

## Investigating the relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility on productivity in the road, housing and urban development research center of Tehran province

Narges Esfandiari<sup>1</sup> & Fattah Nazem<sup>2\*</sup>

<p><b>Keywords:</b> <i>Job burnout, organizational culture, job motivation</i></p> <p><b>Article Type:</b> Research Article</p> <p>Corresponding author's Email: nazem@riau.ac.ir</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p><b>Background and purpose:</b> The low level of employee productivity in some organizations is one of the problems managers face. Therefore, the current research was conducted to investigate the relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility on productivity in the Road, Housing, and Urban Development Research Center of Tehran Province. <b>Methodology:</b> The current research was a correlational descriptive study. The statistical population was all Tehran Road, Housing, and Urban Development Research Center employees. Sampling was done by simple random sampling by preparing a list of 200 sample employees, and questionnaires of Albrecht's organizational intelligence (2002), Sharifi and Chang's (2004) organizational agility, and Hersey and Goldsmith's (2000) productivity questionnaires were implemented. <b>Results:</b> The results showed a significant relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility with productivity. Furthermore, this research showed that organizational intelligence and strategic dimensions, morale, application of knowledge, and performance pressure component, as well as organizational agility and the two dimensions of competence and responsiveness, were able to predict organizational productivity. <b>Conclusion:</b> The findings of the study showed that by increasing the intelligence of the organization, it is possible to provide the fields of the agile organization and bring the organization to its goals faster.</p> <p>This article has been published as open access according to CC BY-NC 4.0. All rights to publish this article belong to the author.</p>
---	---



*How to Cite:*

Esfandiari, N., & Nazem, F. (2021). Investigating the relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility on productivity in the road, housing and urban development research center of Tehran province. *International Journal of Innovation in Management and Organizational Behavior*, 1(3), 10-29.

1. Master's degree, Educational Management, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
2. **\*Corresponding Author:** Associate Professor, Department of Educational Science, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran.

## **Introduction**

Productivity is a concept that more than 230 years have passed since the first attempt and scientific understanding about it (Tahiri, 2009). It has always been the focus of scientific communities and different nations. The word productivity was first defined by "Adam Smith" in 1776 as the concept of "power to produce" and then it was defined in the dictionaries of "Litre" in 1883 and "Laros" in 1946 as the concept of knowledge and production techniques (Khaki, 2015). Later, it was defined by different researchers and organizations as "output to data ratio". Today, productivity is considered an intellectual point of view and the concept of working and acting intelligently (Shojaei, Jamali, and Manteghi, 2016).

In a macro view, productivity can be divided into two types, partial and general, where partial productivity includes productivity indicators of human resources, capital, machinery, etc. Human resources, as an intelligent agent, has a special role and position in improving the productivity of other agents. Therefore, the productivity index of human resources and the factors affecting it are of great importance among other indicators. Considering the importance of the productivity category of human resources in the national economic development, the managers of different economic fields of the country must help the growth and development of human resources with special attention to productivity promotion (Khaki, 2015).

So far, many researchers have explained the factors affecting the productivity of human resources, among which few studies have been conducted on the effect of organizational intelligence and organizational agility on the organizational productivity of employees. Therefore, in every organization, in addition to intelligent human creative resources, other factors also play an effective role in the performance process of organizations. An organization's employees may be smart and capable of doing great things, but their collective intelligence makes great things happen. Albrecht (2013) points to having three factors of smart people, teams, and organizations for business success, and he uses the title of organizational intelligence to prevent group mental retardation, and the only way to cure mental retardation in the organization is to use and increase the components of organizational intelligence. People with high intelligence can significantly affect management strategies, marketing, and product development for customer groups in different countries. The emergence of social organizations is one of the distinctive features of human civilization. In order to achieve its goals, every organization needs managers and employees who are smart, agile, and able to guide organizations toward a specific goal by using their multiple intelligences (Ghazanfari & Hashemi, 2011).

On the other hand, current organizations operate in an environment where rapid changes require them to have adaptive strategies; In fact, how organizations can succeed in a dynamic and unpredictable environment is the most important challenge in today's world

(Varley and Lawler, 2010). Although various solutions such as just-in-time production, re-engineering, virtual organizations, and networking have been introduced, organization agility is considered one of the most popular solutions. In such an environment, agility has become an important capability that affects the organization's performance (Ravichandran, 2007). In fact, an agile organization is said to be an organization that has characteristics such as innovation, flexibility, and readiness to respond to environmental changes and is very resistant and stable to problems and shortcomings; This type of organization achieves the mentioned characteristics by spending the least amount of money and energy (Yang, 2014). Therefore, although in recent years, many studies have been conducted in the field of organizational productivity, organizational intelligence, and organizational agility separately and a pairwise relationship, until now, the relationship between the components of organizational intelligence and organizational agility has been neglected as important and effective factors in organizational productivity.

