rest of the organization is doomed to failure (Gigliotti, 1987). In this study, organizational effectiveness is defined as the faculty member's perception of the nine dimensions of organizational effectiveness to describe the current situation of their university. An 81-item questionnaire was developed based on literature (e.g. Allen, 2011; Betebenner & Linn, 2010; Kwan & Walker, 2003; Lejeune & Vas, 2009) for measuring the organizational effectiveness. Based on Cameron's (1978) model these dimensions are:

1. Student educational satisfaction: This criterion shows how much students are happy with their academic progress and experiences.
2. Student academic development: This criterion shows the extent to which students grow and attain academic achievements.
3. Student career development: This criterion determines how much students make progress in their jobs with a special attention to their work progress and the opportunities they are given by the university.
4. Student personal development: This criterion indicates how much a student's social, emotional and cultural aspects develop and to what extent the institution plays a role in this development.
5. Faculty satisfaction with employment: This criterion determines to what extent administrators and the members of the faculty are satisfied with their jobs at the university.
6. Faculty quality and occupational progress: This criterion shows how much a faculty develops and to what degree occupational quality is achieved in addition to the institution's contribution to this purpose.
7. System community interaction and openness: This criterion indicates the significance of interaction with, service in and adaptation to the external settings.
8. Capability in obtaining resources: This criterion deals with the institutions' capability in obtaining resources from outside; the sources can include the faculty and good students, financial support and so on.
9. Organizational health: This criterion shows viability, vitality, and benevolence in the processes and practices inside the institution.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. (1983). A typology of management studies involving culture. *Journal of international business studies*, 29-47.
- Alerasool, S., & Ariazand, A. (2006). The result of investment in higher education and developing the skills of human force. *Substructure strategic-scientific quarterly*, 2, 25-37. (In Parsi)
- Alexander, F. K. (2000). The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *Journal of higher education*, 411-431.
- Allen, D. (2011). *Personal development planning newlands*. David (Ed.) Retrieved January 11, 2012 from http://www.economicsnetwork.ac.uk/handbook/printable/pdp_v5.d
- Altbach, P. G., & Umakoshi, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Asian universities: Historical perspectives and contemporary challenges*. Johns Hopkins university press.
- Altschuld, J.W., & Zhang, H.Y. (1995). Assessing the effectiveness of research organizations: An examination of multiple approaches. *Evaluation review*, 19(2), 197-216.
- Amabile, T.M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184.
- Amin Mozaffari, F. (2008). A study of relationship between organizational culture and leadership. *In international conference on applied economics-ICOAE* (p. 679).
- Amin Mozaffari, F., Pardakhtchi, M.H., Yamini Douzi, and Zokaee, M. (2008). A study of relationship between organizational culture and leadership styles in Iranian institutes of higher education. *The journal of research and planning in higher education*, 14 (1), 133 – 157.
- Amoopour, M., Asgari, M. H., & Azari, R. (2012). The relationship between Lean management with organizational performance of Azad University branches in Northern provinces. *International research journal of applied and basic sciences*, 3 (10), 2135-2140.
- An, J. Y., Yom, Y. H., & Ruggiero, J. S. (2011). Organizational culture, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness in Korean University Hospitals. *Journal of transcultural nursing*, 22(1), 22-30.

- Anderson, J. A. (2000). *Explanatory roles of mission and culture: Organizational effectiveness in Tennessee's community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Memphis).
- Antia, J. M., & Cuthbert, R. E. (1976). Critical success factors in Polytechnic performance. *Educational management administration & leadership*, 5(14), 14-36.
- Aragon-Correa, J. A., Garcia-Morales, V. J., & Cordon-Pozo, E. (2007). Leadership and organizational learning's role on innovation and performance: Lessons from Spain. *Industrial marketing management*, 36(3), 349-359.
- Ardalan, M. R., Salimi, Q., Rajaeepour, S., & Molavy, H. (2008). A study of relationship between person-organization fit and organizational culture in western Iran universities. *The journal of research and planning in higher education*, 47, 97-131. (In Parsi)
- Arshad, Z. (2003). *A study of organizational culture and effectiveness of secondary schools' principals* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Lahore).
- Arshad, Z., Rehman, K., & Ahmad, A. (2006). Organizational culture assessment of small and medium sized enterprises. *The Lahore journal of economics*, 11(2), 155-162.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. Ch., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, Ch. (2000). *Introduction to research in education*. New York: Harcourt.
- Bajdo, L. M., & Dickson, M. W. (2001). Perceptions of organizational culture and women's advancement in organizations: A cross-cultural examination. *Sex roles*, 45(5-6), 399 - 414.
- Baker, A., & Branch, K. M. (2008). *Branch literature concepts underlying organizational effectiveness: Trends in the organization and management science management science literature*. Retrieved May 7 2012 from <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/doe/benchmark/ch01> (2008).
- Bargh, C., Scott, P., & Smith, D. (1996). *Governing universities. Changing the culture?* Taylor & Francis, 1900 Frost Road, Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007-1598.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6), 1173.

