

# **To Assess the Rate for Affecting the Structural Dimensions of Governmental Organizations on their Agility (Case Study: Isfahan Province Jihad Agriculture Organization)**

**Fatemeh Rashidi**

Department of Industrial Engineering, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

E-mail: [Fatemeh\\_rashidi\\_90@ymail.com](mailto:Fatemeh_rashidi_90@ymail.com), (Corresponding author)

**Ali Rashidpoor**

Department of Management, Isfahan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Email: [rashidpoorali@yahoo.com](mailto:rashidpoorali@yahoo.com)

**Mahdi Alinaghian**

Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran

Email: [alinaghian@cc.iut.ir](mailto:alinaghian@cc.iut.ir)

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i4/781 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i4/781>

## **Abstract**

This research has been performed in the direction of making agile the governmental organizations at Isfahan Province Jihad Agriculture Organization. In this research the structural dimensions were eight dimensions (formalization, specialization, standardization, hierarchy of authorities, complexity, centralization, professionalism, personnel rations). In order to assess the variables for testing the research hypotheses, a standard questionnaire was built in the dimension of the organizational structure and researcher- made agility questionnaire that their  $\alpha$  coefficient was calculated respectively 0.81 and 0.79 and its content validity was approved from the viewpoint of the professors. The results were analyzed statistically using SPSS Software and the tests of KS, regression, independent t, ANOVA, and Toki Test. The research results indicated that the organization's structural dimensions with the coefficient of 65 % had effect on the organization's agility and the formalization dimension has the most effect on the agility. Then the effects of the structural dimensions on each one of the agility elements (organizational change, leadership, electronic government, service to customer, culture and values and performance management) were studied and prioritized. Also significant difference was observed between the employees with various educations and work record concerning the rate of effect for the structural dimensions on the organization's agility.

**Keywords:** Structural organization, Structural dimensions of the organization, Organization agility

### **1- Introduction:**

With the advent of new era for the business that change is as one of its major features, success and survival of the organizations has also become more difficult and the past systems and approaches are no longer able to guarantee the organizations' success. Major changes in the communications channels, opening geographic and organizational borders, technologic innovations have made the organizations survival dependent on the major review of the priorities and their strategic perspective. In one word we can say that the past strategies and solutions have lost their capability and ability for confrontation with the modern environmental and organizational challenges or it is better that they to be replaced with new viewpoints. In order to confront and respond to the organizational changes, the present world is experiencing a new paradigm called agility (Zhang, 2011). It seems that agility subject is not something that can be considered only for the private section. Applying agility in governmental section can be an appropriate area for the growth and fostering of this section.

Of course some people believe that with regard to the non-existence of competition and haste in the governmental section, and in one word non-existence of dynamicity in its performance and working environment, actually expressing agility in this section is meaningless and irrelevant. But it shall be considered that the governmental section needs agility more than the private section due to abundance of the clients, more requirement for removing their demands and problems, its excellence in the fields of speed and quality and the most important thing that is reducing cost, and since the purpose in the governmental section is achieving simultaneously to high productivity and flexibility, the agility can cause to rise productivity in the governmental section. In this direction an organization that is designed in an agile form requires to a unique organizational structure which causes the organization act with more efficiency in performing its procedures. Constituting an appropriate structure can cause to obtain the privileges due to agility from concentration on the employees and innovation and creativity resulted from their effective cooperation and consequently it ables the organization to have some specifications such as flexibility, high speed in confrontation with the environment changes, responsiveness and appropriate reaction against foreseeable and unforeseeable changes( Farzaneh, Sohrabi & Raeesi, 2011).

Thus determining the organizational structure of the process is determining the relations, individuals' responsibility, responsiveness and power and it specifies the manner for configuration of works and activities for effective use of the organizational sources which are required for achieving to the organizational goals and for this reason it is very important (Willem, 2009). From management viewpoint, designing the organization's structure emphasizes somehow on removing the repetitive works, grouping similar works and utilization from saving the scale and domain, aligning the strategies and organization's abilities and in this way not only causes to increase the efficiency resulting from coordination in the organization, but it has effect on the development of the capabilities in the organizational units as well (Ambos, Schlegelmilch & Branner, 2009). For this purpose, organizational structure can be studied from various aspects such as formalization, centralization, decision making, specialization, standardization, non-absolutism, complexity, hierarchical levels, control degree,

coordination and organizational size (Isern & Moreno, 2011). The studies for the subject literatures of the organizational structure area indicate that the traditional structures with some specifications such as concentration, severe work division, non- flexibility against environmental changes, close control and their mechanical form take each type of mobility and dynamicity from the employees and act weakly in helping the organization for development and effective confrontation with the challenges and new demands (Ramezan, 2011).

