

January 2011

Organizational Intelligence in Faculty Members of Shahrekord Selected Universities, Iran

MANIJEH FAHAMI

Meymeh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Meymeh, Iran, fahami.manijah@gmail.com

MOHAMMAD TAGHI MAHMOUDI DEHKORDI

Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran, mahmoody44@yahoo.com

ALI MAHZOUNIEH

Tehran University, Tehran, Iran, mahzoon3@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.interscience.in/imr>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), and the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

FAHAMI, MANIJEH; DEHKORDI, MOHAMMAD TAGHI MAHMOUDI; and MAHZOUNIEH, ALI (2011) "Organizational Intelligence in Faculty Members of Shahrekord Selected Universities, Iran," *Interscience Management Review*. Vol. 4 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

DOI: 10.47893/IMR.2011.1072

Available at: <https://www.interscience.in/imr/vol4/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Interscience Journals at Interscience Research Network. It has been accepted for inclusion in Interscience Management Review by an authorized editor of Interscience Research Network. For more information, please contact sritampatnaik@gmail.com.

Organizational Intelligence in Faculty Members of Shahrekord Selected Universities, Iran

Manijeh Fahami¹, Mohammad Taghi Mahmoudi Dehkordi² & Ali Mahzounieh³

1- Faculty_of_Literature_and_Humanities, Meymeh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Meymeh, Iran
2- Faculty_of_Literature_and_Humanities, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran
3- Faculty of Power Engineering, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran
E-mail: fahami.manijeh@gmail.com, mahmoody44@yahoo.com, mahzoon3@gmail.com

Abstract- Organizational intelligence is considered as one of the prerequisites of organizational success and helps the organizations to achieve their missions. The purpose of this article is to diagnose a university's business intelligence. The indicators of organizational intelligence (strategic vision, shared fate, appetite for change, alignment, performance pressure, knowledge deployment and spirit) were measured in academic members in Shahrekord selected Universities, Iran. Data were collected from 168 faculty members and analyzed by correlation descriptive method. Albrecht's standard questionnaire was used to collect data. Results showed that all of these seven indicators of intelligence assessment among faculty members were located at a higher level than the median and mean of them were ranged from 19.6 up to 24.8 (out of 35). Two indicators include strategic vision and spirit showed the highest and the application of knowledge showed the lowest values.

Organizational Intelligence didn't showed any correlation with age of faculty members, but the performance pressure was higher among full Professors, and components of strategic vision, appetite for change and organizational alignment were significantly higher among female faculty members than male ones.

Keywords- *Organizational intelligence; faculty members; Shahrekord; Iran.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Organizational intelligence (OI) is the capacity of an organization to mobilize all of its brain power, and focus that brain power on achieving the mission [1]. The concept of organizational intelligence encompasses the procedural ability of a business organization to efficiently process, exchange, measure and reason to support efficient and effective decision-making in its activities, specifically planning, organizing, leading, and controlling the organization's operations [6]. The concept of OI came into vogue in academic setting in the 1980s. Some of authors believe that Michael Porter first introduced the concepts of OI and competition intelligence. On the other hand, Carl Albrecht is one of

the pioneers in designing OI. According to his viewpoint, humans may be very competent and intelligent for doing great jobs but it is their collective mental power that leads to doing great jobs [4]. Universities especially private ones currently adopt corporate-like behaviors, being, thus, influenced by the same need to develop their organizational intelligence which has recently become a widespread practice in the business world.

In fact, they should have been pioneers in the field, given that, although they are losing the monopoly on knowledge, universities still are accredited knowledge producers, so they are inherently involved in the field of intelligence supply and trading. It was not the case, particularly because, traditionally, the economy of higher education was far from being a free one, as it benefited from a sort of knowledge protectionism, from unaccountable autonomy. Now, as they pass from a command-driven (the requirements of the nation-state, for instance, whom universities, as institutions, have served) to a demand-driven (based on market laws) regime, universities must focus on fostering their organizational intelligence development strategies.

The first step of the process, an on-going one, is the evaluation of the present status of organizational intelligence. Since organizational intelligence is seen as an evolving, mobile feature, its measurements can't, obviously, be static. So, Universities have to design adequate functions whose variables are environment-sensitive and, by optimizing these functions, to ensure that they have reached an acceptable level of organizational intelligence, a basis for future development [9]. If the authorities and managers do not care about organizational intelligence in their Universities, no doubt, as the competition will be defeated and they will get longer and more costly to achieve their goals. Albrecht says that intelligent people, when assembled into an organization, will tend toward collective stupidity.

This collective incapacity is not a necessary or inevitable part of the life of an enterprise. It is optional to the extent that intelligent people allow it to happen. It

is optional to the extent that leaders show by their behavior that they accept and condone it [1]. Evaluating the OI status of any particular organization like university is admittedly a rather subjective matter — more like a mental-health appraisal than a detailed medical checkup. If you're a member of an organization of any type, however, chances are you were reading about the seven traits of OI with your own enterprise at least partly in mind.