Experts in management science believe that in today's world, the most important factor of development and progress is the productivity of human resources (Renzle, 2012). This is even though the workforce productivity index in Iran is lower compared to countries in the region and East Asia (Daniali, Allameh, and Mansouri, 2013). Human is both a producer and a consumer of knowledge and technology, they are the most important component in social, economic and industrial development and has a key role in improving productivity (Eng & Jones, 2013). However, productivity is one of the key indicators in the development of economic activities. Its improvement and promotion are also considered one of the competitive advantages of various industries and companies (Rao, 2006).

Therefore, productivity is a comprehensive and general concept whose increase as a necessity in order to improve the standard of living, more prosperity, peace and comfort of people, which is considered a basic goal for all countries of the world, has always been considered by political, economic and statesmen (Zarei, Farsizadeh, Siah Serani and Dehghani, 2015). In addition, workforce productivity is one of the issues that has occupied the minds of many researchers for a long time due to its close connection with the underdevelopment of nations. At the national level, improving the effectiveness and quality of human resources leads to a greater increase in gross national income or production (gross national production) than the use of additional capital and labor (Iranzadeh, Mesbahi Jahormi, Shokri, and Ebrahimi, 2016). Therefore, the productivity of the human force determines to a large extent the extent to which the products of a country can compete internationally. In addition, increasing productivity in organizations is one of the main concerns of executive managers and decision-makers in every country, so that in many countries, they base their development plans on increasing productivity. In such a way, during the last fifteen years, the world's productivity has increased 45 times (Daniali et al., 2013). On the other hand, there is still time to apply quality and productivity improvement

methods in various industries and economic sectors. The success of these strategies in economic growth and development prompted experts to test them in the most fundamental institutions and educational centers. In this regard, productivity improvement methods in these systems have also been successful (Iranzadeh et al., 2016). Among the variables affecting productivity are organizational intelligence and organizational agility.

Since no matter how well an organization works, it should still be aware of the activities of its competitors. Therefore, according to these conditions, acquiring organizational intelligence is one of the absolute requirements for most companies to increase their capabilities by acquiring and analyzing information, increasing knowledge, and agility, and creating awareness. In light of this knowledge, a complete picture of the current and future state of the competition scene is played in front of the managers so that they can provide the growth and development of their organization with quick and timely decisions (Sadeghi et al., 2016). Therefore, organizational intelligence is a new concept in the field of management and organization that has recently received attention.

Organizational intelligence is one of the most important capabilities of the organization that increases the changeability organization (Zabihi et al., 2015). Albrecht (2013) defines organizational intelligence as the talent and capacity of the organization to transfer its mental power and concentrate it on realizing the organization's mission; He summarizes organizational intelligence in a short sentence: organizational intelligence is the organization's success in its environment. Organizational intelligence is a quantitative measure of the organization's information dissemination, decision-making, and implementation efficiency. The IQ of organizations can be measured just like the IQ of people. Intelligent organizations increase their mental and physical power (Zarei et al., 2015).

In the last decade, the success of organizations has depended on their ability to identify customer needs and provide quick and cheap services according to their needs (Zarei et al., 2015). Nowadays, "Agility" as the dominant business paradigm in the third millennium and as the best option for the survival of organizations has been noticed by the general production and service organizations (Jiang, 2012). Following this attention, efforts have been made in order to reach a suitable and appropriate level of agility in these organizations. In the current economy, achieving profitability requires paying attention to customers' changes and needs, in other words, implementing an agile approach in the organization. Research centers should take effective and useful steps to investigate customer needs, environmental changes, and competitors' actions as organizations that play an important role in the economy and prosperity of a country (Pajohesh and Ansarifard, 2016). In the meantime, what guarantees the survival and continuity of the activities of these organizations is providing services in a favorable, reliable, fast, cheap, and proportionate way so that they can satisfy the expectations and demands of customers and cause their

satisfaction and loyalty (Iranzadeh et al., 2016). This important thing can only be achieved if the research centers create and optimize agility and agility culture in the organization's structure and among their employees in this tight competition.

On the other hand, since the resources of a country are generally limited, increasing performance becomes important as a basic necessity to improve the standard of living of a nation. In today's world, due to the limitations of various production factors, agility and productivity are vital in both developed and developing countries (Sadeghi et al., 2016). The importance of organizational performance due to the expansion of the level of competition, the complexity of technology, the speed of information exchange, and the variety of tastes is not hidden from anyone. Today, increasing performance and efficiency is valuable in managers' eyes, and everyone is looking for more efficiency and effectiveness. Their efforts are also formed in this direction to ensure the organization's stability in a highly competitive world (Daniali et al., 2013). Organizational intelligence and agility and the development of industries and small companies is a known need and new issue. Also, this issue requires more discussion due to the need for more research on the issue of organizational intelligence and agility in organizational productivity. Therefore, this research aims to investigate the relationship between organizational intelligence and agility in organizational productivity.