But a dynamic structure with some features such as customer-oriented, non-concentration in decision making, power division, high flexibility and inclination toward self-controlling, low formalization, minimum hierarchy, appropriate application of information technology, removing the borders between the units, existence of suitable site for group work, management trust to the employees and delegation of authority to the organization's employees provide a stronger field for performing the organization processes and has more effect on increasing the organization agility (Naseri, 2009).

In most of the previous researches only the effect for the three dimensions of concentration, complexity and formalization on various variables were evaluated, but in this research eight dimensions of formalization, complexity, standardization, centralization, hierarchy of authorities, professionalism, specialization, and personnel ratios have been researched. For example, Vaezi and Sabzikaran(2010), Nafari and Omidfar (2010) found the inverse relation of the organizational structure (three dimensions of centralization, complexity, and formalization) with psychological rehabilitation ; Valas and Storm (2003) also in their research introduced the organizational structure as one of the effective factors on rehabilitation. Wilim & colleagues (2007) in a research concluded that the component of centralization has negative effect and the component of complexity has positive effect on the nurses' occupation satisfaction. Petrusa et al (2010) in a research concluded that complexity and organizational centralization respectively have positive and negative effect on the knowledge performance; But formalization and execution of knowledge have no confirmed positive relation. Also Rajaeipour & colleagues (2010) in a research concluded that there is a direct relation between organizational structure and organizational alienation, particularly organizational alienation. Thus with regard to the privileges of existing agility and restrictions for the loss of agility in organization, considering the establishment of a supporting organizational structure for facilitating organization agility is required. Each structure is not appropriate for creating agility in organization; a structure is suitable that provides a fertile site for the agility creating variables.

## **2-Research literature**

Organization is a social institution that is based on the purpose; Its structure has been designed consciously and it has active and coordinate systems and is in relation with the outside environment. The base for constituting organizations is relation of the individuals with each other. When the individuals interact for performing essential duties in the direction of procuring the aims, then an organization is established. From other side, the managers establish organizational structure in a knowledge-based and well-formed manner. Dynamicity is a feature for organizations. In case that the organization does not create an interaction with the constituting elements of the outside environment (clients, suppliers, competitive companies,...), its existence will be endangered; so when an organization is put against the changes in the outside environment, the organization borders shall be more flexible (Daft,


2006). The organizational structure is important because it causes to increase the effectiveness of organizational controls on the essential activities for achieving to the purposes. The main purpose of the organizational structure is controlling the coordination procedures for the individuals' activities and controlling the individuals' motivator tools for achieving to the organizational purposes. An appropriate structure for each organization is a structure that facilitates the process for effective responding to the coordination problems and motivating the employees (Jonse, 2007). Perhaps we can consider the organizational structure as the most essential section of the organization after purposes. The extensiveness of the definitions area and the structure effect also emphasize on its importance as well; especially this case that each type of organizational changes is in relation with the dimensions of the organization structure (Vaezi & Sabzikaran, 2010). One of the newest organizational viewpoints is the viewpoint of Richard L. Daft. This theory on the basis of systemic viewpoint believes that the organization moves within the route of incessant and dynamic activities. In order to recognize the organization very well and understand the manner of its action, we shall study some of its dimensions exactly. These dimensions describe the organization in a manner that its character and specifications are recognizable for us. The organizational dimensions have two major groups that include structural dimensions and contextual dimensions.

The structural dimensions express internal specifications of the organization and through them we can recognize the organizations exactly, compare them together and plan for them in various fields (Akhavan, 2002). From Daft's viewpoint, the structural dimensions consist of eight following dimensions:

Formalization, which is called to the rate for ruling of the deeds and documents that exist in the organization (Bucaria, 2006). Formalization has two sections: The first section refers to the rate of written laws and bylaws in the organization and the second section refers to the degree that these laws and regulations are observed and executed (March & Simon, 2009). Specialization means this that to what extent the organization has divided its works and activities to separate and specialized duties. Standardization is said to the cases that many similar works are performed by a similar method and in a unique form. The purpose for hierarchy of authorities is specifying this matter that each individual shall submit his/her work record to whom; also controlling area is determined for each manager. Complexity is the number of works or subsidiary systems that are performed within an organization or exist in it (Daft, 2006). Centralization is the rate that decision making has been centralized in a unique point at an organization (Rabinze, 2008) and in other words it is gathering power in the organization (Hall, 2004). Professionalism is mentioned for the level of educational and formal educations of the employees. Personnel ratios express applying the individuals who are employed by the organization for various duties and different circles (Daft, 2006) that in this research the basis of the structural dimensions is these eight dimensions.

