

## The Impact of Organizational Agility on Empowerment of Employees of Executive Systems of Zahedan City

\*<sup>1</sup>Marziyeh Saedizadeh, <sup>2</sup>Abdulrahman Naroue

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Psychology & Educative Sciences, Zahedan Branch Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran. <sup>2</sup>Department of Accounting, International Chabahar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Chabahar, Iran.

Received: 19<sup>th</sup> May 2017, Accepted: 26<sup>th</sup> July 2017, Published: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2017

### Abstract

The present study attempts to evaluate the impact of organizational agility on empowerment of employees of executive systems of Zahedan city. After extension of conceptual space of topic and a theoretical and empirical review of study, the study hypotheses are formulated. By survey method and a questionnaires of organizational agility of Sharifi and Zhang (1999) and employees empowerment of Spritzer (1995), the data of study were selected from 331 employees of Zahedan city by Morgan and Kerjenci table (1975) and ratio stratified sampling was used. For the validity of questionnaire, content validity and face validity were used and to evaluate reliability, internal consistency of items was evaluated by Cronbach's alpha. The Cronbach's alpha for organizational agility is 0.93 and for employees empowerment is 0.89. The results of study in bi-variate analysis show that there is a significant effect between the components of organizational agility, speed, competence, responsiveness and flexibility with empowerment of employees at the error level 0.01. The study results show that there is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees empowerment in terms of population features of age and work experience of employees at the error level 0.05.

**Keywords:** Organizational agility, Speed, Competence, Responsiveness, Flexibility, Employees empowerment, Zahedan

### Introduction

Today, the organizations are encountered with the changes and challenges and the organization should cope up with them. On one hand, having a strategic view to the changes and opportunities of changes and the improvement of capabilities and organization can be a good mechanism for the long-term and sustainable success of organization. The response to changes and considering their advantage via strategic use of manufacturing and managerial methods are the main concepts of Agile manufacturing (Sepahvand, 2013). The advance IT and manufacturing can lead to the manufacturing agility and via the cost reduction, speed increase and quality improvement, organization agility is created (Crocitto, M., & Youssef, M. 2003). Based on the rapid changes of knowledge, everything is changing

considerably. As an open system, the organizations interact with the environment and for life continuance, the required the response to the environmental changes. For the survival, each organization in the current unreliable and dynamic environment requires agility. As a managerial concept, organizational agility was formed at first in a manufacturing basis namely flexible manufacturing systems and then it was developed to other business fields and it was raised as one of the organizational features (Ghorbanizade et al., 2011). Before providing this strategic document, Lihay University with the financial support of marine force of US and with Yakuka institute, performed some studies on 13 great manufacturing organizations including General Motors, General Electric, IBM, Texas, Instrument, etc. The above study answered the question that successful organizations had some features in the 21<sup>th</sup> century. Later, more than 100 other organizations were evaluated and in 1991, the results of study were published in a journal. Later in 1995, the results of above studies were published in the book Stive Goldman, Nigel and Press (1995) A "Agile competitors and virtual organizations". The movement to agile manufacturing and achieving agility were on the priority for the manufacturing organizations of US and then European countries (Jafarnejad and Shahayi, 2007). The goal of an agile organization is enrichment and respecting the customers and employees with a set of capabilities to perform good reactions to the changes in the business environment (Krestive and Yusef, 2003). Despite the traditional methods, agile methods emphasized on employees and their creativity to fight against instabilities. One of the important principles of organizations is human resources. To achieve agility, the organizations should bring up the agile employees to achieve the expected results (Esmaili et al., 2013).

There is no separate set of enabler to reflect all dimensions of agility (Lin et al., 2006).

Empowerment approaches include communicational approaches (structural), motivational and cognitive (psychological).

1. Communicative approach: in communicative approach, empowerment is a process in which the manager of an organization divides its power with the subordinates. Whetten & Cameron (1998) consider empowerment as giving power to the

employees, we help them to improve self-confidence and cope up with inability and give energy and motivation to perform the activities (Hosseini, 2012:4).