### **Methodology**

The method of the present research is correlational. Using this method, the distribution and relationships between predictor variables and research criteria will be investigated in society. Finally, the multivariate regression method will be used to predict the criterion variable. In order to carry out the research process, the statistical population of this study consists of all employees of the Road, Housing and Urban Development Research Center of Tehran Province. The sampling method of this research was as follows: first, a list of employees of the Road, Housing and Urban Development Research Center of Tehran province was prepared. Then, two companies were randomly selected and a sample of 300 people was randomly selected from among the employees of these companies and based on the total number of the statistical population and according to Morgan's table. Finally, after obtaining consent to participate in the research, organizational intelligence, organizational agility and productivity questionnaires were implemented. After scoring the questionnaires, 100 were discarded due to needing to be more accurate and complete, and a total of 200 questionnaires were analyzed. According to the research topic and its method, three organizational intelligence questionnaires, organizational productivity questionnaires, and organizational agility questionnaires have been used.

## Materials

**1- Questionnaire of organizational intelligence.** Albrecht created it in 2003 based on his own theory in this field. This questionnaire includes 49 items that evaluate seven components of strategic vision, common destiny, desire to change, morale, unity and agreement, application of knowledge and performance pressure. This questionnaire is scored using a five-point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, disagree, strongly disagree). Therefore, the highest score of this questionnaire is 225 and the lowest score is 49. After designing the questions, the questionnaire was given to specialists and experts in this field, and their opinion regarding the validity of the questionnaire was applied. Therefore, it can be concluded that the questionnaire has the required content validity. The reliability obtained from the Albrecht organizational intelligence questionnaire was 0.92, which indicates its good reliability.

**2- Organizational productivity questionnaire.** Hersey and Goldsmith presented the human resource productivity questionnaire based on the Achio model in 1980. This questionnaire, with 26 items on a Likert scale (1=very low to 5=very high), examines seven aspects of this model's human resource productivity dimensions. Dimensions of the questionnaire: The questionnaire is based on the dimensions of ability, understanding, recognition, organizational support, motivation, feedback, validity and compatibility (ACHIEVE model). The creators of the questionnaire reported Cronbach's alpha coefficient to be 0.90. In domestic studies, the reliability coefficient of this scale has been reported as 0.89 in the research of Kasiri and Kamalzadeh (2016). Data analysis is done in two parts, descriptive and inferential statistics.

**3- Organizational agility questionnaire.** Organizational agility questionnaire with 29 questions designed by Sharifi and Zhang in 2004. The first part of the questionnaire contains questions related to the demographic variables of the people participating in the research, and the second part contains 29 closed questions. The factors affecting the organization's agility are set in the form of four agility indicators: responsiveness, competence, flexibility, and speed. The scoring scale for the questions is based on the Likert scale and includes the options of very little, little to some extent (moderate), much, and very much from one to five. The maximum score that can be obtained is 145, and the minimum is 29. The validity of the questionnaire was confirmed based on the opinions of professors and experts. The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated by Cronbach's alpha method, which was 0.96. Also, to check the reliability of the questionnaire, using Gutman's dichotomization method, the number 0.91 was obtained,

which indicates the very good reliability of the questionnaire. In order to determine the agility level of the investigated organization, the agility scores were divided into five categories, each category representing a level of agility:

**Table 1: Organizational agility questionnaire scoring table**

Organizational agility components	Min score	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Excellent	Max score
Speed	6	< 9	9-15	15-21	21-27	> 27	30
Competency	7	< 11.5	-17.5 11.5	-24.5 17.5	-31.5 24.5	> 31.5	35
Responsiveness	7	< 11.5	-17.5 11.5	-24.5 17.5	-31.5 24.5	> 31.5	35
Flexibility	9	< 13.5	-22.5 13.5	-31.5 22.5	-40.5 31.5	> 40.5	45
Organizational agility	29	< 43.5	-72.5 43.5	-101.5 72.5	-130.5 101.5	> 130.5	145

**Results**

The information collected from the subjects was analyzed by organizational intelligence, organizational productivity, and organizational agility questionnaires using appropriate statistical tests, and research hypotheses were tested. For this purpose, descriptive statistics indices were used to describe and classify the data collected from the sample, and Pearson's correlation and multivariate regression were used to test and analyze the hypotheses. The statistical sample of this research included 125 men (62.5%) and 75% women (37.5%). Among them, 16.5% had a diploma and associate degree, 24% had a bachelor's degree, and 59.5% had a master's degree and above.