Now this question arises that how a governmental organization becomes more agile? In this case, various priorities have been presented by the policy maker section of the organizations and some of them are considered by the agents and actors as well. The results indicate that most of the agile governmental organizations have considered six dimensions of agility. London Social Sciences Studies Institution has presented the model for agility various dimensions more comprehensive than the other existing models for the governmental organizations which consist of: organizational change, leadership, culture and values, service to client, information

technology (electronic government) and finally performance management (Jafarnezhad & Shahee, 2010) that in this research these six dimensions have been used for evaluating organization agility.



### 3-Conceptual Model for the Research




Figure 2. Conceptual Model for the Research

### 4-Materials and Research Method

The present research is applied concerning purpose and regarding the method of collecting data it is descriptive-measurement correlation type. Statistical population of this research consisted of all the employees in Isfahan Province Agriculture Jihad Organization ( 400 individuals). The sample number obtained 194 individuals using the formula of Karjesi and Morgan. The sampling method was performed in a coincidental form from the whole employees in Isfahan Province Agriculture Jihad Organization.

In order to assess the variables for testing the research hypotheses, a standard questionnaire in the dimension of organizational structure and a researcher-made agility questionnaire were used. For the questionnaire contextual validity, while observing the principles of regulating the questionnaire, it was put at the disposal of several experts in the management field after drawing up and after performing some amendments it was confirmed by them and its reliability using Chronbakh  $\alpha$  coefficient for some questions that evaluate each one of the organization's structural dimensions have been brought in Table 4. It is prevalent that Chronbakh  $\alpha$  coefficient is acceptable higher than 70 % and the questionnaire is regarded reliable. Therefore the used

questionnaire in this research has been considered reliable. The results were analyzed statistically using SPSS Software and using KS Tests, regression, variance analysis and Toki Test.

*Table 1. Chronbakh  $\alpha$  of the questions for the question that study each variable in the research*

Factors	Questions	Chronbakh $\alpha$
<b>Agility</b>	1–21	./79
<b>Formalization</b>	22–26	./80
<b>Complexity</b>	27–31	./81
<b>Centralization</b>	32–35	./83
<b>Specialization</b>	36–38	./85
<b>Standardization</b>	39–41	./76
<b>Hierarchy</b>	42–44	./84
<b>Personnel rations</b>	28 & 30	./77
<b>Professionalism</b>	45 & 38	./80
<b>Structural dimensions</b>	22–45	0/81
<b>Total</b>		./81

## **5-Applied study and findings**

### **5-1-Data Distribution Normality Test**

In order to study the mentioned claim regarding distribution of the data for one qualitative variable the KS Test is used. In this test, the zero hypothesis is the mentioned claim regarding the type of data distribution. In the present research, normality for the data distribution is studied using KS Test. As it has been specified in Table 1, the results of this test indicate that all the factors in the sample under study follow normal distribution because significance level is more than 5%. Thus for testing the hypotheses we can use parametric statistical tests.



Data distribution is normal: H0  
 Data distribution is not normal: H1

Table 2 . Kolmogrof-Smearnof Test

Factor/Variable	Average	Standard Deviation	Significance level
Agility	3.2809	0.97929	./08
Formalization	3.4480	0.89253	./32
Complexity	3.4947	0.84030	./23
Centralization	3.3694	0.87115	./12
Specialization	3.4648	0.88296	./09
Standardization	3.4771	0.84590	./21
Hierarchy	3.4691	0.83319	./45
Personnel ration	3.4493	0.88624	./06
Professionalism	3.4253	0.93052	./058

**Main hypothesis:** Structural dimensions have effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 3. Regression Test Related to the main hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std.Error	Beta	B	
Constant	0.372	0.235		1.582	0.115
Structural dimensions	0.854	0.066	0.658	12.686	.000



Table 4 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Structural dimensions on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Structural dimensions Agility	Structural dimensions dimensions	Agility
Structural dimensions	.65	Organizational change	./38
		Electronic government	./19
		Service to client	./26
		Performance management	./26
		Culture & Values	./49
		Leadership	./24

**First hypothesis:** Centralization has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 5. Regression Test Related to the first hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
Constant	1.271	0.239		312.5	.000
Centralization	0.597	0.069	-0.531	8.676	.000

Table 6 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Centralization on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Centralization → Agility	Centralization dimensions	Agility
Centralization	-./53	Organizational change	-./02
		Electronic government	-./73
		Service to client	./04
		Performance management	-./012
		Culture & Values	-./51
		Leadership	-./33

**Second hypothesis:** Formalization has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 7. Regression Test Related to the second hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std.Error	Beta	B	
Constant	0.662	0.204		3.245	0.001
Formalization	-0.760	0.057	-0.692	13.291	.000

Table 8 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Formalization on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Formalization → Agility	Formalization → Agility dimensions	
Formalization	-./69	Organizational change	-./32
		Electronic government	-./60
		Service to client	./002
		Performance management	-./52
		Culture & Values	./04
		Leadership	./01