- Bartlett, J.E., Kotrlik, J.W., & Higgins, Ch.C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information technology, learning, and performance journal*, 19 (1), 43-50.
- Behr, M., & Walker, I. (2009). *Getting past 'accountability'. Inside higher education*. Retrieved March 5, 2012 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/popup/views/2009/06/02/behrr>.
- Bergquist, W. H., & Pawlak, K. (2008). *Engaging the six cultures of the academy: Revised and expanded edition of the four cultures of the academy*. USA: Wiley. com.
- Berio, A. A. (2003). An organizational culture assessment using the competing values framework: A profile of Ohio state university extension. *Journal of extension online*, 41(2). Retrieved May 3, 2011 from www.joe.org/joe/2003april/index.shtml.25.k
- Betebenner, D., & Linn, R. L. (2010). *Growth in student achievement: Issues of measurement, longitudinal data analysis and accountability*. Retrieved January 3, 2013 from <http://www.k12center.org/publications.html>
- Beytekin, O. F., Yalcinkaya, M., Miray, D., & Karakoc, N. (2010). The organizational culture at the university. *International journal of educational researchers*, 2(1), 1-13.
- Bilimoria, D., Perry, S. R., Liang, X., Stoller, E. P., Higgins, P., & Taylor, C. (2006). How do female and male faculty members construct job satisfaction? The roles of perceived institutional leadership and mentoring and their mediating processes. *The journal of technology transfer*, 31(3), 355-365.
- Blazer, L. (2007). *Describing the values within the sub-cultures at Hillside university* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the incarnate word, U.S.A).
- Boan, D., & F. Funderburk. 2003. *Healthcare quality improvement and organizational culture*. Washington, D.C.: Delmarva foundation.
- Boer, H., & During, W. E. (2001). Innovation, what innovation? A comparison between product, process and organizational innovation. *International journal of technology management*, 22(1), 83-107.
- Bolman, L.G. and Deal, T.E. (2008), *Reframing organization: Artistry, choice and leadership*, 4th ed., San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bordia, R., Kronenberg, E., & Neely, D. (2005). *Innovation's ORGDNA*. Booz Allen Hamilton. Retrieved April 8, 2011 from http://www.booz.com/media/uploads/Innovations_OrgDNA.pdf

- Boyce, S. Y. (2002). *Evaluation of discovery research scientists' perceptions of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, internal resource reputation, and innovatory work environment* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).
- Bratianu, C., & Vasilache, S. (2009). Implementing innovation and knowledge management in the Romanian economy. *Management*, 4(4), 3-14.
- Braxton, J. M., Hirschy, A. S., & McClendon, S. A. (2011). *Understanding and reducing college student departure: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 16. Jossey-Bass.
- Brooks, M. G. (2007). *Organizational leadership in academic libraries: Identifying culture types and leadership roles* (Doctoral dissertation, Marshall University).
- Buelence, M., Sinding, K., Waldstrom, Ch., Kreintner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. Fourth edition. UK: McGraw- Hill Education.
- Burke, J. C. (2005). *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cameron, K. S. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. *Administrative science quarterly*, 23, 604-632.
- Cameron, K. S. (1981). Domains of organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities. *The academy of management journal*, 24 (1), 25-47.
- Cameron, K. (1986). A study of organizational effectiveness and its predictors. *Management science*, 32 (1), 87-112.
- Cameron, K., & Freeman, S. J. (1991). Cultural congruence, strength, and type: Relationships to effectiveness. *Research in organizational change and development*, 5(1), 23-58.
- Cameron, K. S., Mora, C., Leutscher, T., & Calarco, M. (2011). Effects of positive practices on organizational effectiveness. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 47(3), 266-308.
- Cameron, K., & Smart, J. (1998). Maintaining effectiveness amid downsizing and decline in institutions of higher education. *Research in higher education*, 39 (1), 65-86.
- Cameron, K.S., & Quinn, R.E. (2006). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture. Revised edition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Cameron, K. S., & Whetten, D. A. (1983). *Organizational effectiveness: One model or several. Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models* (Vol.733). Academic pr.
- Carmeil, A., & Tishler, A. (2004). Resources, capabilities, and the performances of industrial firms: A multivariate analyses. *Managerial and decision economics*, 25, 299-315.
- Chandy, R. K., & Prabhu, J. C. (2010). *Innovation typologies. Wiley international encyclopedia of marketing*, Barry Bayus(ed.), John Wiley and Sons, forth coming.
- Chen, J., Liu, Z. C., & Wu, N. Q. (2009, December). Relationships between organizational learning, innovation and performance: an empirical examination. *In information management, innovation management and industrial engineering, 2009 International conference on* (Vol. 3, pp. 488-492). IEEE.
- Chen, L. Y. (2004). Examining the effect of organization culture and leadership behaviors on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance at small and middle-sized firms of Taiwan. *Journal of American academy of business*, 5(1/2), 432-438.
- Cho, S. M. (2007). Assessing organizational effectiveness in human service organizations: An empirical review conceptualization and determinants. *Journal of social service research*, 33(3), 31-45.
- Chuan, Ch. L. (2006). Sample size estimation using Krejcie and Morgan and Cohen statistical power analysis: A comparison. *Journal penyelidikan IPBL*, 7, 78-86.
- Chuang, L. M., Liu, C. C., Tsai, W. C., & Huang, C. M. (2010). Towards an analytical framework of organizational innovation in the service industry. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage*, 4(5), 790-799.
- Coakes, S. J. and Steed, L. (2007). *SPSS version 14.0 for windows: Analysis without anguish*. Melbourne: Wiley.
- Cochran, W.G. (Aug., 1977). *Sampling techniques*. America: John Willey and sons Ltd.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Methods in psychology. A power primer. *Psychological bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.