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics indicators and interval estimation of organizational intelligence variable and its components**

Components	N	Range	Min	Max	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Estimated interval with 95% confidence	
								Lower limit	Upper limit
Total organizational intelligence score	200	105	52	157	11/416	19/75	39/240	0/68	1/20
Organizational intelligence subcategory: strategic	200	19	7	26	17/49	3/51	12/34	0/31	0/40
Organizational intelligence subcategory: common destiny	200	20	7	27	17/47	3/96	15/69	0/15	0/22
Organizational intelligence subcategory: desire to change	200	15	7	22	15/73	3/60	13/02	0/32	0/33

ales	spirit	200	15	9	24	16/53	3/46	11/99	0/08	0/17
	Unity	200	16	8	24	16/92	3/43	11/78	0/63	0/46
	and agreeme nt									
	Applicat ion of knowled ge	200	16	7	23	16/66	3/84	14/77	0/44	1/03
	Perform ance pressure	200	16	7	23	15/58	3/57	12/75	0/37	1/24

As shown in the above table, the indicators of the descriptive statistics of the organizational intelligence variable are reported. For example, this variable's mean and standard deviation are 116.41 and 19.75, respectively. At the same time, the numbers in the interval estimation column indicate that it can be estimated with 95% confidence that the average of the cultural intelligence variable is between 0.68 and 1.20 of the community average. Also, the average of other components of this variable is reported in the table.

**Table 3: Descriptive statistics indicators and interval estimation of organizational productivity variable and its components (N=200)**

Components	Range	Min	Max	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Estimated interval with 95% confidence	
							Lower limit	Upper limit
Total organizational productivity score	59	26	85	116.41	10.26	10.52	1.07	2.89
Ability	8	3	11	56.7	1.57	2.46	0.58	0.63
Understanding	8	4	12	10.9	1.97	4.88	0.60	1.39
Organizational	9	4	13	13.7	2.33	5.43	1.16	1.46
Organizational support	10	4	14	14.7	2.15	4.63	0.44	1.30
Organizational productivity subscales	10	4	14	16.9	2.14	4.60	1.11	2.18
Validity	10	4	14	14.8	2.43	5.94	0.58	1.05
compatibility	9	3	12	13.7	2.05	4.22	1.23	2.12

As shown in the above table, the indicators of descriptive statistics of organizational productivity variables are reported. For example, knowledge management's mean and standard deviation are 56.12 and 10.26, respectively. At the same time, the numbers in the interval estimation column indicate that it can be estimated with 95% confidence that



the average of this variable is in the interval between 1.07 and 2.89 communities. Also, the average of other components of this variable is reported in the table.

**Table 4: Descriptive statistics indicators and interval estimation of organizational agility variable and its components (N=200)**

Components	Range	Min	Max	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Estimated interval with 95% confidence	
							Lower limit	Upper limit
Total organizational agility score	97	29	126	97.71	16/78	28/781	1/15	2/04
Speed	16	6	22	99.14	3/82	14/64	0/79	1/25
Competency	15	7	22	53.16	4/15	17/22	0/79	1/13
Organizational Agility subscales	55	7	62	11.18	7/37	54/42	2/06	3/28
Flexibility	24	8	32	68.19	4/06	16/53	0/52	2/61

As shown in this table, the descriptive statistics indicators of organizational agility variables are reported. For example, this variable's mean and standard deviation are 97.71 and 78.16, respectively. At the same time, the numbers of the interval estimation column indicate that it can be estimated with 95% confidence that the average of the organizational agility variable is between 1.15 and 04.2 of the community average. Also, the average of other components of this variable is reported in the table in order of value.

**Table 5: Correlation coefficient**

Model	Correlation coefficient	The coefficient of determination	Modified coefficient of determination	Standard error of estimation
1	*0/701	0/491	0/486	7/360

The first research question was, "Is there a significant relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility with organizational productivity in the road, housing and urban development research center of Tehran province?". The correlation and determination coefficient between dependent and independent variables are presented in the table above. So that the obtained correlation coefficient is equal to 0.701, and the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.491; In other words, 49% of the changes in the dependent variable of organizational productivity are covered by the variables of organizational intelligence and organizational agility.

**Table 6: Regression equation coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized coefficient	T	(sig)
		B	Standard error			
1	Constant	13/849	3/136		4/415	0/000
	Organizational	0/282	0/035	0/543	8/270	0/000

intelligence					
Organizational	0/131	0/041	0/215	3/233	0/001
productivity					

According to the above table and the regression test, since the sig value obtained in organizational intelligence and organizational agility is less than 0.05, the role of these two in the regression equation is significant.

**Table 7: Correlation coefficient**

Model	Correlation coefficient	The coefficient of determination	Modified coefficient of determination	Standard error of estimation
1	0/710 <sup>a</sup>	0/504	0/486	7/360

The second research question was, "Is there a significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational intelligence and organizational productivity in the Road, Housing and Urban Development Research Center of Tehran province?". The correlation and determination coefficient between dependent and independent variables are presented in the table above. So that the obtained correlation coefficient is equal to 0.710, and the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.504; In other words, 50% of the changes in the dependent variable of organizational productivity are covered by the independent variables of organizational intelligence dimensions.