**Third hypothesis:** Specialization has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 9. Regression Test Related to the third hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std.Error	Beta	B	
Constant	0.845	0.221		3.819	.000
Specialization	0.703	0.062	0.634	11.355	.000

Table 10 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Specialization on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Specialization → Agility	Specialization → Agility dimensions	
Specialization	.63	Organizational change	.86
		Electronic government	.53
		Service to client	.53
		Performance management	.02
		Culture & Values	.05
		Leadership	.23

**Forth hypothesis:** Hierarchy has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 11. Regression Test Related to the forth hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
Constant	0.820	0.241		3.398	0.001
Hierarchy	-0.409	0.068	-0.404	10.491	.000

Table 12 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Hierarchy on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Hierarchy → Agility	Hierarchy → Agility dimensions	
Hierarchy	-./40	Organizational change	-.84
		Electronic government	-.06
		Service to client	-.49
		Performance management	-.54
		Culture & Values	.03
		Leadership	.001

**Fifth hypothesis:** Standardization has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 13. Regression Test Related to the fifth hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
Constant	0.749	0.232		3.223	0.001
Standardization	0.728	0.065	0.629	11.210	.000

Table 14 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Standardization on agility

Effect	Direct effect		Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Standardization	Agility	Standardization	Agility dimensions
Standardization	.62		Organizational change	./29
			Electronic government	-./05
			Service to client	./71
			Performance management	./57
			Culture & Values	./03
			Leadership	./01

**Sixth hypothesis:** Complexity has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 15. Regression Test Related to the sixth hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	
Constant	0.668	0.232		2.881	0.004
Complexity	-0.548	0.065	-0.542	11.589	.000

Table 16 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Complexity on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Complexity → Agility	Complexity → Agility dimensions	
Complexity	-./54	Organizational change	-./39
		Electronic government	-./04
		Service to client	-./61
		Performance management	./07
		Culture & Values	-./33
		Leadership	./03

**Seventh hypothesis:** Professionalism has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Table 17. Regression Test Related to the seventh hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std.Error	Beta	B	
Constant	1.182	0.219		5.393	.000
Professionalism	0.613	0.062	0.582	9.927	.000

Table 18 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Professionalism on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
Independent Factor	Professionalism → Agility	Professionalism → Agility dimensions	
Professionalism	./58	Organizational change	./16
		Electronic government	./46
		Service to client	./60
		Performance management	./19
		Culture & Values	./25
		Leadership	./18

**Eighth hypothesis:** Personnel ration has effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization

Table 19. Regression Test Related to the eighth hypothesis

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Significance level
	B	Std.Error	Beta	B	
Constant	1.214	0.239		5.090	.000
Personnel ration	0.499	0.067	0.442	8.940	.000

Table 20 . Separation of direct and indirect effects of Personnel ration on agility

Effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect
<b>Independent Factor</b>	Personnel ration → <b>Agility</b>	Personnel ration → <b>Agility dimensions</b>
Personnel ration	. / 44	<b>Organizational change</b> . / 12
		<b>Electronic government</b> . / 13
		<b>Service to client</b> . / 49
		<b>Performance management</b> . / 48
		<b>Culture &amp; Values</b> . / 21
		<b>Leadership</b> . / 19

For analyzing demographic variables, the direct t Test (for sexuality variable) and ANOVA Test (for variables of educational degree and work record) have been used.

**5-2- Sexuality**

*Table 21. direct t Test, comparison of average for the marks of women and men concerning the rate for effect of the structural dimensions on organizational agility*

Factors	sexuality	Mean	SD	Levine test (Equality of variances)		Assumption	df	t	P
Formalization	Woman	2/68	/7600	F	P	Equality of variances	158	1/660	/0990
	Man	2/37	/6270	/3220	/5710	Unequal variances	/48313	1/411	/1810
Centralization	Woman	2/57	/9250	F	P	Equality of variances	164	1/199	/2320
	Man	2/29	/7870	/3120	/5770	Unequal variances	/51613	1/045	/3140
Complexity	Woman	2/46	/9590	F	P	Equality of variances	153	0/321	/7490
	Man	2/39	/7680	/4520	/5030	Unequal variances	/70114	0/267	/7930
Specialization	Woman	3/65	/7310	F	P	Equality of variances	164	0/076-	/9400
	Man	3/67	/7450	/0540	/8170	Unequal variances	/59715	0/077-	/9400
Standardization	Woman	4/09	/5220	F	P	Equality of variances	166	0/218	/8280
	Man	4/05	/6850	/3126	/0130	Unequal variances	/68415	0/273	/7880
Hierarchy	Woman	2/57	/6060	F	P	Equality of variances	150	1/543	/1250
	Man	2/33	/5290	/0091	/3170	Unequal variances	/07215	1/378	/1880
Professionalism	Woman	4/02	/5430	F	P	Equality of variances	164	0/316-	/7520
	Man	4/07	/5800	/1530	/6960	Unequal variances	/43014	0/334-	/7430
Personnel ration	Woman	3/67	/8130	F	P	Equality of variances	165	0/133-	/8950
	Man	3/70	/8270	/0990	/7530	Unequal variances	/56415	0/134-	/8950