First of all we have a glance at these indicators [2], and deeper looking for more specific evidences of organizational intelligence in University. The mentioned points at the end of each paragraph were considered for designing of questions in a questionnaire [9].

1. Strategic Vision. It is a theory, a concept, an organizing principle, or a definition of the destiny which all try to seek it. The OI dimension, or trait, of strategic vision presupposes that the leaders can articulate and evolve a success concept, and that they can reinvent it when and as necessary.

For strategic vision, the matters in focus are:

- The “strategic conversation” in the university.
- The environmental scanning.
- Annual strategic review.
- Value proposition.
- Statement of direction.
- Correlation between statement of direction and key decisions.
- Leaders' identification and promotion.

2. Shared Fate. When all or most of the people involved in the university, know what the mission is, have a sense of common purpose, and understand their individual parts in the algebra of its success. This sense creates a powerful sense of community and esprit de corps. Similarly, for shared fate, other seven questions have to be addressed to:

- Plans and priorities sharing between management and employees.
- Understanding of the organizational idea throughout the organization
- Information sharing across departments
- Sense of belonging.
- Employees – management partnership.
- Employees' belief in the organization success.
- Projected long lasting relationship with the organization.

3. Appetite for change. Changes represent challenge, opportunity for new and exciting experiences, and a chance to tackle something new. People in these

environments see the need to reinvent the business model as a welcome and stimulating challenge, and a chance to learn new ways of succeeding. The appetite for change needs to be big enough to accommodate the kinds of changes called for in the strategic vision.

Change orientation is accounted for by:

- Issuance of new university services to keep up with the demand.
- Natural mechanisms to encourage innovation.
- Employees' stimulation to find creative ways to better do their jobs.
- Permission to question the habitual way of getting things done.
- Bureaucracy
- Willingness of the management to admit their mistakes and to cancel non-working strategies
- Openness

4. Heart. In an organization with lots of heart, the leaders have somehow managed to earn a measure of discretionary effort, i.e. the willingness of the employees to contribute something more than expected, because they identify their success with the success of the enterprise and they want it to succeed. “Heart and Soul” measures commitment in terms of:

- Overall quality of work life, as perceived by the employees
- Management's interests as perceived by the employees
- Pride taken in belonging to the organization
- Willingness, from the part of the employees, to spend extra effort to build organizational success.
- Optimism regarding the future of employees' career in the organization
- Management commitment.
- Perception of managers as role models.

5. Alignment. In an intelligent organization the systems, broadly defined, all come together to enable the people to achieve the mission. Its designers and leaders have eliminated most of the structural contradictions to the core value proposition, and have promoted the alignment of individual energies toward the common purpose. Alignment shows:

- Organizational structure appropriateness to the mission.
- Sense-making of rules and policies, as compared to priorities.
- Facilitation of employee performance.
- Information systems as facilitators.
- Value creation.

- Authority delegation.
- Alignment of department's missions, as to facilitate cooperation.

6. Knowledge Deployment. OI must include the free flow of knowledge throughout the culture, and the careful balance between the conservation of sensitive information and the availability of information at key points of need. It must also include support and encouragement for new ideas, new inventions, and an open-minded questioning of the status quo. Knowledge deployment is expressed by:

- Cultural processes of knowledge sharing.
- Managers' respect for employees' knowledge skills.
- Porous organizational boundaries.
- Information systems knowledge flows support.
- Continuous study of the new tendencies at the managerial level.
- Continuous learning programs support.
- Accurate appreciation of employees' tacit knowledge.

7. Performance Pressure. When people hold one another accountable for their contributions to the mission, a performance culture takes shape, and every new member who joins can feel the shared sense of imperative. Performance pressure takes into account:

- Clear understanding of roles and responsibilities, at all levels.
- On-going communication of performance goals and expectations.
- Replacement of poorly performing employees.
- Removal of failing managers.
- Feedback to employees and recognition of their contributions.
- Employees' perception that their work contributes to the organization's success
- Employees' perception that career success is determined by job performance

The higher education is conducted by Public and private universities in Iran, and the later is developed in three recent decades. The Islamic Azad University (IAU) was established in 1982, and has enjoyed gigantic growth in vast areas, so now, IAU is main non-profit university in Iran also it is the worlds' largest university. About half of Iranian students in higher education are studying in IAU. The Islamic Azad University has eighteen country zones, with over 400 branches in Iran, and 3 branches overseas, covers almost every subject in its curriculum and delivers huge flexibility and choice to its students [3].

Privatization will create the impression that they do not meet standards, although they are under internal/external monitoring and evaluation systems. This study was carried out to evaluate organizational intelligence in Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord Branch, and compare the OI scores with public University in this area. Furthermore, correlations between OI with gender, academic ranking and age of faculty members were also studied.