**Table 8: Regression equation coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized coefficient	Standard error	Standardized coefficient	T	(sig)
	B		Beta		
Constant	14/17	3/31		4/40	0/000
1 strategic	0/51	0/20	0/17	2/45	0/01
common destiny	0/15	0/18	0/05	0/80	0/42
desire to change	-0/32	0/21	-0/11	-1/47	0/14
spirit	0/82	0/23	0/27	3/49	0/001
Unity and agreement	-0/05	0/27	-0/01	-0/18	0/85
Application of knowledge	0/77	0/20	0/28	3/86	0/000
Performance pressure	0/62	0/27	0/21	2/26	0/02

According to the above table and the regression test, since the obtained sig value is less than 0.05 in all cases except for the dimensions of common destiny, desire for change, unity, and agreement, their role in the regression equation is significant.

**Table 9: Correlation coefficient**

Model	Correlation coefficient	The coefficient of determination	Modified coefficient of determination	Standard error of estimation
1	<sup>a</sup> 0/755	0/571	0/562	6/793

The third research question was, "Is there a significant relationship between organizational agility and its dimensions with organizational productivity in the Road, Housing and Urban Development Research Center of Tehran Province?". The correlation and determination coefficient between dependent and independent variables are presented in the table above. So that the obtained correlation coefficient is equal to 0.755 and the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.571; In other words, 57 percent of the changes in the dependent variable of organizational productivity are covered by the independent variables of organizational agility dimensions.

**Table 10: Regression equation coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	(sig)
	B	Standard Error	Beta		
1 Constant	26/411	2/436		10/840	0/000
Speed	-0/254	0/207	-0/095	-1/228	0/22
competency	2/118	0/202	0/856	10/486	0/000
Responsiveness	-0/208	0/078	-0/150	-2/664	0/008
Flexibility	0/116	0/171	0/046	0/681	0/49

According to the above table and the regression test, since the obtained sig value is less than 0.05 in all cases except for the dimensions of speed and flexibility, their role in the regression equation is significant.

### Discussion and Conclusion

This research aimed to investigate the relationship between organizational intelligence and agility on organizational productivity. The research's first finding showed a significant relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility with productivity. So that the obtained correlation coefficient is equal to 0.701, and the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.491; In other words, 49% of the changes in the dependent variable of organizational productivity are covered by the variables of organizational intelligence and agility. The findings of this research are in line with the results of Iranzadeh et al. (2016), Ansarifard (2016), Abili et al. (2015), Zabihi et al. (2015), Rezaei et al. (2015), Shiri et al. (2014), Bafarzadeh and Akbari Debauer (2010), Segra-Navarro et al. (2016), Wang et al. (2016) and Lefter et al. (2008). For example, Iranzadeh et al. (2016) investigated the relationship between organizational agility dimensions and employee productivity of Dana Insurance Company in East Azerbaijan province. Their results showed a positive and significant relationship between organizational agility and its dimensions and the productivity of the employees of Dana Insurance Company in East Azerbaijan province, which is in line with the results of the

present study. Ebili et al. (2015) in a study investigating the effect of knowledge sharing on the organizational agility of educational and research staff with the mediating role of organizational intelligence on 144 employees of teaching and research assistants of medical sciences in Tehran. Their results indicate that knowledge sharing with a path coefficient ( $r=0.77$ ) has been effective on organizational agility and with a path coefficient ( $r=0.64$ ) on organizational intelligence. It was also found that knowledge sharing with the path coefficient ( $r=0.50$ ) indirectly influenced the organizational agility of the teaching and research staff of Tehran University of Medical Sciences. Also, Zabihi et al. (2015), in a study to determine the relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility in 408 hospital employees of Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, showed a significant relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility in hospitals. The components of strategic vision, performance pressure, and unity and agreement contributed the greatest to determining agility. In their study, Shiri and his colleagues (2014) examined the relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility in the employees and managers of Ilam Governorate. Their results showed a significant relationship between organizational intelligence and agility in Ilam Governorate. Moreover, there is a relationship between strategic vision, common destiny, willingness to change, morale, unity and agreement, application of knowledge and performance pressure, and organizational agility in the governorate of Ilam province. Also, Pajuhesh and Ansarifard (2016) also studied and analyzed in their meta-analytical study the field, organizational culture, organizational agility, and knowledge management, which was the result of master's and doctoral theses collected. Finally, according to the literature, they concluded that the organizational culture in Iran should act locally but have a global vision considering the globalization process. Also, Iranian organizations need to achieve a local organizational culture based on knowledge, agility, and flexibility. Rezaei and his colleagues (2015) examined knowledge management and agility strategies in the publishing industry in their study. The results of knowledge management and agility studies in this research showed a significant and high correlation between these factors. Also, the results showed that among the elements of knowledge management, the factors of "creating and acquiring classified knowledge" and "facilitating actions related to knowledge in the field of the organization's goals" have the greatest effect on organizational agility, and these findings are consistent with the results of the present study. Also, Segra-Navarro et al. (2016) investigated organizational performance and knowledge management structure with the mediating role of organizational agility, which

was conducted on 112 large Spanish companies. They showed that the presented model directly affects knowledge management on organizational performance and a mediating role of organizational agility in these companies. Also, the research results of Lefter and his colleagues (2008) showed that only 13% of the employees of large and medium-sized companies are familiar with the concept of organizational intelligence, and the employees of small companies need to learn this concept. However, the analysis of the obtained data showed that the organizational intelligence in these companies was average and higher, which is an important factor in the productivity of the companies, which is consistent with the findings of the present research.