- Collins, W., & Apple, D. K. (2000). *Profile of a quality faculty member*. Faculty guidebook, Section 1. Retrieved February 4, 2011 from http://www.pcrest.com/PC/FGB/1_2_4.pdf
- Cornell University (2010). *A strategic plan 2010-2015: Section VI. Excellence in organizational stewardship*. Retrieved July 23, 2011 from <http://www.cornell.edu/strategicplan/stewardship.cfm>
- Cruz, N. M., Escudero, A. I. R., Barahona, J. H., & Leitaó, F. S. (2009). The effect of entrepreneurship education programmes on satisfaction with innovation behaviour and performance. *Journal of European industrial training*, 33(3), 198-214.
- Cyril de Run, E. May-Chiun, L., & Kusnaryadi, H. (2008). *Basic analysis: A guide for students and researchers*. Malaysia: Jade Tree Press Publication.
- Daft, R. (1978). A dual-core model of organizational innovation. *Academy of management journal*, 21, 193-210.
- Dalton, T., & Dalton, L. (1988). *The politics of measuring public sector performance*. New York: St. Martin: In promoting productivity in the public sector, edited by R.M. Kelly.
- Damanpour, F. (1987). The adoption of technological, administrative and ancillary innovations: Impact of organizational factors. *Journal of management*, 13, 675-688.
- Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of management journal*, 34, 555-590.
- Damanpour, F., & Daniel Wischnevsky, J. (2006). Research on innovation in organizations: Distinguishing innovation-generating from innovation-adopting organizations. *Journal of engineering and technology management*, 23(4), 269-291.
- Damanpour, F., & Evan, W.M. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: The problem of organizational lag. *Administrative science quarterly*, 29, 392-400.
- Damanpour, F., & Scheneider, M. (2009). Characteristics of innovation and innovation adaption in public organizations: Assessing the role of managers. *Journal of public administration research and theory*. 19 (3), 495-522.
- Damanpour, F., Szabat, K. A., & Evan, W. M. (1989). The relationship between types of innovation and organizational performance. *Journal of management studies*, 26(6), 587-602.

- Damanpour, F., Walker, R. M., & Avellaneda, C. N. (2009). Combinative effects of innovation types and organizational performance: A longitudinal study of service organizations. *Journal of management studies*, 46(4), 650-675.
- Danesh Pajoo, F., Hossieni, A.A., Dehbozorgi, Gh., & Zare, N. (2005). The relationship between organizational culture and occupational stress among faculty members of Shiraz university of medical sciences. *Medical research Journal*, 3 (3), 144-153.
- Day, G. S. (1994). The capabilities of market- driven organizations. *Journal of marketing*, 58, 37-52.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (2000). *Corporate culture: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Perseus Publishing.
- Dela Cruz, W. S. (2011). The roles of organizational culture, management strategy, and decision- making process on institutional effectiveness at a four - year public higher education institution. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, San Antonio).
- De Mooij, M., & Hofstede, G. (2010). The Hofstede model. Applications to global branding and advertising strategy and research. *International journal of advertising*, 29(1), 85-110.
- Denison, D. R. (2000). *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*. New York: John Wiley and sons.
- Denison, D. R., Haaland, S., & Goelzer, P. (2004) Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness: Is Asia different from the rest of the world? *Organizational dynamics*, 33(1), 98-109.
- Denison, R. D., & Mishra, A.K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization science*, 6(2), 204-223.
- Denison, D. R., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1991). Organizational culture and organizational development: A competing values approach. *Research in organizational change and development*, 5, 1-21.
- Deshpande, R., & Webster, F.E. (1989). Organizational culture and marketing: Defining the research agenda. *Journal of marketing*, 53, 3-15.
- Deshpande, R., & Farley, J. U. (2004). Organizational culture, market orientation, innovativeness, and firm performance: an international research odyssey. *International journal of research in marketing*, 21(1), 3-22.

- Detert, J.R., Schroeder, R.J., & Mauriel, J.J. (2000). A framework for linking culture and improvement initiatives in organizations. *The academy of management review*, 25(4), 850-863.
- Downs, G. & Mohr, L. (1976). Conceptual issues in the study of innovation. *Administrative science quarterly*, 21, 700-714.
- Dunnett, A. J. (2007). The role of organizational culture in customer service. *The business review*, 7(1), 38-44.
- Duréndez, A., & Garcia, D. (2008). Innovative culture, management control systems and performance in young SMEs. *Entrepreneurship, culture, finance and economic development*, 1-17.
- Duygulu, E., & Ozeren, E. (2009). The effects of leadership styles and organizational culture on firms innovativeness. *African Journal of business management*, 3(9), 475-485.
- Ebeid, A. Y., & Gadelrab, H. F. (2009). Identifying dominant organizational culture types in public Egyptian universities and their relationships to a set of developmental indicators. *Problems and perspectives in management*, 7 (4), 23-32.
- Eichotz, M. M. (2004). *Oganizational effectiveness, strcture, and technology. University of Arkansas, culture and climate report.* Arkansas cooperative extension services. Field, R.
- Engle, A.D. (1990). *An enfranchisement model of organizational effectiveness.* Retrieved July 25 2010 from <http://www.people.eku.edu/englea/orgeffect.pdf>
- Evan, M.W.(1966). Organizational lag. *Human organizations*, 25, 51-53.
- Faerman, L. B. (2009). *The relationship between organizational culture and effectiveness in university Residence Hall Associations: a competing values study* (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University Boca Raton, Florida).
- Ferreira, A.L. ,& Hill, M.M. (2008). Organizational cultures in public and private Portuguese universities: a case study. *The journal of higher education*, 55, 637-650.
- Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: (and sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll)* (3rd Ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Fink, A. (2003). *The survey handbook* (2 nd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Frazier, P. A., Tix, A. P., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects in counseling psychology research. *Journal of counseling psychology, 51(1)*, 115.
- Friedman, L. (2005). *Faculty professional development: A primer for school leaders*. Retrieved August 15, 2011 from <http://www.nais.org/Articles/Pages/Faculty-Professional-Development-A-Primer-for-School-Leaders.aspx>
- Furst-Bowe, J. A., & Bauer, R. A. (2007). Application of the Baldrige model for innovation in higher education. *New direction for higher education, 137*, 5-14.
- Gandotra, N. K. (2010). Innovation culture for sustainable competitive advantage. *Asia Pacific journal of research in business management, 1(2)*, 51-59.
- García-Morales, V. J., Llorens-Montes, F. J., & Verdú-Jover, A. J. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational innovation and organizational learning in entrepreneurship. *Industrial management & data systems, 106(1)*, 21-42.
- Garnett, J. L., Marlowe, J., & Pandey, S. K. (2008). Penetrating the performance predicament: communication as a mediator or moderator of organizational culture's impact on public organizational performance. *Public administration review, 68(2)*, 266-281.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ghorbani, M., & Sabbagh, B. (2011). *The study of the relation of organizational culture and organizational learning in IAU of Mashhad*. Paper presented at the 2010 international conference on economics, business and management. Retrieved June 11, 2012 from <http://www.ipedr.com/vol2/38-P20008.pdf>
- Ghorchian, N., & Salehi, M. (2005). Designing a model to establish providence in IAU. *Khorasgan IAU's journal of knowledge and research, 2*, 1-22.
- Giancola, F. (2008). Linking rewards with organizational culture. *WorldatWork journal, 17(1)*, 55 -65.
- Gibson, C., Maznevski, M., & Kirkman, B.L. (2006). *When does culture matter*. Macmillan, New York: in Lewin, A.Y. (Ed.), *Emerging research in international business*