**5-3- Degree of Education**

*Table 22. direct t Test, comparison of average for the marks of the individuals with various educations concerning the rate for effect of the structural dimensions on organizational agility*

Factors		df	Mean Square	Sum of squares	P
<b>Formalization</b>	Between Groups	3	0/959	2/877	0/071
	Within Groups	156	0/402	62/667	
<b>Centralization</b>	Between Groups	3	1/302	3/906	0/105
	Within Groups	162	0/626	101/438	
<b>Complexity</b>	Between Groups	3	0/751	2/253	0/302
	Within Groups	151	0/612	92/364	
<b>Specialization</b>	Between Groups	3	3/511	10/532	0/000
	Within Groups	162	0/497	80/460	
<b>Standardization</b>	Between Groups	3	0/181	0/543	0/756
	Within Groups	164	0/457	75/015	
<b>Hierarchy</b>	Between Groups	3	0/466	1/397	0/186
	Within Groups	148	0/287	42/419	
<b>Professionalism</b>	Between Groups	3	1/391	4/172	0/005
	Within Groups	162	0/313	5/704	
<b>Personnel ration</b>	Between Groups	3	1/863	5/588	0/040
	Within Groups	163	0/657	108/104	

*Table 23. Toki Test for the comparison of average marks of the individuals with various educations concerning the rate for effect of the structural dimensions on organizational agility*

dimension	I	J	Mean Difference I-J	std. Error	Sig.
<b>Specialization</b>	Diploma	Masters	-0/517	0/195	<b>0/044</b>
<b>Specialization</b>	Resource	Bachelor	-0/579	0/155	<b>0/002</b>
<b>Specialization</b>	Resource	Masters	-0/707	0/181	<b>0/001</b>
<b>Professionalism</b>	Diploma	Masters	-0/487	0/155	<b>0/011</b>
<b>Professionalism</b>	Bachelor	Masters	-0/323	0/112	<b>0/023</b>
<b>Personnel ration</b>	Resource	Masters	-0/596	0/208	<b>0/025</b>

**5-4- Work Record**

*Table 24. Variance Analysis Test, comparison of average for the marks of the individuals with various work records concerning the rate for effect of the structural dimensions on organizational agility*

Factors		Sum of squares	Mean Square	df	P
<b>Formalization</b>	Between Groups	0/593	0/148	4	0/841
	Within Groups	64/952	0/419	155	
<b>Centralization</b>	Between Groups	1/175	0/294	4	0/769
	Within Groups	104/170	0/647	161	
<b>Complexity</b>	Between Groups	2/593	0/648	4	0/380
	Within Groups	92/023	0/613	150	
<b>Specialization</b>	Between Groups	5/465	1/366	4	0/040
	Within Groups	85/527	0/531	161	
<b>Standardization</b>	Between Groups	8/232	2/058	4	0/001
	Within Groups	67/326	0/413	163	
<b>Hierarchy</b>	Between Groups	0/857	0/214	4	0/571

	Within Groups	42/959	0/292	147	
<b>Professionalism</b>	Between Groups	2/269	0/567	4	0/144
	Within Groups	52/606	0/327	161	
<b>Personnel ration</b>	Between Groups	8/770	2/193	4	0/010
	Within Groups	103/922	0/641	162	

Table 25. Toki Test for comparison of average for the marks of the individuals with various work records concerning the rate for effect of the structural dimensions on organizational agility

dimensions	I	J	Mean Difference I-J	std. Error	Sig.
<b>Specialization</b>	<b>Less than 5 years</b>	<b>5-10 years</b>	<b>0/443</b>	<b>0/146</b>	<b>0/024</b>
<b>Standardization</b>	<b>Less than 5 years</b>	<b>15-20 years</b>	<b>-0/597</b>	<b>0/183</b>	<b>0/012</b>
<b>Standardization</b>	<b>5-10 years</b>	<b>15-20 years</b>	<b>-0/693</b>	<b>0/172</b>	<b>0/001</b>
<b>Standardization</b>	<b>20 years and over</b>	<b>15-20 years</b>	<b>-0/805</b>	<b>0/239</b>	<b>0/008</b>
<b>Personnel ration</b>	<b>5-10 years</b>	<b>10-15 years</b>	<b>-0/527</b>	<b>0/169</b>	<b>0/019</b>

### 6-Discussion

The obtained results from test of the main hypothesis indicated that from viewpoint of employees in Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization, the structural dimensions of the organization have effect on the organization agility with 65 % coefficient, it means that one unit of change in the organization structural dimensions causes to create 0.65 change in the agility for Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization. Also structural dimensions of the organization have effect on all the agility components. It has the most effect with 0.49 coefficient on the component of culture and values.