The second finding of the current research showed that the obtained correlation coefficient is equal to 0.710 and the determination coefficient is equal to 0.504; In other words, 50% of the changes in the dependent variable of organizational productivity are covered by the independent variables of organizational intelligence dimensions. Also, the strategic components of morale component, knowledge application component and performance pressure component have a significant relationship with organizational productivity, and they were able to predict productivity well. The findings of this section are in line with the studies of Khastoui and Benisi (2015), Khatib Zanjani and Abbasian (2014), Mohammadi and Kashgar (2012), Khodadai et al. (2010), Zabihi et al. Lefter and colleagues (2008). Khastooi and Banisi (2016) investigated the relationship between the dimensions and components of organizational intelligence on the productivity of employees and faculty members of Islamic Azad University, Tehran East Branch, whose number is around 190 employees and 181 faculty members. The results related to the main research question show that the correlation between these two variables is 0.868, and the coefficient of determination is 0.754. Also, at the significance level of 0.000 and  $F = 0.754$ , the regression equation is statistically significant, and there is a direct and positive relationship between the two variables. Concerning the sub-questions of the research, which seeks to investigate the relationship between the dimensions and components of organizational intelligence on the productivity of employees of Islamic Azad University, Tehran East Branch, the results showed the correlation coefficient in all cases was high and the regression equation was significant. In their study, Khatibzanjani and Abbasian (2013) examined the relationship between the components of organizational intelligence and organizational productivity in the physical education departments of nineteen districts of Tehran. The research results showed that based on the Pearson correlation coefficient, there is a positive and significant relationship between all the components of organizational intelligence and organizational

productivity,  $P < 0.05$ . Finally, the linear regression analysis showed that among the components of organizational intelligence - common destiny, organizational spirit and unity and agreement can predict more productivity.

Mohammadi and Kashgar (2012) investigated the relationship between organizational intelligence components and human resources' productivity in selected sports federations. The research results show that based on Pearson's correlation coefficient, there is a positive and significant relationship between human resources productivity and the components of organizational intelligence and overall organizational intelligence ( $P < 0.01$ ); and the results of the step-by-step regression analysis showed that among the components of organizational intelligence, the desire to change, and common destiny could predict the productivity of human resources meaningfully. Finally, Fisher's z-test shows no difference in the relationship between organizational intelligence components and human resources productivity in group and individual sports federations. Khodadadi and his colleagues (2010) investigated the relationship between organizational intelligence and its components and the productivity of physical education department managers in East Azerbaijan. The research results showed that based on the Pearson correlation coefficient, there is a positive and significant relationship between all the components of organizational intelligence and overall organizational intelligence and productivity. Finally, the results of step-by-step regression analysis showed that among the components of organizational intelligence, willingness to change, morale, and knowledge application are capable of predicting productivity meaningfully. Also, Green and Turker (2015) discussed in a research entitled Perspectives of a Quantitative Measurement of Organizational Agility: A Validation Study on an Organizational Agility Maturity Model. The results showed that the set of items in the tool and experimental support in the new group are factors of organizational agility. The greater the depth of cultural intelligence, the more organizational agility we will have. Lefter and his colleagues (2008) showed that only 13% of employees of large and medium-sized companies are familiar with the concept of organizational intelligence, and employees of small companies do not know this concept. However, the analysis of the obtained data showed that the organizational intelligence in these companies was average and higher, and this is an important factor on the productivity of the companies. These findings are in line with the results of the current research.

The third finding of the current research indicates that the obtained correlation coefficient is equal to 0.755 and the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.571; In other words, 57 percent of the changes in the dependent variable of organizational productivity are

covered by the independent variables of organizational agility dimensions. Also, among the components of agility, only competence and responsiveness have a significant relationship with productivity, and they could predict productivity well.

The results of this finding are consistent with the research of Iranzadeh et al. (2016), Arab Najaf Abadi (2016), Hossein Abadi (2015), and Segra-Navarro et al. (2016). In their study, Iranzadeh et al. (2016) examined the relationship between organizational agility dimensions and employee productivity of Dana Insurance Company in East Azerbaijan province. Their results showed a positive and significant relationship between organizational agility and its dimensions and the productivity of Dana insurance company employees in East Azerbaijan province. In his research, Arab Najaf Abadi (2015) examined the effect of organizational agility on the workforce productivity in Shahid Mohammad Montazeri Electricity Production Management Company of Isfahan. The results showed a significant relationship between organizational agility and its sub-variables, i.e. accountability, readiness to deal with problems, the importance of human skills and knowledge, doing work virtually, and workforce productivity.