- Gigliotti, L. I. (1987). An adaptation of Cameron's model of organizational effectiveness at the academic department level in Two-year community (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University).
- Gill, A., Tibrewala, R., Poczter, A., Biger, N., Mand, H. S., Sharma, S. P., & Dhande, K. S. (2010). Effects of transformational leadership on student educational satisfaction and student stress. *The open education journal*, 3, 1-9.
- Gopalakrishnan, S. (2000). Unraveling the links between dimensions of innovation and organizational performance. *The journal of high technology management research*, 11(1), 137-153.
- Gordon, G. G., & DiTomaso, N. (1992). Predicting corporate performance from organizational culture. *Journal of management studies*, 29(6), 783-798.
- Gravetter, F.J., & Wallnau, L.B. (2008). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Sixth edition, America: Thomson learning, Inc.
- Green, S.B., & Salkind, N.J. (2011). *Using SPSS for windows and macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data*, 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Gregory, B.T., Harris, S.G., Armenakis, A.A., & Shook, Ch. L. (2009). Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes. *Journal of business research*, 62, 673-679.
- Grunig, J. E., Grunig, L. A., & Dozier, D. M. (2006). *The excellence theory 1*. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazelton (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 21-62). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (2008). Excellence theory in public relations: Past, present, and future. *In public relations research* (pp. 327- 347). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gudmundson, D., Tower, C. B., & Hartman, E. A. (2003). Innovation in small businesses: culture and ownership structure do matter. *Journal of developmental entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 1-18.
- Hadjimanolis, A. (2000). An investigation of innovation antecedents in small firms in the context of a small developing country. *R & D management*, 30(3), 235-246.

- Hafeznia, M.R. (2009). *An introduction to the research method in humanities*. Tehran, Iran: Samt publication. (In Parsi)
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., and Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6 Ed.). NJ: Pearson.
- Hamel, G. (2000). *Leading the revolution*. Boston, MA, USA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 677.
- Hedayati, H. (2007). *Culture: A comparison between the organizational cultures models*. Retrieved June 8, 2011 from <http://www.wetowej.blogfa.com/post-102.aspx>
- Hellrigel, D., & Slocum. Jr. J.W. (2007). *Organizational behavior*. Elventh edition, Thamsom, South-Western.
- Hernon, P., Dugan, R. E., & Schwartz, C. (2006). *Revisiting outcomes assessment in higher education*. Libraries Unlimited.
- Hertelendy, A. J. (2010). *A survey of emergency medical services programs: National EMS education program accreditation and organizational effectiveness* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi Medical Center).
- Ho, L. A. (2011). Meditation, learning, organizational innovation and performance. *Industrial management & data systems*, 111(1), 113-131.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work- related values*, Second edition. Beverly Hills CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M.H. (1988). The Confucius connection: from cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational dynamics*, 16(4), 4-21.
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G.J. (2005), *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Hong, K.S., Songan, P., Gan, S.L., Hasbee, H.U., Ngui, K.S., & Rujhan, M. (2010). Relationships between leadership behaviour, university culture and leadership effectiveness for academic work in Malaysian public university. *ADEPT (Higher Education Leadership Research Bulletin)*, 3, 57-73.

- Howell, D.C. (2010). *Statistical methods for psychology* (7th Ed.) USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Hult, G. T. M., Hurley, R. F., & Knight, G. A. (2004). Innovativeness: its antecedents and impact on business performance. *Industrial marketing management*, 33(5), 429-438.
- Hult, G. T. M., Ketchen, D. J., & Nichols, E. L. (2002). An examination of cultural competitiveness and order fulfillment cycle time within supply chains. *Academy of management journal*, 45(3), 577-586.
- Ingram, P., & Clay, K. (2000). The choice-within-constraints new institutionalism and implications for sociology. *Annual review of sociology*, 525-546.
- Jafari, P., Ghourchian, N. G., & Sadeghi, M. (2013). Evaluation of university quality in terms of sustainable components of university: A case study of West Islam Abad campus of Islamic Azad University. *International journal of economy, management and social sciences*, 2(5), 118-123
- Jafarzadeh Kermani, Z., & Fatahi, R. (2004). Investigating effective factors in job satisfaction of faculty members of informatics. *Informatics*, 7(1), 5-24. (In Parsi)
- Jamrog, J., Vickers, M., & Bear, D. (2006). Building and sustaining a culture that supports innovation. *Human resource planning*, 29(3), 9 -19.
- Jansen, J. J., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2006). Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance: Effects of organizational antecedents and environmental moderators. *Management science*, 52(11), 1661-1674.
- Jaskyte, K. (2002). *Organizational culture and innovation in nonprofit human service organizations*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama).
- Jaskyte, K. (2011). Predictors of administrative and technological innovations in nonprofit organizations. *Public administration review*, 71(1), 77-86.
- Jaskyte, K., & Dressler, W. W. (2004). Studying culture as an integral aggregate variable: Organizational culture and innovation in a group of nonprofit organizations. *Field Methods*, 16(3), 265-284.
- Jaskyte, K., & Kisieliene, A. (2006). Organizational innovation: A comparison of nonprofit human-service organizations in Lithuania and the United States. *International social work*, 49(2), 165–176.
- Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation, organizational learning, and performance. *Journal of business research*, 64(4), 408-417.