2.Motivational approach: According to these experts, the empowerment is based on motivational inclinations of people. The term empowerment means increasing power. Empowerment is creating the required conditions to improve motivation in their duties via development of self-efficacy or reduction of lack of power (Kanger and Kanango, 1998:482, cited in Hosseini, 2012:5, Afje and Miri, 2009:5). According to the motivational approach, any strategy leading to the increase of “working activity”, “Self-decision”, “self-adequacy” of employees and this leads to the employees’ empowerment. With this description, employee’s empowerment is “the process of improving competence of people in organization via the identification and elimination of the conditions leading to their lack of power (Tabarsa and Ahangar, 2008).

3.Cognitive approach: According to cognitive approach, empowerment is the process of increasing internal motivation to do the duties. This process refers to the positive experiences that people achieve directly in doing their duties. These experiences motivate the internal motivation to perform the duties and this increases the satisfaction increase. Thomas and Velthous (1990) added psychological dimension to empowerment and defined it as a set of cognitive-motivational field including competence or self-efficacy and three other cognitive fields (autonomy or choice, meaning and effect)(Tabarsa and Ahangar, 2008).

In one of the best empirical studies about empowerment, Spritser (1992) identified four dimensions for psychological empowerment. Based on the study of Mishra (1992), Whetten& Cameron (1998) added trust dimension to the psychological empowerment and five key dimensions of empowerment were formed (Shahraki, 2010:7-8).

It should be said that the executive organizations and systems could achieve their organizational missions, if they have the employees with high job and organizational quality. The employees with high empowerment: high competence, effect, meaning and reliability to the co-workers and organization. This depends upon the identification of effective factors on empowerment of employees. Organizational agility is one of the effective factors on employee’s empowerment. From this respect, the present study attempts to evaluate the impact of organizational agility on empowerment of employees of executive systems of Zahedan city.

**Study methodology**

The present study is descriptive in terms of nature and correlation and in terms of data collection method is survey. The study population is all employees of 16 executive systems of Zahedan city in 2015 as 2260 people. By survey method and a questionnaires of organizational agility of Sharifi and Zhang (1999) and employees empowerment of Spritzer (1995), the data of study were selected from 331 employees of Zahedan city by Morgan and Kerjeci table (1975) and ratio stratified sampling was used. To determine the reliability of test in SPSS software, Cronbach’s alpha method is used (Table 1). To determine reliability, face content validity is used.

**Table 1. The reliability (validity) of study variables**

| Variable type | Variable               | Dimensions     | Reliability         |             |
|---------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------|
|               |                        |                | Alpha value         |             |
|               |                        |                | Alpha of dimensions | Total alpha |
| Dependent     | Employee’s empowerment | Effect         | 0.79                | 0.93        |
|               |                        | Meaning        | 0.93                |             |
|               |                        | Competence     | 0.87                |             |
|               |                        | Choice         | 0.89                |             |
|               |                        | Reliability    | 0.87                |             |
| Independent   | Organizational agility | Flexibility    | 0.86                | 0.94        |
|               |                        | Responsiveness | 0.82                |             |
|               |                        | Competence     | 0.80                |             |
|               |                        | Speed          | 0.90                |             |

**Study findings**

**Descriptive findings**

1-Organizational agility

The organizational agility is evaluated in four dimensions : speed, competence, responsiveness and

flexibility and totally with 29 questions (ranging 29-145). The distribution of central statistics and dispersion of organizational agility and its dimensions are shown in Table 2:

**Table 2. Distribution of central statistics and dispersion of organizational agility and its dimensions**

| INDICES<br>VARIBLE AND COMPONENTS | MEAN  | CUT<br>OFF | SD     | MIN | MAX | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------|-------|------------|--------|-----|-----|-------|
| Organizational agility            | 98.79 | 87         | 16.389 | 45  | 137 | 331   |
| Speed                             | 20.53 | 18         | 3.980  | 8   | 30  | 331   |
| Competence                        | 23.82 | 21         | 4.803  | 10  | 35  | 331   |
| Responsiveness                    | 24.31 | 21         | 4.016  | 9   | 34  | 331   |
| Flexibility                       | 30.13 | 27         | 6.387  | 11  | 45  | 331   |
| Number of valid observations      | 331   |            |        |     |     |       |

As shown in Table 2, organizational agility from the view of employees of executive systems of Zahedan city with the mean 98.79 (cut off 87) is above average and at relatively good level. Regarding the components of organizational agility from the view of employees of executive systems of Zahedan, we should say the speed component with the mean 20.53 (cut off 18), competence with the mean 23.82 (cut off 21), responsiveness with the mean 24.31 (cut

off 21), flexibility with the mean 30.13 (cut off 27) is above average at a relatively good level.