II. METHODOLOGY

A Persian translation of Albrecht's Questionnaire with questions according to Prejmerean, & Vasilache (2007) was used in this study. The Organizational Intelligence Profile, published by Karl Albrecht International, is an executive-level assessment questionnaire which enables executives and managers to assess their organization on each of these seven key dimensions of OI as mentioned above. Our study carried out in two public and private universities in Shahrekord, Iran, during 2012. Each university includes 7 faculties, 4000-5000 students and 220-250 faculty members. Sample size was determined based on the Cochran's formula, so 162 population sample from 470 subjects was selected. Ten percent extra questionnaire was considered to ensure receiving adequate number of forms. A questionnaire based on 49 statements Albrecht (2003) to assess and evaluate organizational intelligence dimensions were prepared and distributed among faculty members and asked them to complete it.

Five-point Likert-type scale was applied. The coring for each question was rated from 1 to 5 according to answers: completely disagree, disagree, no opinion, agree and completely agree, respectively. Seven questions in each seven dimensions were asked in the questionnaire. The minimum and maximum scores for each dimension were 7 and 35 respectively. Total average score for OI was a number between 49 and 245.

Demographic characteristics such as age, gender and academic rank were also recorded and the data were analyzed using the methods of statistical analysis by SPSS software version 15.

III. RESULTS

One hundred sixty eight questionnaires were received in perfect form. The results showed that, 45.2% and 54.8 % of faculty members participating in this research were working in Public and private universities respectively. Male and female staffs were 81.5% and 18.5 percent respectively. Academic ranks of faculty members participating in this study were: 23.8%, 63.1%, 11.3% and 1.8%, lecturer, assistant Professor, associate Professor and full Professor, respectively. Mean of

scores (\pm SE) for seven indicators of organizational intelligence in universities were shown in Table I.

TABLE I. Indicators Of Organizational Intelligence In Shahrekord Universities

Indicators	Scores			
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SE
strategic vision	7	33	23.4	4.9
shared fate	7	34	24.9	4
appetite for change	7	35	21.7	4.8
sprit	7	34	24.3	4.2
alignment	7	35	22.9	4.3
knowledge deployment	8	30	19.6	3.7
performance pressure	9	35	23.1	3.8
Total	68	147	111.6	13.4

As indicated in table I, minimum and maximum for OI scores, were 68 and 147, respectively, and in total for these seven dimensions was 111.6. The results of the organizational intelligence in both universities and comparison of them are given in Table II. According to the results in Table II, there is no significant difference between OI in private university with public university ($p \geq 0.05$).

TABLE II. Indicators of Organizational Intelligence In Shahrekord Universities

Indicators	Public University		Private University		t	p
	Mean	SE	Mea	SE		
strategic vision	23.7	4.2	23.1	5.5	0.68	0.49
shared fate	24.5	3.7	25.1	4.3	0.94	0.35
appetite for change	21.3	4.3	22	5.2	0.93	0.36
sprit	24.1	3.3	24.5	4.8	0.73	0.47
alignment	23.1	3.5	22.8	2.9	0.48	0.63
knowledge deployment	19.4	3.2	19.7	4	0.51	0.61
performance pressure	22.9	3.4	23.3	4.1	0.76	0.45

The correlation of mean score on the organizational intelligence indicators with gender are shown in table III. Statistical analysis of results showed that strategic vision, desire for change, and alignment had positive correlation with gender, and therefore, these indicators of organizational intelligence are higher in female than male staff.

TABLE III. Indicators Of Organizational Intelligence In Shahrekord Universities

Indicators	Male		Female		t	p
	Mean	SE	Mea	SE		
strategic vision	0.02	2.4	3.1	25.3	5.2	22.9
shared fate	0.40	0.85	3.7	25.4	4.1	24.7
appetite for change	0.04	2.1	4.2	23.3	4.9	21.3
sprit	0.28	1.1	4.3	25.1	4.2	24.2
alignment	0.03	2.2	4.1	24.4	4.3	22.6
knowledge deployment	0.13	1.5	4.1	20.5	3.6	19.4
performance pressure	0.16	1.4	4.1	24	3.7	22.9

Organizational intelligence scores according to academic rank of faculty members are shown in table IV. Higher score in one OI indicator, performance pressure, was seen in full Professors than others which followed by lecturers.