- Johnson, C. E., Shelton, P. M., & Yates, L. (2012). Nice guys (and gals) finish first: Ethical leadership and organizational trust, satisfaction, and effectiveness. *International leadership journal*, 4(1), 3-19.
- Johnson, D. (2001). What is innovation and entrepreneurship? Lessons for larger organisations. *Industrial and commercial training*, 33(4), 135-140.
- Job, P. A., & Bhattacharyya, S. (2007). Creativity and Innovation for competitive excellence in organizations. Available on <http://dspace.iimk.ac.in/bitstream/2259/439/1/53-63>
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (2010). *Data analysis in social psychology: Recent and recurring issues*. Handbook of social psychology. Wiley Online Library.
- Jurow, S. (2006). Set in Your Ways? *Business officer*, 39(8), 18–22.
- Karagoz, S., & Oz, E. (2008). Organizational effectiveness in higher education; measures, measurement and evaluation. In *EABR & TLC Conferences Proceedings Rothenburg, Germany*.
- Kasim, R. S. R., & Noh, I. (2012, May). The impact of organizational innovativeness on the performance of the university: An analysis among selected Malaysian private universities. In *Innovation Management and Technology Research (ICIMTR), 2012 International Conference on* (pp. 1-5). IEEE.
- Katz, F., & Rosenzweig, J. (1972). General systems theory: Applications for organization and management. *Academy of management Journal*, 447-465.
- Kazemi, A. (2005). A survey about relationship between criteria of organizational culture and effectiveness of the organization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tarbiat Modares, Tehran, Iran) (In Parsi).
- Kenny, D. A. (2012). Mediation. From <http://davidakenny.net/cm/mediate.htm>
- Khodamoradi, A., & Amerian, M. (2012). Face-to-face interaction in ODE language courses in Iran. *Asian journal of distance education*, 10(2), 54-62.
- Khoshbakhti, J. (2005). The relationship among leadership styles, staff's quality of work life, and degree of effectiveness of college principals and education groups. *Journal of physical education*, 24, 129-150.
- Kim, M. J., Lee, H., Kim, H. K., Ahn, Y. H., Kim, E., Yun, S. N., & Lee, K. J. (2010). Quality of faculty, students, curriculum and resources for

nursing doctoral education in Korea: a focus group study. *International journal of nursing studies*, 47(3), 295-306.

Kimpston, R. D., & Sonnabend, L. C. (1973). Organizational health: A requisite for innovation? *Educational leadership*, 30(6), 543-547.

Kleeman, G.L., & Richardson Jr, R.C. (1985). Student characteristics and perceptions of university effectiveness. *Review of higher education*, 9(1), 5-20.

Klein, S. P., Kuh, G., Chun, M., Hamilton, L., & Shavelson, R. (2005). An approach to measuring cognitive outcomes across higher education institutions. *Research in higher education*, 46(3), 251-276.

Klyver, K., Hunter, E., & Watne, T. (2008). Entrepreneurial embeddedness and innovativeness in the start-up process. In *2007 AGSE Conference, Melbourne, Australia*.

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30, 607-610.

Kwantes, C. T., & Boglarsky, Ch. A. (2007). Perceptions of organizational culture, leadership effectiveness and personal effectiveness across six countries. *Journal of international management*, 13 (2), 204-235.

Kwan, P. (2002). *An investigation of the relationship between organizational culture and organizational effectiveness in Hong Kong higher education institutions* (Doctoral dissertation, The Chinese university of Hong Kong).

Kwan, P., & Walker, A. (2003). Positing organizational effectiveness as a second-order construct in Hong Kong higher education institutions. *Research in higher education*, 44(6), 705-725.

Lam, A. (2005). *Organizational innovation*. In Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D. C. and Nelson, R. R. (Eds), the Oxford handbook of Innovations. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 115-47.

Lee, C., Lee, K., & Pennings, J. M. (2001). Internal capabilities, external networks, and performance: A study on technology - based ventures. *Strategic management journal*, 22(6 - 7), 615-640.

Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2008). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation* (3rd ed.). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lejeune, Ch., & Vas, A. (2009). Organizational culture and effectiveness in business schools: a test of the accreditation impact. *Journal of management development*, 28(8), 728-741.

- Lester, R. K. (2005). *Universities, innovation, and the competitiveness of local economies*. Industrial performance center, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. p .1-33.
- Levy, P.S., & Lemeshow, S. (2008). *Sampling of populations: Methods and applications*. 4th Edition. America: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Liaw, S. S., Huang, H. M., & Chen, G. D. (2007). Surveying instructor and learner attitudes toward e-learning. *Computers & education*, 49(4), 1066-1080.
- Lin, Y.Y. (2006). *An examination of the relationship between organizational learning culture, structure, organizational innovativeness and effectiveness: evidence from Taiwanese organizations* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota- Twin cities).
- Liu, C. C. (2005). An empirical study on the construction of a model for measuring organisational innovation in Taiwanese high-tech enterprises. *International journal of innovation management*, 9(02), 241-257.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., Hoffman, J. M., West, S. G., & Sheets, V. (2002). A comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects. *Psychological methods*, 7(1), 83 – 104.
- Malik, J. N., & Mahmood, R. B. (2012). Facilitating corporate entrepreneurship in public sector higher education institutions: A conceptual model. *Issues in social and environmental accounting*, 6(1/2), 26-49.
- Martins, E. C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European journal of innovation management*, 6(1), 64-74.
- Mavondo, F. T., Tsarenko, D. Y., & Gabbott, M. (2004). International and local student satisfaction: resources and capabilities perspective. *Journal of marketing for higher education*, 14(1), 41-60. doi: 10.1300/J050v14n01_03
- McCann, J. (2004). Organizational effectiveness: Changing concepts for changing environments. *Human resource planning*, 27(1), 42-50.
- McClean, L. (2005). Organizational culture's influence on creativity and innovation: A review of the literature and implications for human resource development. *Advances in developing human resources*, 7(2), 226- 246.