**2-Employee’s empowerment**

The employee’s empowerment is evaluated in five dimensions: Effect, meaning, trust and totally with 29 questions (ranging 17-85). The distribution of central statistics and dispersion of employees’ empowerment and its dimensions are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. The distribution of central statistics and dispersion of employee’s empowerment and its Dimensions**

| INDICES<br>VARIBLE AND COMPONENTS | MEAN  | CUT<br>OFF | SD     | MIN | MAX | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------|-------|------------|--------|-----|-----|-------|
| Employee’s empowerment            | 61.78 | 51         | 10.704 | 26  | 85  | 331   |
| Effect                            | 10.37 | 9          | 2.495  | 3   | 15  | 331   |
| Meaning                           | 11.94 | 9          | 2.555  | 3   | 15  | 331   |
| Competence                        | 15.57 | 12         | 2.889  | 6   | 20  | 331   |
| Choice                            | 13.73 | 12         | 3.459  | 4   | 20  | 331   |
| Trust                             | 10.17 | 9          | 2.975  | 3   | 15  | 331   |
| Number of valid observations      | 331   |            |        |     |     |       |

As shown in Table 3, employee’s empowerment from the view of employees of executive systems of Zahedan city with the mean 61.78 (cut off 51) is above average and at relatively good level. Regarding the components of employee’s empowerment from the view of employees of executive systems of Zahedan, we should say that effect component with the mean 10.37 (cut off 9), meaning with the mean 11.94 (cut off 21), competence with the mean 15.57 (cut off 12), choice

with the mean 13.73 (cut off 12) and trust with the mean 10.17 (cut off 9) are above average at a relatively good level.

**2-Inferential findings**

1-Organizational agility is effective on employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan.

Table 4 shows the bi-variate regression analysis of organizational agility and employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan.

**Table 5. The bi-variate regression analysis of organizational agility and employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan.**

| Variable                     | Component      | Employee’s empowerment                        |       |
|------------------------------|----------------|---|-------|
|                              |                | The results of bi-variate regression analysis |       |
| Organizational agility       | Speed          | R correlation coefficient                     | 0.42  |
|                              |                | Beta  | 0.42  |
|                              |                | Significance level of t-test                  | 0.000 |
|                              |                | N   | 331   |
|                              | Component      | Employee’s empowerment                        |       |
|                              |                | The results of bi-variate regression analysis |       |
|                              | Competence     | R correlation coefficient                     | 0.49  |
|                              |                | Beta  | 0.49  |
|                              |                | Significance level of t-test                  | 0.000 |
|                              |                | N   | 331   |
|                              | Component      | Employee’s empowerment                        |       |
|                              |                | The results of bi-variate regression analysis |       |
|                              | Responsiveness | R correlation coefficient                     | 0.47  |
|                              |                | Beta  | 0.47  |
|                              |                | Significance level of t-test                  | 0.000 |
|                              |                | N   | 331   |
|                              | Component      | Employee’s empowerment                        |       |
|                              |                | The results of bi-variate regression analysis |       |
|                              | Flexibility    | R correlation coefficient                     | 0.47  |
|                              |                | Beta  | 0.47  |
| Significance level of t-test |                | 0.000   |       |
| N                            |                | 331   |       |

As shown in Table 5:

- 1- Speed component of organizational agility has significant effect at the error level 0.01 on employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan. Thus, the study hypothesis is supported.
- 2- Competence component of organizational agility has significant effect at the error level 0.01 on employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan. Thus, the study hypothesis is supported.
- 3- Responsiveness component of organizational agility has significant effect at the error level 0.01 on employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan. Thus, the study hypothesis is supported.
- 4- Flexibility component of organizational agility has significant effect at the error level 0.01 on employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan. Thus, the study hypothesis is supported.

Based on the study findings, the fourth hypothesis regarding the fact that organizational agility has significant effect on employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan is supported.