TABLE IV. Indicators of Organizational Intelligence In Shahrekord Universities

	Lecturer		Assistant Professor		Associate professor		Professor		F	p
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE		
1	23.6	5.4	23.2	4.6	23.5	5.7	23.7	8.3	0.06	0.98
2	24.9	4	24.5	4	26.2	3.3	26.3	7.1	1.03	0.38
3	22.7	4.3	21.1	4.8	22.3	5.8	24	4	1.37	0.25
4	25.6	4.5	23.7	4.1	25.3	3	27	6.6	2.35	0.07
5	23.5	4.9	22.5	4.2	23.5	3.6	24	5.2	0.7	0.57

	Lecturer		Assistant Professor		Associate professor		Professor		F	p
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE		
6	19.8	4.1	19.2	3.6	21.2	3.2	19.7	3.8	1.6	0.2
7	24.6	3.8	22.5	3.6	23.3	3.5	25.3	6.8	6.63	0.01*

* $p \leq 0.05$ *

The means of performance pressure in different academic rank of faculty members showed significant differences. There was no significant correlation among other indicators (table V).

TABLE V. Indicators of Organizational Intelligence In Shahrekord Universities

	Difference of mean	p
Lecturer/Assistant Professor	2.13	0.002

Based on analysis of results which is showed in table VI, correlation between organizational intelligence and age is not significant ($p \geq 0.05$). Thus, there is no significant relationship between organizational intelligence and age of faculty members.

TABLE VI. Correlation Coefficient Of Organizational Intelligence With Age Of Faculty Members

organizational intelligence			
	n	r	p
Age	152	0.014	0.86

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this study was to evaluate seven prominent indicators of university intelligence among faculty members of Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord Branch, and Public University of Shahrekord. Also we try to identify its relationship with age, gender and academic ranking. The results showed that all the components were higher than the median and the average of these seven areas were ranged among 19.6 - 24.8 (out of 35). Strategic vision and spirit had the highest levels among OI indicators and knowledge deployment was at the lowest (19.6).

This is the first report for comparing of OI scores in public and private universities in Iran. Our results are consent with results which published by Jamalzadeh et al. (2009). Jamalzadeh studied OI in faculty members of zone 1 of Islamic Azad University in Fars, Iran. Their results indicated that score of spirit was the highest (26.7) and knowledge deployment was at the lowest among OI indicators [5]. Besides the importance of OI in an enterprise, OI might be has direct or indirect effects on other capabilities of organization. In the study of Marjani and Arabi (2011), they were confirmed that there was a positive and significant relationship between organizational intelligence (and all its components) with knowledge management (and all its components) in the economic department of the central bank of the Iran [8]. The analytical model for determination of relationship between variables showed a highly correlation between OI and entrepreneurship [4]. Of course, both the internal and the external environment of a university are complicated and complex, but, in order to model the dynamic equilibrium needed between the two, we isolated one main force representative for each of the domains. The university can control its internal performance by R&D expenditure, while its external performance is controlled by marketing expenditure. The optimizing problem is, thus, reduced to determining the optimal ratio between the two, in order to assess the marketability of university research and to avoid the trap of knowledge for knowledge sake, which is not a solution, any longer, in the present economic context [9].

In today's highly-competitive, fast-paced business world, corporations, businesses and organizations in

both the public and private sectors are constantly searching for new cutting-edge methods and techniques for creating, storing, capturing, managing, organizing, distributing, combining, and retrieving knowledge [7]. Having data for OI status of a university can be very helpful, but the key questions facing every executive are: How can we raise the level of collective intelligence across our universities? How is it possible to reduce entropy and increase the level of syntropy? What are the specific strategies and actions for becoming collectively smarter? We need a plan to improve the OI in universities and we need to check it periodically.

REFERENCES

- [1] Albrecht, K. (2003). *The power of minds at work: Organizational intelligence in action*. Amacom/American Management Association
- [2] Albrecht, K. (2009). *Organizational intelligence & Knowledge Management: thinking outside the silos*.
- [3] Anonymus, (2009). Vice President international affairs, Islamic Azad University, available at: <http://www.intl.iau.ir/>
- [4] Bakhshian, A.; Hamidi, F. and Ezati, M. (2011). Relationship between organizational intelligence and entrepreneurship among university educational managers. *The Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science*, 3(4), 413 – 421
- [5] Jamalzadeh, M.; Gholami, I. and Saif, M.H. (2009). The relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational learning among faculty staff of the first regional universities of Islamic Azad Universities and provide a model for improving of organizational learning. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 2: 63- 86. (In Persian)
- [6] Jung, Y. (2009). *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 Public University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy In Environmental Design and Planning, Copyright 2009
- [7] Liebowitz, J. (1999). *Building organizational intelligence knowledge management primer*. CRC Press. Boca Paton London New York Washington. D.C.
- [8] Marjani, A.B. & Arabi, P. (2011). The role of organizational intelligence in organizational knowledge management (The case of the Central Bank of the Islamic Republic of Iran). *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 25 (3), 49-58
- [9] Prejmerean, M. & Vasilache, S. (2007). University's Organizational Intelligence. Standards, Strategies and Debouches, *Journal Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Negotia*, 2, 23-36.