- Mcluhan, M. (2006). *Towards an effective theory of organizational effectiveness*. Retrieved August 7, 2011 from http://.whatisthemessage.blogspot.com/2006_03_01_archive.html
- Meeus, M. T. H. and Edquist, C. (2006). 'Introduction to Part I: Product and process innovation'. In Hage, J. and Meeus, M. (Eds), *Innovation, science, and institutional change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 23–37.
- Mehralizadeh, Y., & Atyabi, S. M. R. (2006). A regression analysis of the relationship between organizational analysis of the relationship between organizational culture and effectiveness of principal of secondary schools. *Available at SSRN 902028*.
- Middaugh, M. F. (2009). *Planning and assessment in higher education: Demonstrating institutional effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass.
- Middaugh, M., & Isaacs, H. (2003). Describing faculty activity and productivity for multiple audiences. *The primer for institutional research*, 24-47.
- Milosevic, D., & Patanakul, P. (2005). Standardized project management may increase development projects success. *International journal of project management*, 23(3), 181-192.
- Mit Career Development Handbook (2011-2012). Retrived July 21, from <http://gecd.mit.edu/sites/default/files/2011workbook.pdf>
- Miron, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2004). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other? *Journal of organizational behavior*, 25(2), 175-199.
- Mogren, R.G., Bullis, M., & Falls, J. (2007). *Post- school outcomes: Response rates and nonresponse bias*. Available at: www.psocenter.org
- Mohammadi, M., Yeganeh, E. M., & Rad, T. D. (2010). The relationship between faculty members' perception of organizational culture types and their preferences for instruction and counseling in Iranian college of education and psychology. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 5, 1841-1848.
- Monavarian, A., & Bakhtayi, A. *Management theories*. In the fourth international management conference. Tehran, 2006.
- Moon, M. J. (1999). The pursuit of managerial entrepreneurship: Does organization matter? *Public administration review*, 31-43.

- Mosaddegh-rad, A. M. (2004). *Investigation of the relationship between personnel's job satisfaction and management style of managers in Isfahan hospitals*. Isfahan University of Medical Sciences: Research report. (In Parsi)
- Mullins, L. J. (2006). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. England: Prentice Hall Publication.
- Naderi Khorshidi, A. (2008). The learner organizational culture. *Journal of management studies*, 46, 57-84.
- Naranjo-Valencia, J. C., Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2011). Innovation or imitation? The role of organizational culture. *Management decision*, 49(1), 55-72.
- Ngo, H. Y., & Loi, R. (2008). Human resource flexibility, organizational culture and firm performance: an investigation of multinational firms in Hong Kong. *The international journal of human resource management*, 19(9), 1654-1666.
- Obenchain, A. M., & Marie, A. (2002). *Organizational culture and organizational innovation in not-for-profit, private, and public institutions of higher education* (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University).
- Obenchain, A. M., & Johnson, W. C. (2004). Product and process innovation in service organizations: the influence of organizational culture in higher education institutions. *Journal of applied management and entrepreneurship*, 9(3), 91-113.
- Obenchain, A. M., Johnson, W. C., & Dion, P. A. (2004). Institutional types, organizational cultures, and innovation in Christian colleges and universities. *Christian higher education*, 3(1), 15-39.
- O'Brien, P. (Ed.) (2009). Accreditation: assuring and enhancing quality. *New directions for higher education*, 48(145), 1-6.
- OECD (2005). *Reviews of national policies for education: University education in Denmark 2005* Retrieved October 18, 2011 from <http://www.oecdbookshop.org/oecd/display.asp?lang=EN&sf1=identifiers&st1=5lgz3lw25cs5>
- Orfila-Sintes, F., & Mattsson, J. (2009). Innovation behavior in the hotel industry. *Omega*, 37(2), 380- 394.
- Osborne, R. L. (1995). The essence of entrepreneurial success. *Management decision*, 33(7), 4-9.

- Pallant, J. F. (2005). *SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (2nd Ed). Australia: Allen and Unwin Publication.
- Park, W. Y., & Yoon, S. H. (2009). The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior between organizational justice and organizational effectiveness in nursing organizations. *Journal of Korean academy of nursing*, 39(2), 229-236.
- Pech, R. J. (2001). Reflections: Termites, group behaviour, and the loss of innovation: conformity rules!. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 16(7), 559-574.
- Pennings, J.M., & Goodman, P.S. (1979). Towards a workable framework. *Journal of new perspectives on organizational effectiveness*, 146 - 184. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Perri 6. (1993). Innovation by nonprofit organizations: Policy and research issues. *Nonprofit management and leadership*, 3(4), 393-414.
- Pounder, J. (1999). Organizational effectiveness in Higher Education managerial implications of a Hong Kong study. *Educational management administration & leadership*, 27(4), 389-400.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Prevatt, F., Li, H., Welles, T., Festa-Dreher, D., Yelland, S., & Lee, J. (2011). The Academic Success Inventory for College Students: Scale Development and Practical Implications for Use with Students. *Journal of college admission*, 211, 26-31.
- Processor, J. (2000). *School culture*. University of Southampton. U.K.
- Pushnykh, V., & Chemeris, V. (2006). Study of a Russian university's organisational culture in transition from planned to market economy. *Tertiary education & management*, 12(2), 161-182.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Toward a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management science*, 29(3), 363-377.
- Quinn, R. E., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1991). The psychometrics of the competing values culture instrument and analysis of the impact of organizational culture on quality of life. *Research in organizational change and development*, 5, 115-142.
- Rahnama, A., Mousavian, S. J., Alaei, A., & Maghvan, T. S. (2011). The survey of relationship between creativity of staffs and organizational

effectiveness. *Australian journal of business and management research*, 1(6), 97-104.