After the bi-variate analysis, we can say the main hypothesis of study as organizational agility is effective on spiritual intelligence and employee’s empowerment of executive systems of Zahedan is supported.

3-There is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employee’s

empowerment in terms of population features (age, gender, experience, education).

For hypothesis test, the effect of organizational agility on empowerment in terms of demographic features, comparative analysis is used. At first, the normality or non-normality of study variables are defined. Table 6 shows normal or non-normal distribution of organizational agility based on Single range Kolmogorov-Smirnov test:

**Table 6. Normal and non-normal distribution of organizational agility**

| Variable               | Single range Kolmogorov-Smirnov test |          | Results |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| Organizational agility | Mean                                 |          | 98.79   |
|                        | SD                                   |          | 16.689  |
|                        | Difference of highest absolute value | Total    | 0.04    |
|                        |                                      | Positive | 0.023   |
|                        |                                      | Negative | -0.040  |
|                        | Value                                |          | 0.726   |
|                        | Test significance level              |          | 0.668   |
|                        | Total                                |          | 331     |

The results of Table 6 show that the distribution of organizational agility variable based on Single range Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is normal as the significance level of the mentioned test is significant above 0.05. To test the study hypothesis, Parametric statistical test (quantitative) is applied.

Table 7 shows the normal and non-normal distribution of employee’s empowerment based on Single range Kolmogorov-Smirnov test:

**Table 7. Normal and non-normal distribution of employee’s empowerment**

| Variable               | Single range Kolmogorov-Smirnov test |          | Results |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| Employee’s empowerment | Mean                                 |          | 61.78   |
|                        | SD                                   |          | 10.704  |
|                        | Difference of highest absolute value | Total    | 0.042   |
|                        |                                      | Positive | 0.042   |
|                        |                                      | Negative | -0.039  |
|                        | Value                                |          | 0.771   |
|                        | Test significance level              |          | 0.591   |
|                        | Total                                |          | 331     |

The results of Table 7 show that the distribution of employees’ empowerment variable based on Single range Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is normal as the significance level of the mentioned test is significant above 0.05. To test the study hypothesis, Parametric statistical test (quantitative) is applied.

Later, we test the third hypothesis of study in terms of demographic properties based on parametric statistics.

1-3There is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employee’s empowerment in terms of demographic properties of gender.

As the dependent variable of study is compared based on two variables of organizational agility and gender, two-way variance analysis or uni-variate covariance is used for testing this hypothesis. Table

8 shows the results of two-way variance analysis test regarding the effect of organizational agility on employee's empowerment in terms of demographic properties of gender:

**Table 8. The results of two-way variance analysis test regarding the effect of organizational agility on employee's empowerment in terms of demographic properties of gender**

| VARIANCE                          | SUM OF SQUARES | DEGREE OF (DF)FREEDOM | MEAN OF SQUARES | F VALUE | F SIGNIFICANCE TEST |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|
| GENDER                            | 19.949         | 1                     | 19.949          | 0.211   | 0.646               |
| Organizational agility            | 6442.474       | 2                     | 3221.237        | 34.048  | 0.000               |
| Gender and organizational agility | 12.656         | 2                     | 6.328           | 0.067   | 0.935               |
| Total                             | 37812.006      | 331                   |                 |         |                     |

As shown in Table 8, there is no significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees empowerment in terms of demographic properties. The significance level of F test in the interactive effect of gender and organizational agility on employee's empowerment is significant at the level above 0.05.<sup>1</sup>

Also, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of test is 0.19 and the real coefficient of determination is 0.18 and it shows that really, 18% of variance and the changes of dependent variable of empowerment of employees are dedicated to gender and organizational agility and 82% of the residual effects are dedicated to the unknown and external factors as not entered in covariance analysis.

In addition, we should say that regarding the separated effects of two variables on employees' empowerment, only organizational agility variable

has significant effect at the error level 0.01. Thus, the study hypothesis as there is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees' empowerment based on the demographic properties of gender is not supported. 3-2 There is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees' empowerment in terms of population property of age.