Hossein Abadi (2015) investigated the relationship between the perception of intellectual capital and organizational agility with organizational productivity in the University of Isfahan. The findings of the research indicated that there is a significant relationship between intellectual capital and its dimensions with organizational productivity and also between organizational agility and organizational productivity. The results of the step-by-step regression showed that among the dimensions of intellectual capital in the first step, the dimension of human capital and in the second step, the dimension of structural capital. From the dimensions of organizational agility, in the first step, leadership and shared identity dimension and in the second step, the adaptive organizational plan was the best predictor of organizational productivity. There was a significant difference between the respondents' opinions in the intellectual capital variable according to educational qualifications and service experience. However, no significant difference was observed in organizational agility and productivity variables according to demographic factors. Segra-Navarro et al. (2016) in their study that investigated organizational performance and productivity and knowledge management structure with the mediating role of organizational agility conducted on 112 large Spanish companies. They showed that the presented model directly affects knowledge management on organizational performance and productivity and a mediating role of organizational agility on these companies.

One of the biggest management challenges today is creating a new generation of smart organizations. Organizations in which organizational intelligence is a determining factor and its proper use can cause a significant increase in the organization's productivity, and neglecting and not paying attention to it can remove any organization from the cycle of competition and continued survival (Iranzadeh et al., 2016). Currently, most successful organizations in developed countries use competitive intelligence as a powerful tool to gain more awareness of the environment. Organizations will feel more secure by relying on the capabilities of competitive intelligence, gathering, successful analysis of information and overcoming the uncertainty of the competitive landscape (Segra-Navarro et al., 2016); Just as in the human world and in the turbulent human life, there will be successful and efficient people who have rich intelligence and benefit from a high level of intelligence, the situation will definitely be the same in the organizational world. In particular, as time goes on in the present era, due to the advancement of science and technology and the emergence of new needs and challenges, organizations are also becoming more complex, and their administration is also becoming more difficult. This meaning will multiply its importance when we accept that in today's organization, in addition to the huge and creative source of intelligent human beings, intelligent machines also play an effective role in the organization's processes (Mohammadi and Kashgar, 2012).

In today's era, organizations are successful when all their employees strive to improve their abilities, and the manager must provide suitable conditions for this learning process. Organizational learning builds on individual learning and is then shared with other organizational members in organizational policies, standard operating practices, and cultural norms. Of course, it should be noted that despite the challenges facing today's organizations, paying attention to the process of organizational intelligence to strengthen performance and further growth through examining and promoting strategic vision, common destiny, desire for change, morale, unity and agreement, application of knowledge and pressure Performance, which is one of the dimensions of organizational intelligence, is a necessary action (Khastooi and Benisi, 2016).

Some experts consider productivity as a way of thinking that a person can do today's work better than yesterday. It is an endless effort to use resources, workforce, skills, technology and information to achieve the best results; Therefore, building organizational intelligence is another start for productivity that managers, systems analysts and others need in competitive sectors (Mohammadi and Kashgar, 2012).



According to Drucker, this finding heralds the creation of a new type of organization in which, instead of arm power, the power of the mind rules and shows the use of intelligence in productivity. In fact, this part of the findings introduces the components through which productivity can be enhanced and improved. Finally, the improvement and excellence of the productivity lead to the acquisition and maintenance of the competitive power of the organization and the more successful presence of the organization in its environment and the sustainable survival of the organization (Khostui and Benisi, 2016). In organizations, there are many employees, and if the capabilities, thinking, mentality, and set of capabilities of the employees are transformed into more favorable performance, the organization will be fresh, profitable and superior. The excellence of organizations depends on the excellence of employees; that is, in order to have an excellent and excellent organization, first of all, the employees should be excellent and excellent so that these excellent employees can start and continue the way of excellence of the organization. Employees' excellence is achieved by developing a set of mental, intellectual, attitudinal, and knowledge capabilities. Based on this, organizations must follow human resources development systematically, directly, and practically (Khodadadi et al., 2010). Among the limitations of this research, we can mention the insufficient willingness of some subjects to answer the questions, which is a limitation that leads to spending much time recording information.

### **Ethics**

This research observed ethical standards, including obtaining informed consent and ensuring privacy and confidentiality. Also, while completing the questionnaires while emphasizing completing all the questions, the participants were free to withdraw from the research at any time and provide individual information. They were assured that the information would remain confidential, which was strictly adhered to.

### **Acknowledgement**

The cooperation of all participants in the research is thanked and appreciated.

### **Conflict of Interest**

According to the authors, this article has no financial sponsor or conflict of interest.

### **References**

Albrecht, K (2013). *The power of mind at work: organizational intelligence inaction*, New York: Amancom.