Ralston, D. A., Ter Pstra- Tong, J., Ter Pstra, R.H., Wang, X., & Egri, C. (2006). Today's State- owned enterprises of China: Are they dying dinosaurs or dynamic dynamos? *Strategic management journal*, 27(9), 825-843.

Ramirez, T. J. (2011). *Factors that contribute to overall job satisfaction among faculty at a large public land-grant university in the Midwest*. (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa).

Rezai, M. H. (2006). *The effective organization culture in college institutions*. (Doctoral dissertation, IAU, Tehran, Iran). (In Parsi)

Robbins, S.P. (2004). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (seventh Ed.).USA: Prentice Hall.

Roberts, P. W., & Amit, R. (2003). The dynamics of innovative activity and competitive advantage: The case of Australian retail banking, 1981 to 1995. *Organization science*, 14(2), 107-122.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*, (fifth Ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Rowley, J., Baregheh, A., & Sambrook, S. (2011). Towards an innovation-type mapping tool. *Management decision*, 49(1), 73-86.

Russo, M. V., & Fouts, P. A. (1997). A Resource-Based Perspective on Corporate Environmental Performance and Profitability. *Academy of management journal*, 40(3), 534-559.

Safarpour, S., & Siadat, A. (2012). Study of relation between organizational culture and ethical behavior of personnel at Islamic Azad University Shahrekord branch. *International journal of contemporary research in business*, 4(3), 145- 151.

Salkind, N. J. (2005). *Exploring research* (6rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Saraph, J. V., Benson, P. G., & Schroeder, R. G. (1989). An instrument for measuring the critical factors of quality management. *Decision sciences*, 20(4), 810-829.

Sardari, A. (2005). A study of relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction in scientific-research centers under ministry of science, research and technology in Tehran. *Daneshvar raftar journal*, 11(5), 45-54.

- Sapprasert, K. (2008). *On Factors explaining organizational innovation and its effects. Paper presented at the 5th celebration conference 2008 on entrepreneurship and innovation organizations, institutions, systems and regions.* Retrieved July 16, 2011 <http://www2.druid.dk/conferences/viewpaper.php?id=3317&cf=29>
- Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schermerhorn, Jr.J.R., Hunt, J.G., & Osborn, R.N. (2005). *Organizational behavior.* America: Ninth edition, John Wiley and sons, Inc.
- Schilling, K. M., & Schilling, K. L. (1998). *Proclaiming and sustaining excellence: Assessment as a faculty role. ASHE-ERIC higher education report, Volume 26, No. 3.* ERIC clearinghouse on higher education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183.
- Schin, J. a., & McClomb, G. E. (1998). Top executive leadership and organizational innovation: An investigation of nonprofit human service organizations. *Social work administration, 22* (3), 1-21.
- Sharafi, M. (2009). Innovation in higher education. *The journal of Tadbir, 191,* 43-47. (In Parsi) <http://www.imi.ir/tadbir/tadbir-191/article-191/6.asp>
- Shariatmadari, M. (2008). *Organization.* Tehran, Iran: Central organization of IAU Publication. (In Parsi)
- Shin, J. (1996). The effects of executive leadership on organizational innovation in nonprofit, human service organizations. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).
- Slack, T. (1997). *Understanding sport organizations: The application of organization theory.* Champaign: IL: Human Kinetics.
- Singh, J., House, R.H., & Tucker, D.J. (1989). Organizational legitimacy and the liability of newness. *Administrative science quarterly, 31*(6), 171-93.
- Singleton, R. A., Jr., & Straits, B.C. (2004), *Approaches to social research, 4* editions. USA. Oxford University Press.
- Skolits, G. J., & Graybeal, S. (2007). Community college institutional effectiveness perspectives of campus stakeholders. *Community college review, 34*(4), 302-323.
- Smart, J. C. (2003). Organizational effectiveness of 2-year colleges: the centrality of cultural and leadership complexity. *Research in higher education, 44*(6), 673-703.

- Smart, J. C., & John, E. P. S. (1996). Organizational culture and effectiveness in higher education: A test of the "culture type" and "strong culture" hypotheses. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 18(3), 219-241.
- Smith, L.A. (2004). *What do we know about organizational culture?* Retrieved December 20, 2012, from http://cims.ncsu.edu/downloads/Research/71_WDWK_culture.pdf.
- Smith, M., Brooks, S., Lichtenberg, A., McIlveen, P., Torjul, P., & Tyler, J. (2009). *Career development learning: Maximizing the contribution of work-integrated learning to the student experience: Australian Learning & Teaching Council Final project report*. University of Wollongong, Careers Central, and Academic Services Division.
- Socketel, H. Y., & Mak, B. (2004). The relationship of perceived organizational innovativeness (PORGI) on IS&T employee continuance: A Lisrel model. *International journal of innovation and technology management*, 1(04), 393-414.
- Soltani, I., Damirchi, Q. V., & Darban, M. Z. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational innovation. *Arabian journal of business and management review*, 1(4), 1-7.
- Sorayaei, A., Seifi-Divkolaii, M., & Far, E. F. (2007). *An Investigation of organizational culture on selected faculty: A study in Azad Islamic University of Babol Branch*. Retrieved March 11, 2012 from <http://www.ipedr.com/vol43/014-ICFME2012-M10005.pdf>
- Sørensen, J. B. (2002). The strength of corporate culture and the reliability of firm performance. *Administrative science quarterly*, 47(1), 70-91.
- Stevens Jr, D. L. (2002). *Estimation of means, totals, and distribution functions from probability survey data*. RMP technical report: SFEI contribution #110. Oakland, CA: San Francisco Estuary Institute,
- Stone, D. L. Stone-Romero, E. F., & Lukaszewski, K. M. (2007). The impact of cultural values on the acceptance and effectiveness of human resource management policies and practices. *Human resource management review*, 17, 152-165.
- Subramanian, A., & Nilakanta, S. (1996). Organizational innovativeness: Exploring the relationship between organizational determinants of innovation, types of innovations, and measures of organizational performance. *Omega, Int. J. Mgmt Sci.* 24(6), 631-647.
- Suhardini, D. (2005). *The Relationship between organizational culture, organizational learning capability and organizational effectiveness in*

higher education institutions in Indonesia (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).