As the dependent variable of study is compared based on two variables of organizational agility and age, two-way variance analysis or uni-variate covariance is used for testing this hypothesis. Table 9 shows the results of two-way variance analysis test regarding the effect of organizational agility on employee's empowerment in terms of demographic properties of age:

**Table 9. The results of two-way variance analysis test regarding the effect of organizational agility on employee's empowerment in terms of demographic properties of age**

| VARIANCE                       | SUM OF SQUARES | DEGREE OF (DF)FREEDOM | MEAN OF SQUARES | F VALUE | F SIGNIFICANCE TEST |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|
| AGE                            | 966.210        | 3                     | 322.070         | 3.684   | 0.012               |
| Organizational agility         | 6226.477       | 2                     | 3113.238        | 35.614  | 0.000               |
| Age and organizational agility | 1164.436       | 5                     | 232.887         | 2.664   | 0.022               |
| Total                          | 37812.006      | 331                   |                 |         |                     |

<sup>1</sup> Regarding this hypothesis, we avoid the estimation of the difference means and post hoc tests.

As shown in Table 9, there is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees empowerment in terms of demographic properties of age at the error level 0.05. The significance level of F test in the interactive effect of age and organizational agility on employee’s empowerment is significant at the level below 0.05. Also, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of test is 0.26 and the real coefficient of determination is 0.23 and it shows that really, 23% of variance and the changes of dependent variable of empowerment of

employees are dedicated to age and organizational agility and 77% of the residual effects are dedicated to the unknown and external factors as not entered in covariance analysis.

In addition, two variables of age and organizational agility separately show the significant effect with the employees’ empowerment at the significance level 0.05, 0.01 respectively.

Table 10 shows the estimation of difference mean of employees’ empowerment in terms of demographic terms of age and organizational agility:

**Table 10. Estimation of difference means of employees’ empowerment in terms of demographic terms of age and organizational agility**

| No. | Age                | Organizational agility | Mean   | Standard error | 95% confidence interval |             |
|-----|--------------------|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|     |                    |                        |        |                | Lower bound             | Upper bound |
| 1   | 30 years and below | Low                    | 41.600 | 4.181          | 33.374                  | 49.826      |
|     |                    | Average                | 57.857 | 1.350          | 55.220                  | 60.530      |
|     |                    | High                   | 69.500 | 2.499          | 64.584                  | 74.416      |
| 2   | 31----40           | Low                    | 46.333 | 5.398          | 35.713                  | 56.953      |
|     |                    | Average                | 58.500 | 0.891          | 56.746                  | 60.254      |
|     |                    | High                   | 70.750 | 2.091          | 66.637                  | 74.863      |
| 3   | 41----50           | Low                    | 56.333 | 5.398          | 45.713                  | 66.953      |
|     |                    | Average                | 64.283 | 1.087          | 62.145                  | 66.422      |
|     |                    | High                   | 66.947 | 2.145          | 62.727                  | 71.167      |
| 4   | 51 years and above | Average                | 62.666 | 1.799          | 59.127                  | 66.207      |
|     |                    | High                   | 76.125 | 3.306          | 69.622                  | 82.628      |

Based on the descriptive results of Table 10, the mean of employee’s empowerment in terms of organizational agility in the different age groups is not similar. This shows the lack of equality of employee’s empowerment in terms of organizational agility among the different age groups. To evaluate the compare employee’s empowerment in terms of different age groups of organizational agility, we can use one of post hoc tests. At first, we should estimate the assumption or non-assumption of equality of variance of different

groups of organizational agility and to do this, Leven’s test is used. As Leven’s test (2.846) with the degree of freedom 10 is significant at the level 0.01 for different groups of organizational agility. Thus, variance homogeneity of different groups of organizational agility is not assumed. Thus, post hoc tests are used for unequal variances as Tamhane’s T2. Table 11 shows Tamhane’s T2 test to compare the employee’s empowerment in terms of different groups of organizational agility:

**Table 11. Comparing the employee’s empowerment in terms of different groups of organizational agility**

| Different groups of organizational agility |         | Mean difference | Standard error | Significance level | 95% confidence interval |             |
|--|---------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|  |         |                 |                |                    | Lower bound             | Lower bound |
| Low  | Average | -13.562         | 2.878          | 0.000              | -20.064                 | -6.483      |
|  | High    | -23.074         | 3.062          | 0.000              | -30.606                 | -15.542     |
| Average                                    | Low     | 13.562          | 2.878          | 0.000              | 6.483                   | 20.640      |
|  | High    | -9.512          | 1.330          | 0.000              | -12.784                 | -6.240      |
| High                                       | Low     | 23.074          | 3.062          | 0.000              | 15.542                  | 30.606      |
|  | Average | 9.512           | 1.330          | 0.000              | 6.240                   | 12.784      |

