



University of Hormozgan

Designing the Organization Development Model with Organizational Agility Approach in the Department of Education in Sistan and Baluchistan Province

Fatemeh Heydari Amin¹, Farideh Hashemiannejad^{2✉}, Nazia Sadat Nasser³

1. PhD Student in Educational Management, Department of Educational Sciences, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran
2. Assistant Professor of Educational Planning, Department of Educational Sciences, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran, Hash@mshdiau.ac.ir
3. Assistant Professor of Educational Planning, Department of Educational Sciences, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

Article Info

Article type:

Research Article

Article history:

Received 28 Mar. 2023

Received in revised form 29 Aug. 2024

Accepted 3 Oct. 2023

Published online 01 Sep. 2024

Keywords:

Organizational development,
Organizational agility,
Education,
Mixed method study

ABSTRACT

Objective: The aim of this research was to formulate an organizational development model from the perspective of organizational agility within the General Department of Education in Sistan and Baluchistan province.

Methods: This study employed a mixed exploratory design, specifically a sequential exploratory mixed research design, encompassing both qualitative and quantitative phases. In the qualitative phase, the study focused on individuals with university education, experts, opinion leaders, professors, elites within the scientific community, and specialists, who were purposefully selected (totaling 25 participants). In the quantitative phase, the research considered managers and employees of the General Department of Education in Sistan and Baluchistan province (comprising 681 individuals). In the qualitative phase, the Delphi method was employed, while the quantitative section utilized structural equation modeling to investigate the central research question and align the model with the collected data.

Results: The outcomes of the research revealed that the organizational development consisted of four dimensions: professional development, organizational development, individual development, and educational development. Moreover, the organizational agility model identified four dimensions: responsiveness, flexibility, change management, and performance enhancement. In conclusion, this research underscores the importance of developing a human resource strategy aligned with organizational strategies, fostering a shared vision, promoting intellectual synergy, welcoming innovative ideas, and instilling a culture of systemic thinking regarding organizational development among members of the organization.

Conclusions: These measures are essential steps toward creating a more agile organization, as recommended for managers and officials.

Cite this article: Heydari Amin, F., Hashemiannejad, F. & Sadat Nasser, N. (2024). Designing the organization development model with organizational agility approach in the department of education in Sistan and Baluchistan Province. *Iranian Evolutionary Educational Psychology Journal*, 6 (3), 91-106.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/6.3.91>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Hormozgan.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/6.3.91>

Introduction

In contemporary society, the swift transformations necessitate prompt decision-making; furthermore, it is imperative for all organizations to engage in organizational growth or development to remain competitive, ensure survival, enhance efficiency, and optimize productivity. This crucial endeavor can only be realized through the metamorphosis of the organization, wherein the pivotal and foundational component of this transformation is the human capital. For organizations to flourish, it is essential that the individuals within the organization experience personal growth, as these evolving individuals will subsequently facilitate the advancement of both the organization and society at large ([Hosseinzadeh & Safarei, 2018](#)). A primary asset of any organization is its human capital, comprised of individuals with diverse needs who, when their needs are adequately addressed and they are sufficiently motivated, will contribute their talents and skills to the organization ([Dadashzadeh Asl et al., 2012](#)). In the current epoch, it is unequivocal that the attainment of commendable objectives and significant educational missions is contingent upon the empowerment of educators who realize their potential and possess substantial capabilities to enhance the educational framework, thereby gaining advantages in growth, development, and competition. Such educators are likely to achieve greater success, thereby exacerbating the disparity in social, economic, political, and quality of life metrics when compared to others. Consequently, a multitude of political leaders and international organizations presently leverage fundamental education that is contemporary and adaptable to current needs as a symbolic representation, viewing it as a mechanism to address societal social and economic challenges ([Parvin et al., 2021](#)).

The concept of organizational change garnered attention in the late 1950s. Numerous enterprises are compelled to react to psychological pressures and pursue enhancements in their performance. Typically, changes within an organization elicit a resistant response from employees ([Soparnot, 2011](#)). Scholars of organizational theory assert that the impetus for any organizational change stems from the pursuit of increased benefits ([Pettigrew et al., 2001](#)). Within the framework of this ideology, it is posited that organizations are confronted with finite and limited resources, prompting competition among individuals and groups over these resources ([Burke & Litwin, 1992](#)). Organizational change is perceived as a shift in the organization's interests and power dynamics. It is plausible that individuals whose interests and power are jeopardized by such

changes may respond defensively, striving to preserve the existing state of affairs ([Lewis, 2019](#)). Changes across any domain are seldom embraced universally upon their inception, and the emergence of resistance is a normative phenomenon, irrespective of its intensity or mildness.