- Tajeddini, K. (2011). The effects of innovativeness on effectiveness and efficiency. *Education, business and society: Contemporary Middle Eastern issues*, 4(1), 6-18.
- Taleghani, M., Soofi, Z. T., & Fomani, S. A. (2012). Islamic Azad University Function Analysis with using the SWOT model in order to provide strategic guidelines (Case Study: Faculty of Humanities). *Journal of basic and applied scientific research*, 2(5), 4494-4500.
- Tang, H. K. (1998). An inventory of organizational innovativeness. *Technovation*, 19(1), 41-51.
- Tellis, G. J., Stremersch, S., & Yin, E. (2003). The international takeoff of new products: The role of economics, culture, and country innovativeness. *Marketing science*, 22(2), 188-208.
- Thomson, W. J. (1983). Effects of control on choice of reward or punishment. *Bulletin of the psychonomic society*, 21(6), 462-464.
- Tien, L. C., & Chao, H. S. (2012). Effects of information culture and job satisfaction on the organizational innovation-a study of different leadership styles as a moderator. *Advances in management & applied economics* 2 (3), 83-110.
- Tierney, W. G. (2008). *The impact of culture on organizational decision-making: Theory and practice in higher education*. Stylus Pub Llc.
- Toosi, M. A. (2005). *Organizational development*. Iran: Training center for governmental management Publication. (In Parsi)
- Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2002). *Winning through innovation: A practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Ul Hassan, F. S., Shah, B., Ikramullah, M., Zaman, T., & Khan, H. (2011). The role of organization culture in predicting organizational effectiveness: A case from developing countries. *International business and management*, 3(2), 99-111.
- Uli, J. (2011). *Lecture notes for data analysis and interpretation using SPSS for windows*. Unpublished book. University Putra Malaysia.
- Utterback, J. M. (1974). Innovation in industry and the diffusion of technology. *Science*, 183 (2), 620-626.

- Valencia, J. C. N., Valle, R. S., & Jimenez, D. J. (2010). Organizational culture as determinant of product innovation. *European journal of innovation management*, 13(4), 466-480.
- Vermeulen, P. (2004). Managing product innovation in financial services firms. *European management journal*, 22(1), 43-50.
- Vice President International Affairs of Islamic Azad University (2013). Retrieved February 9 2013, from http://www.intl.iau.ir/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=141&Itemid=572
- Vincent, L. H., Bharadwaj, S. G., & Challagalla, G. N. (2004). *Does innovation mediate firm performance? A meta-analysis of determinants and consequences of organizational innovation*. Retrieved February 20, 2013 from <http://hdl.handle.net/1853/10731>
- Vinitwatanakhun, M. W. (1998). *Factors affecting organizational effectiveness of nursing institutes in Thailand*. 1-5. Retrieved March 2, 2013 from <http://www.journal.au.edu/au techno/2002/apr2002/article8.pdf>
- Walker, R., Damanpour, F., & Avellaneda, C. (2007, August). Combinative effects of innovation types on performance: A longitudinal study of public services. In *academy of management proceedings* (Vol. 2007, No. 1, pp. 1-6). Academy of management.
- Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2004). The development and validation of the organizational innovativeness construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *European journal of innovation management*, 7 (4), 303-313.
- Wang, J., Solan, D., & Ghods, A. (2010). Distance learning success—a perspective from socio-technical systems theory. *Behavior & information technology*, 29(3), 321-329.
- Wang, Z. (2005). Organizational effectiveness through technology innovation and HRM strategies. *International journal of manpower*, 26(6), 481-487.
- West, M., & Farr, J. (1990). *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*. New Yourk: John Wily and sons.
- Wikipedia, (2013). *Pars*. Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pars>.
- Williamson, E., et.al (1949). *The student personnel point of view*. Washington: American council on education, series VI. Retrieved August 9, 2011 from http://www.naspa.org/pubs/files/StudAff_1949.pdf

- Willis, D. A. (2010). *An exploratory study of organizational culture and its relationship to organizational effectiveness in distance education institutions* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland University College).
- Yeniyurt, S., & Townsend, J. D. (2003). Does culture explain acceptance of new products in a country?: An empirical investigation. *International marketing review*, 20(4), 377-396.
- Yilmaz, C., & Ergun, E. (2008). Organizational culture and firm effectiveness: An examination of relative effects of culture traits and the balanced culture hypothesis in an emerging economy. *Journal of world business*, 43 (3), 290-306.
- Yorke, D.M. (1987). Indicators of institutional achievement: some theoretical and empirical considerations. *Higher education*, 16, 3-20.
- Yu, T., & Wu. N. (2009). A review of study on the competing values framework. *International journal of business and management*, 4(7), 37-42.
- Zand, A., Arfaie, M., & Hossiny, M. (2011). Role of effective educational and management factors on professional development of IAU's employees. *Educational administration research quarterly*, 3(2), 145-160. (In Parsi)
- Zarei Matin, H., & Mahdavi, S. (2003). Organizational culture and the role of ideology and values in this culture. *Journal of lessons from Islam*, 507, 61-68. (In Parsi)
- Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of consumer research*, 37(2), 197-206.
- Zheng, W., Yang, B., & McLean, G. N. (2010). Linking organizational culture, knowledge management. *Journal of business research*, 63(7), 763-771.
- Zilwa, D. (2006). Organizational culture and values and the adaptation of academic units in Australian universities. *The journal of higher education*, 54, 557-574.