As shown in Table 11, the results of Tamhane’s T2 test show that there is a significant difference between different age groups of organizational agility in organizational empowerment of employees. High organizational agility with the mean difference 23.074 has the highest employees’ empowerment and low organizational agility with the mean difference 9.512 has the lowest empowerment of employees. Thus, study hypothesis as there is the significant difference of organizational agility on employee’s empowerment in terms of age is supported.

3-3-There is a significant difference between organizational agility on employee’s empowerment in terms of demographic properties of education. As the dependent variable of study is compared based on two variables of organizational agility and education, two-way variance analysis or uni-variate covariance is used for testing this hypothesis. Table 12 shows the results of two-way variance analysis test regarding the effect of organizational agility on employee’s empowerment in terms of demographic properties of education:

**Table 12. Employee’s empowerment in terms of demographic properties of education**

| Variance                             | Sum of Squares | Degree of (Df)Freedom | Mean of Squares | F Value | F Significance Test |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|
| Education                            | 29.752         | 3                     | 9.917           | 0.107   | 0.956               |
| Organizational Agility               | 5288.386       |                       | 2644.193        | 28.634  | 0.000               |
| Education And Organizational Agility | 993.902        | 5                     | 198.780         | 2.153   | 0.059               |
| Total                                | 37812.006      | 331                   |                 |         |                     |

As shown in Table 12, there is no significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees empowerment in terms of demographic properties of education. The significance level of F test in the interactive effect of education and organizational agility on employee’s empowerment is significant at the level above 0.05. Also, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of test is 0.21 and the real coefficient of determination is 0.20 and it shows that really, 20% of variance and the changes of dependent variable of empowerment of employees are dedicated to education and organizational agility and 80% of the residual effects are dedicated to the unknown and external factors as not entered in covariance analysis. In addition, we should say that regarding the separated effects of two variables on employees’ empowerment, only organizational agility variable has significant effect at the error level 0.01. Thus,

the study hypothesis as there is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees’ empowerment based on the demographic properties of education is not supported. 3-4There is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees’ empowerment in terms of population property of work experience. As the dependent variable of study is compared based on two variables of organizational agility and work experience, two-way variance analysis or uni-variate covariance is used for testing this hypothesis. Table 13 shows the results of two-way variance analysis test regarding the effect of organizational agility on employee’s empowerment in terms of demographic properties of work experience:



**Table 13. The results of two-way variance analysis test regarding the effect of organizational agility on employee’s empowerment in terms of demographic properties of work experience**

| VARIANCE                                   | SUM OF SQUARES | DEGREE OF (DF)FREEDOM | MEAN OF SQUARES | F VALUE | F SIGNIFICANCE TEST |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|
| WORK EXPERIENCE                            | 884.319        | 3                     | 294.773         | 3.420   | 0.018               |
| Organizational agility                     | 3049.700       | 2                     | 1524.850        | 17.690  | 0.000               |
| Work experience and organizational agility | 976.902        | 5                     | 195.380         | 2.267   | 0.048               |
| Total                                      | 37812.006      | 331                   |                 |         |                     |

As shown in Table 13, there is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employees empowerment in terms of demographic properties of work experience at the error level 0.05. The significance level of F test in the interactive effect of age and organizational agility on employee’s empowerment is significant at the level below 0.05.

Also, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of test is 0.28 and the real coefficient of determination is 0.24 and it shows that really, 24% of variance and the changes of dependent variable of empowerment of

employees are dedicated to work experience and organizational agility and 76% of the residual effects are dedicated to the unknown and external factors as not entered in covariance analysis.

In addition, two variables of work experience and organizational agility separately show the significant effect with the employees’ empowerment at the significance level 0.05, 0.01 respectively.