The obtained results from the test of the first hypothesis indicated that from viewpoint of employees in Isfahan Province Jihad Agriculture Organization, centralization dimension has effect on the organization agility with 0.53 coefficient, it means one unit of change in the centralization variable causes -0.53 change in the agility. In another word, non cooperation of team and direct supervision of the higher management in gathering and interpretation of the

data with no cooperation of the employees has negative effect on the agility of Jihad Agriculture Organization and causes to reduce its agility.

Also centralization has no tangible effect on the agility components (organizational change, management of performance and service to client), but it has negative effect on components of culture and values, technology and leadership. In another word, non- centralization in the organization causes that the senior management of the organization interact with other sections of the organization for considerable time. Also it creates confidence and reliance between the employees and leaders and culturalization is regarded as public role in the organization.

The obtained results from the second hypothesis test indicated that from viewpoint of Jihad Agriculture Organization's employees, formalization dimension with -0.69 coefficient has effect on the organization agility, it means one unit of change in the formalization variable creates - 0.69 change in agility. In other words, increasing the written laws and regulations, existence of formal communications between the organization members and also non-existence of authority to the employees has negative effect on agility of Isfahan Province Jihad Agriculture Organization and causes to reduce its agility that among the eight dimensions of the present research, formalization dimension has the most effect (negative effect) on agility of Isfahan Province Jihad Agriculture Organization.

Also formalization had no tangible effect on the agility components (service to client and culture and values) but it had effect on the components of performance management, electronic government, leadership and organizational change that it had the most effect with - 0.60 coefficient on electronic government (technology).

The obtained results from the third hypothesis test indicated that from viewpoint of Jihad Agriculture Organization's employees, professionalism dimension with 0.63 coefficient has effect on the organization agility. In other words, abundance of performed activities by the employees, variety of expertise, professional activities and increasing the level for the employees' professional skill have positive effect on organization agility. And they cause to increase agility in this organization.

Also professionalism had no tangible effect on agility components ( performance management and culture and values), but it had effect on the components of organizational change, electronic government, leadership and service to client that it had the most effect with 0.86 coefficient on the component of organizational change; it means that the more the level of employees' expert and skill increases, the more rapidly the organization can react to the environmental changes.

The obtained results from the fourth hypothesis test indicated that from viewpoint of Jihad Agriculture Organization's employees, authorities hierarchy dimension with -0.40 coefficient has effect on the organization agility, it means one unit of change in the hierarchy variable creates -0.40 change in organization's agility. In other words, non distribution of decision making in the organization's levels, non-existing of rapid communications and particularly increasing the organization's layers have negative effect on the Jihad Agriculture Organization's agility and cause to reduce its agility.

Also authorities hierarchy had no tangible effect on the agility components of technology, culture, values and leadership, but it had reverse effect on components of organizational change, performance management and service to client that it had the most effect with -0.84

coefficient on the component of organizational change; this means that the more mutual and extensive relations exist between the employees, the more rapid it can be responsive against environmental changes.

The obtained results from the fifth hypothesis test indicated that from viewpoint of Jihad Agriculture Organization's employees, standardization dimension with -0.62 coefficient has effect on the organization agility, it means one unit of change in the standardization variable creates -0.62 change in organization's agility. In other words, existence of methodology and also the degree for exactness in work performance have positive effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization and cause to increase agility in the organization.

Also standardization had no tangible effect on the components of electronic government, culture, values and leadership, but it had effect on components of organizational change, performance management and service to client that it had the most effect with -0.71 coefficient on the component of service to client.

The obtained results from the sixth hypothesis test indicated that from viewpoint of Jihad Agriculture Organization's employees, complexity dimension with -0.54 coefficient has effect on the organization agility, it means one unit of change in the complexity variable creates - 0.54 change in agility. In other words, existence of abundant number of job titles, non-equilibrium and alignment in purposes and strategies and non- coordination between leveled units have negative effect on the agility of Jihad Agriculture Organization and reduce the agility of this organization.

Also complexity had no tangible effect on the agility components of performance management, technology and leadership, but it had effect on components of organizational change, culture and values as well as service to client that it had the most effect with -0.61 coefficient on the component of service to client. It means that non-equilibrium and alignment in the organization's purposes and strategies cause that service to client does not be in the direction of business processes.