- Albrecht, K. (2003), "Organizational Intelligence Survey Preliminary Assessment Australian Managers". Australian institute of management. September..
- Babaei, M., & Momeni, N. (2005). The effect of emotional intelligence on the effectiveness of managers. *Tadbir*, 16(166).
- Babolhavaeji, F., Ghazi Mir Saeed, S. J., & Elahian, A. (2010). Measuring the organizational intelligence of employees of Ferdowsi Libraries of Mashhad and Astan Quds Razavi. *Library and Information Sciences*, 13(1), 9-33.
- Chung S., Lee K.Y., & Kim K. (2014). Job performance through mobile enterprise systems: The role of organizational agility, location independence, and task characteristics. *Information & Management*. 51(6); 605-617.
- Ebili, K., Rominae, Y., & Beiranvand, M. (2015). The effect of knowledge sharing on the organizational agility of educational and research staff with the mediating role of organizational intelligence. *Journal of healthcare management*, 6(3), 55-65.
- Eng, T. & Jones, G (2013). "An investigation of marketing capabilities and upgrading performance of manufacturers in mainland China and Hong Kong". *Journal of World Business*, 44(4): 463-475.
- Ghazanfari, F., & Hashemi, S. (2012). The Relationship Between Organizational Intelligence and Organizational Commitment in Lorestan University of Medical Sciences Staff. *Caring Today*, 7(24-25), 32-39.
- Goldman, S.L., Nagel, R.N. and Preiss, K. (1995), *Agile Competitors and Virtual Organisations*, Van No strand Reinhold, New York, NY.
- Grover, P., and Froese T. M., ( 2016) . "The Interface Between Building , *Info rmation Model And The Public*," in 5th Construction SpecialityConference.
- Hillegersberg, J; and et.al (2005): *Business agility requirements in financial service*, *Journal of Rotterdam School, F Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam*.
- Hizom Shekan Hossein Abadi, E. (2015). *The relationship between the perception of intellectual capital and organizational agility with organizational productivity in Isfahan University*. Master's thesis, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Isfahan Islamic Azad University (Khorasgan).
- Jafarnejad, A., Shahae, B. (2010). *An introduction to organizational agility and agile manufacturing*. Tehran: Mehraban.
- Jung Y. (2014). An Approach to Organizational Intelligence Management (a Framework for Analyzing Organizational Intelligence within the Construction Process). Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial

fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy In Environmental Design and Planning; 2014: 66.

- Khaki, G. (2005). *Productivity improvement cycle management (on a national and organizational scale with a human resources approach)*. Tehran: Fouzhan.
- Khastouei, Z., & Banici, P. (2016). Investigation relationship between some dimension of organizational Intelligent on employment efficiency in Islamic Azad University, East Branch. *Social Research*, 8(32), 19-40.
- Misra, S. C., & Mondal, A. (2011), "Identification of a company's suitability for the adoption of cloud computing and modelling its corresponding Return on Investment", *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 53(3-4):504-521. doi:10.1016/j.mcm.2010.03.037.
- Pajuhesh, S., & Ansarifard, S. S. (2016). Meta-analysis of organizational culture with organizational agility approach based on organizational knowledge. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Change and Transformation Management*, 65-70.
- Renzle.B. (2012). Trust in Management and Knowledge Sharing: The Mediating effects of fear and Knowledge Documentation. *Omega* 2012; 36: 206-220.
- Roger, M. (2001) . Pulling Through with Productivity, Transportation and Distribution/ 36/ 9.
- Shiri, A., Mohseni Moghadam, A., & Feizi, S. (2014). The relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility in Ilam Governorate. *Ilam Culture*, 15(44-45), 22-36.
- Taheri, S. (2009). *Productivity and its analysis in organizations*. Tehran: Hamestan.
- Tallon P.P. and Pinsonneault A. (2011). Competing Perspectives on the Link Between Strategic Information Technology Alignment and Organizational Agility: Insights from a Mediation Model. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (June 2011), pp. 463-486
- Torang Lin, C and et.al (2005): *Agility evaluation using fuzzy logic, Int. J. Production Economics*, pp.1-16.
- Virtanen P., & Vakkuri J. (2015). Searching for Organizational Intelligence in the Evolution of Public-Sector Performance Management. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 8(2); 1-29.
- Wang, M-H & Yang T . (2016) Investigating the success of knowledge management: An empirical study of small- and medium-sized enterprises Original Research Article, *Asia Pacific Management Review*, Volume 21, Issue 2, June 2016, Pages 79-91.
- Yang, Seung-Bum and Choi, Sang .(2009). Employee Empowerment and Team performance. *Team performance Management*. Vol. 15, 289-301(7).
- Zabihi, M. R., Tabatabaee, S. S., Ghamari, M. R., & Asadi, M. H. (2015). The Relationship Between Organizational Intelligence And Organizational Agility In Hospitals Of Mashhad

University Of Medical Sciences. *Payavard*, 9(1): 43-54.

Zarei, A., Farsizadeh, H., Siah Sarani, M. A., & Dehghani, M. (2015). The impact of organizational intelligence on organizational performance using marketing capacities. *Journal of Executive Management*, 7(13), 2-2.