Table 14 shows the estimation of difference mean of employees’ empowerment in terms of demographic terms of work experience and organizational agility:

**Table 14. Estimation of difference means of employees’ empowerment in terms of demographic terms of work experience and organizational agility**

| No. | Work experience    | Organizational agility | Mean   | Standard error | 95% confidence interval |             |
|-----|--------------------|------------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|     |                    |                        |        |                | Lower bound             | Lower bound |
| 1   | 10 years and below | Low                    | 41.600 | 4.152          | 33.431                  | 49.769      |
|     |                    | Average                | 56.139 | 1.045          | 54.084                  | 58.194      |
|     |                    | High                   | 70.875 | 2.321          | 66.309                  | 75.441      |
| 2   | 11---20            | Low                    | 49.400 | 4.152          | 41.231                  | 57.569      |
|     |                    | Average                | 61.472 | 0.902          | 59.698                  | 63.246      |
|     |                    | High                   | 67.684 | 2.130          | 63.494                  | 71.875      |
| 3   | 21---30            | Low                    | 61.000 | 9.284          | 42.734                  | 79.266      |
|     |                    | Average                | 63.653 | 1.094          | 61.500                  | 65.805      |
|     |                    | High                   | 70.000 | 1.895          | 66.272                  | 73.728      |
| 4   | Above 30 years     | Average                | 64.000 | 6.565          | 51.084                  | 76.916      |
|     |                    | High                   | 84.500 | 6.565          | 71.584                  | 97.416      |

Based on the descriptive results of Table 14, the mean of employee’s empowerment in terms of organizational agility in the different age groups is not similar. This shows the lack of equality of employee’s empowerment in terms of

organizational agility among the different age groups.

To evaluate the compare employee’s empowerment in terms of different age groups of organizational agility, we can use one of post hoc tests. At first, we

should estimate the assumption or non-assumption of equality of variance of different groups of organizational agility and to do this, Leven's test is used. As Leven's test (2.237) with the degree of freedom 10 is significant at the level 0.05 for different levels. Thus, variance homogeneity of

different groups of organizational agility is not assumed. Thus, post hoc tests are used for unequal variances as Tamhane's T2. Table 15 shows Tamhane's T2 test to compare the employee's empowerment in terms of different groups of organizational agility:

**Table 15. Comparing the employee's empowerment in terms of different groups of organizational agility**

| Different groups of organizational agility |         | Mean difference | Standard error | Significance level | 95% confidence interval |             |
|--|---------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|  |         |                 |                |                    | Lower bound             | Lower bound |
| Low  | Average | -13.562         | 4.410          | 0.033              | -26.084                 | -1.039      |
|  | High    | -23.074         | 4.494          | 0.001              | -35.666                 | -10.482     |
| Average                                    | Low     | 13.562          | 4.410          | 0.033              | 1.093                   | 26.084      |
|  | High    | -9.512          | 1.218          | 0.000              | -12.469                 | -6.555      |
| High                                       | Low     | 23.074          | 4.494          | 0.001              | 10.482                  | 35.666      |
|  | Average | 9.512           | 1.218          | 0.000              | 6.555                   | 12.469      |

As shown in Table 15, the results of Tamhane's T2 test show that there is a significant difference between different groups of organizational agility on organizational empowerment of employees. The high organizational agility with the mean difference 23.074 has the highest employee's empowerment and low organizational agility with the mean difference 9.512 has the lowest employee's empowerment. Thus, the study hypothesis as there is a significant difference between the effect of organizational agility on employee's empowerment in terms of demographic properties of work experience is supported.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

As it was said in the theoretical issues, empowerment is the power based on competence and it should be created. This power is beyond what should be shared. The power is based on the thought that power is created via the continuous improvement of competence and its application. In this study, employee's empowerment in executive systems of Zahedan city is evaluated with five components:

The findings of present study show that employee's empowerment in executive systems of Zahedan city from the view of employees of executive systems of Zahedan city with the mean 61.78 (cut off 51) is above average and at relatively good level. It should be said that various factors are effective on employee's empowerment and they are grouped in three sets of individual, group and organizational factors. As it was said, we can consider organizational agility as the organizational factors of employee's empowerment. Goldman (1994)

summarizes agility in three terms of strategic reaction, universal changes and dominant system. He believes that agility is a complete reaction to the fundamental changes occurred in the dominant system on business competition in the top economies (Jafarnejad and Shahayi, 2010). The results of present study show that organizational agility in executive systems of Zahedan city with the mean 98.79 (cut off 87) is above average and it is at a relatively good level.