The obtained results from the seventh hypothesis test indicated that from viewpoint of Jihad Agriculture Organization's employees, professionalism dimension with -0.58 coefficient has effect on the organization agility, it means one unit of change in the professionalism variable creates - 0.58 change in organization's agility. In other words, existence of multi-skill employees has positive effect on organization's agility and increases organization's agility.

Also professionalism has effect on all the components of agility in the present research model that it has the most effect with 0.60 coefficient on service to client. It means that existence of multi-skill employees causes that the organization act for the client service more successfully. For example, in case of absence of one of the employees another person in the organization can give service to the client in his absence.

The obtained results from the eighth hypothesis test indicated that from viewpoint of Jihad Agriculture Organization's employees, personnel ratios dimension with -0.44 coefficient has effect on the organization's agility, it means one unit of change in the professionalism variable creates - 0.44 change in organization's agility. In other words, equilibrium of ratio for managerial and administrative ranks in the organization have positive effect on the agility of Isfahan Jihad Agriculture Organization and increase is agility.

Also personnel ratios had no tangible effect on the agility components of organizational change and electronic government but they had effect on components of performance management,

culture and values, leadership and service to client that the component of service to the client had the most effect with 0.49 coefficient.

And finally on the basis of the findings resulted from sexuality test, no significant difference was observed between man and woman employees in Isfahan Province Jihad Agriculture Organization between man and woman employees.

In relation with the education degree after performing the test, it was observed that there is no significant difference between the individuals with various educations regarding the dimensions of formalization, centralization, hierarchy, complexity, and standardization in Jihad Agriculture Organization.

But in the specialization dimension, professionalization degree and personnel ratios no significant difference was observed. It seems that the employees with higher education believe more on the effect for dimensions of specialization and professionalization degree and also personnel ratios on the organization agility.

No significant difference was observed between the individuals with various work records in the dimensions of formalization, centralization, hierarchical levels, professionalization degree and complexity. But significant difference was observed between the individuals with various work records in the dimensions of specialization, standardization and personnel ratios regarding the rate of effect on the organization agility. It seems that the employees with lower work record believe more on the effect of education and specialization dimensions on their work, and the employees with medium and high work records believe more on the effect of existing job standards as well as personnel suitable ratios on organization agility.

## **7-Research Results**

Since the environmental changes have effect on many of the aspects in the organization, so the organizations shall adjust with the environmental changes using appropriate strategies dynamically in order to survive themselves. One of the best methods for confrontation with the environmental changes is conducting the organization towards agility. An organization that has been designed in an agile form has a unique organizational structure that causes the organization act with more effectiveness while performing its procedures. On this basis one of the ways for the organizations' agility is appropriate formation of organizational structure. Thus, the purpose of this research was determining the effect for structural dimensions of governmental organizations on their agility in Isfahan Province Agricultural Jihad Organization. Structural dimensions of the organization in this research were considered eight dimensions of formalization, specialization, standardization, hierarchy of authorities,

Complexity, centralization, professionalization, personnel ratios. Also for measuring the agility, the agility dimensions of TiKorni Model (2003) were uses that include six dimensions of organizational change, leadership, culture & values, performance management, service to customer and electronic government. The obtained results indicated that each eight referred structural dimensions in this research have effect on the agility of Agricultural Jihad Organization. Among them, the dimensions of formalization, complexity, hierarchy of authorities and centralization had negative effect on the agility of organization and the dimensions of specialization, professionalization, standardization, and personnel ratios have positive effect on the organization agility. Also the dimension of formalization with -0.69 coefficient has the most effect and the dimension of hierarchy of authorities with -0.40

coefficient has the least effect on the agility of Isfahan Province Agricultural Jihad Organization. In relation with educational degree in the dimensions of specialization, professionalization degree and personnel ratios no significant difference was observed. But in the dimensions of specialization, standardization, and personnel ratios significant difference was observed between individuals with various work records regarding the rate of effect on the organization's agility.

With regard to the research results and positive effect for structural dimensions of specialization, standardization, professionalization degree and personnel ratios on the organization's agility following suggestions are made to the managers of Isfahan Province Agricultural Jihad Organization for increasing its agility :

In selection of labor force for the administrative units, some individuals with higher education level shall be employed.

Specialized training courses shall be hold for the employees in the organization in order to rise the level of individuals' knowledge for the work duties.

To encourage learning between the organization's employees such that the employees shall have access to a rich and valuable set of information. To equip the organization to the libraries and data bases can put the source of this data at the disposal of the employees.

To make effort for standardization of some affairs that still no specified method exist for it in the organization.