The results of present study are consistent with the findings of study of Vaezi and Sabzikaran (2010), Mohammadi and Shokripour (2008), HatamiNaghahi (2010) and empirically, improves them. They found that the more concentrated, complex and formal the organizational structure, the lower the empowerment of employees and by organizational agility and considering management styles based on team work, etc., employee's empowerment is increased. Based on the results of study, we can increase the employees' empowerment and the following recommendations are presented:

- 1- Dedicate the organizational jobs based on specialization, skill and interest of employees to feel meaning and effect in their affairs.
- 2- Encouraging the employees to perform their duties can improve security and trust in employees.

Improve the organizational participation morale and giving value to the participation of members in the

work process namely in decision making and planning.

#### References

- [1] Afje, SeyedAliakbar, Miri, Alireza. (2009). The empowerment model to improve performance of employees of car parts industry in Iran. *Journal of management sciences in Iran*.14.149-169.
- [2] AlperErtürk&LeventVurgun,(2015) Retention of IT professionals: Examining the influence of empowerment, social exchange, and trust, *Journal of Business Research* 68 ,34–46.
- [3] Crocitto, M &Yousuf, M (2003) “The human side of organizational agility”, *IndustrialManagement & Data Systems*, 103,(1), 388 – 397.
- [4] Esmaili, Mehdi, Rabie, Masoud, Heidari, Ali. (2013). The identification and prioritization of effective factors on agility of human resources in car industry of Iran. *Administrative management view*. 15. 95-117.
- [5] Ghorbanizade, Vajhollah, Hormanesh, Fateme, Gholamhosseini, Hossein. (2011). The cultural role of learning and knowledge management in organizational agility. NO. 65. *The scientific-research journal of improvement and change management*. 47-72.
- [6] Hataminaghabi, Fariba. (2010). The relationship of organizational learning with the empowerment of employees of retirement fund of Oil Company. MA thesis of Payame Noor University of Tehran.
- [7] Hosseini, SeyedeElham, Hosseini, SeyedeRahele. (2012). Employee’s empowerment: A step to entrepreneurship development in organizations. National conference of entrepreneurship and knowledge-based business management. Tehran. 1-14.
- [8] Jafarnejad, Ahmad; Shahayi, Behnam. (2007). An introduction to organizational agility and agile manufacturing. Tehran. Second edition. Mehraban book institute.
- [9] Kinla, Denis. (2002). Human resources empowerment. IrannejadParizi translated. Mehdi and Salimian, Masumali, Managers publication.
- [10] Miri, Abdolreza, Sabzikaran, Esmail. (2011). The evaluation of effective factors on human resources empowerment of national company of distribution of oil products of Iran (Tehran). *The journal of development and change journal*. Period 6, 40-56.
- [11] Mohammadi, Heidar, Shokripour, Saeed. (2012). Empowerment of Naja employees (leadership and management and its role in employee’s empowerment). *Management studies on security education*. Fourth 5(3),105-135.
- [12] Morgan,D.W., Krejcie, R, V .(1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- [13] Sepahvand, Reza. (2013). The evaluation of the effect of knowledge management strategies on empowerment of employees and organizational agility. *Scientific and research journal of Farda management*. 365.
- [14] Shahraki, Amir. (2010). The role of managers in employee’s empowerment. Tehran. Sepah Bank. The office of researches and risk control.
- [15] Tabarsa, Gholamali, Raminmehr, Hamid. (2010). Preset the organizational citizenship behavior model. *Research-scientific journal of administrative management vision*. 3, 103-117.
- [16] Vaezi, Reza; Sabzikaran, Esmail. (2010). The evaluation of the organizational structure and employee’s empowerment in the human resources empowerment of national company of distribution of oil products of Iran (Tehran). *The journal of change management*. 3. 153-178.
- [17] Vetten, David and Cameron. (2002). Empowerment and delegation. Translated by BadroldinOraiYazdani. The institute of educational researches of management affiliated to energy ministry.
- [18] Youssuf , Y,Gunasekaran , A , Adeleye , E, Sivayoganathan, K(2003)Agile Supply chain capabilities:Determiants of competitive objectives, *European Journal of operational Research* , Elsevier.