The number of the individuals that the organization employs shall be in proportion with the need of the various sections and units in the organization. Also with regard to the dimensions of formalization, centralization, complexity, and hierarchy of authorities that have negative effect on the organization's agility, following suggestions are made:

It is better that through applying specialist and trained man power, to exert less control on their work and reduce the formalization rate through this way.

To reduce the number of job titles through insertion of the activities and work performance method, creation of balance and co-direction in the purposes and strategies.

It is better that many decisions to be performed in this organization in an un- concentrated form in a manner that low rank managers enjoy more partial independence for administering the section and units under their control.

To reduce the levels of the organization through reducing the number of the supervision levels for increasing the cooperation and horizontal communications, distributing the data appropriately inside the groups and organizations that creates extensive and mutual communications among the organization's individuals.

## **References**

Akhavan, A. (2002). *Organized and practical approach to the design of organizational structure*. Master's thesis. Naragh University. (in Persian)

Ambos, T. C.; Schlegelmilch, B. B.; Ambos, B., & Brenner, B. (2009). Evolution of organisational structure and capabilities in internationalising Banks;The CEE Operations of UniCredit's Vienna Office, *Long Range Planning*, 42(5), 633-653.



Bucaria, F.S. (2006). *Offseting the negative effect of organizational structure on social relations: structure, social exchange, and justice*. Ph.D.thesis. Doctor of philosophy degree in Business Administration. Touro University International.

Daft, R.L. (2006). *Foundations of organization theory and design* (Translated by A. M. Parsaeian and Arabs), (3rd Ed). Tehran: Office of Cultural Research.

Daft, R.L. (2007). *Organization theory and design*, (9th Ed), South Western Cengage Learning Ltd. USA.

Farzaneh, M.; Sohrabi, B., & Raeesi, I. (2011). The role of organizational structure to facilitate agility in software-producing organizations, *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1(3), 142-136.

Gong, Y., & Janssen, M. (2012). From Policy Implementation to Business Process Management: principles for creating flexibility and agility, *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(1), 61-71.

Hall, R. (2004). *Organization structure, process and outcomes*, (Translated by A. M. Parsaeian and Arabs), (3rd Ed), Tehran: Bureau of Cultural Research, 86-59.

Isern, D.; Sánchez, D., & Moreno, A. (2011). Organizational structures supported by agent-oriented methodologies; *The Journal of Systems and Software*, 84(2), 169-184.

Jafarnejad, A., & Shahaee, B. (2010). *Introduction to agility and agile manufacturing*, (2nd Ed), Tehran: Nshrmhrban.

Jones, G.R. (2007). *Organizational theory design and change*, (5th Ed), New Jersey. USA: Pearson Prentice Hall Ltd.

Nafari, N., & Omidfar, M. (2010). Evaluation of the effect of organizational structure on employee empowerment, *Journal of Management Development*, 13(73), 46-32.

Nasseri, M.; Namdarzngnh, SA., & Bagheri Nejad, J. (2009). Role of organizational structure, organizational culture, and the combined resources of the effectiveness of technology transfer in the Iranian firms producing electrical equipment, *Journal of Research in Iran*, 13(5), 86-67.

March, J., & Simon, H. (2009). *Organizations*, MA, Blackwell Cambridge, 195-324.

Petrusa, E.M.; Zaragoza, P., & Claver, E. (2010). Can formalization complexity and centralization influence knowledge performance, *Journal of business research*, 63 (3), 310-325.

Rajaeepour, S.; Mohammadisadr, M., & Arabisarjou, A. (2012). Relationship between organization structure and organizational Alienation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(12), 188-196.

Ramezan, M. (2011). Intellectual capital and organizational organic structure in knowledge society: How are these concepts related?, *International Journal of Information Management*, 31(1), 88-95.

Robbins, S. (2008). *Theory of organization structure and organizational design*. (Translated by M. Alwani and H. Danaee fard). (24th Ed). Tehran: Safar – Ashrafi publisher.

Vaezi, R., & Sabzikaran, E. (2010). Relationship between organizational structure and employee empowerment at the National Iranian Oil Products Distribution - Tehran region. *Journal of Management Development*, 178-153.

Wallace, M., & Storm, J. (2003). Organizational change in a regional local council, *Australian Journal of Business & Social inquiry*, 1(2), 51-60.

Willem, A.; Buelens, M., & Jonghe, I.D. (2006). Impact of organizational structure on nurses job satisfaction: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of nursing studies*, 44(2), 85-92.

Willem, A.; & Buelens, M. (2009). Knowledge sharing in interunit cooperative episodes: The impact of organizational structure dimension. *International Journal of information management*, 29(2), 151-160.

Zhang, DZ. (2011). Towards theory building in agile manufacturing strategies-Case studies of an agility taxonomy. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 131(3), 303-312.