Since individuals possess established methodologies that they perceive as highly effective for executing tasks, they exhibit resistance to change, as such transformations necessitate re-learning and may entail alterations in employment. Human capital is regarded as a critical asset within any organization, particularly concerning cognitive capacity and innovation, as all modifications and enhancements to organizational frameworks and processes are implemented by individuals. The utilization of the intellectual prowess and competencies of the organization's workforce, which is often referred to as latent capital, is imperative ([Mohammadi et al., 2020](#)).

The concept of development, as a specialized subject and a distinct area of inquiry within the realm of management science, possesses a relatively brief historical background. In contrast to medical sciences, accounting, law, and numerous other professions and academic fields that possess well-defined and established objectives, the domain of organizational development is somewhat atypical due to its intrinsic and fundamental opacity. Development represents a phenomenon that, despite its consistent and progressive expansion, remains entangled with unresolved questions pertaining to its foundational essence, which encompasses a collective of organizational sciences and individual contributors ([Shabani Bahar et al., 2020](#)). According to [Grieves \(2000\)](#), development signifies the strategic advancement of an individual or a group with the aim of actualizing the organization's mission and objectives to the greatest extent feasible. The professional development of trainers is fundamentally aimed at averting the obsolescence of the knowledge and competencies of these individuals, which, despite its significance, has received comparatively limited scholarly attention ([Salehi Omran & Einkhah, 2023](#)).

Change represents the most persistent characteristic that can be ascribed to the contemporary business environment. In the present day, organizations are confronted with exceptionally fierce competition arising from technological advancements and shifts in consumer preferences. This scenario has led to a reassessment of the validity of traditional management paradigms. Organizations must adeptly navigate continuous and unforeseen changes as well as emerging customer challenges while maintaining low operational costs; thus, the capacity for rapid and effective response, competition based on time, and fulfillment of customer requirements has

emerged as a definitive attribute of competitiveness. In essence, agility has become a prerequisite for survival amidst competitors in fluctuating environments, enabling organizations to address the challenges associated with the swift delivery of products and services, quality assurance, and customer satisfaction. Agility, conceptualized as a novel production paradigm to tackle such conditions, has been articulated by researchers at the Ayakoka Institute ([Harraf et al., 2015](#); [Heydari Amin et al., 2023](#)). Agility encompasses the organization's capability to adapt to evolving circumstances while identifying and effectively leveraging the opportunities that arise as a consequence of change. Over the past two decades, the industrial landscape in Iran has encountered unprecedented and fundamentally unpredictable shifts in technology, market dynamics, and consumer demands, resulting in production entities grappling with challenges such as rapid and erratic transformations, compounded by escalated competition stemming from technological innovations and environmental uncertainties.

To address these transformations, agility emerges as an essential prerequisite for operational efficacy and competitive viability within the global economic landscape, which has become a focal concern for managers in Iranian manufacturing enterprises. Consequently, it is imperative for Iranian organizations to gain insight into the facilitators of agility and to comprehend the pathways to attain such agility through these enablers ([Moradi et al., 2021](#)). The examination of organizational growth and development is particularly significant, given the myriad changes and transitions occurring within both societal and organizational contexts. Elements such as the advent of novel technologies, the expansion of knowledge, financial limitations, and inter-organizational competition have collectively compelled organizations to prioritize the matter of organizational growth ([Kazemi Kia et al., 2017](#)).

[Widayati et al. \(2021\)](#), in their research entitled 'Teachers' Perceptions of CPD: A Study of Vocational High School Teachers in Indonesia, posited that formally employed educators participate in more systematic Continuous Professional Development (CPD) initiatives in comparison to their informal counterparts, as CPD activities are more closely tied to promotional opportunities. Their occupational roles and resultant job evaluations are interconnected. All educators indicated a willingness and capability for the further advancement of continuous professional development; however, the elements and dimensions of such development are significantly influenced by organizational determinants. In an exploratory investigation, [Turner et](#)

[al. \(2021\)](#) assessed the degree of enthusiasm exhibited by educators towards development programs. The findings delineated four themes pertinent to the initial volunteer decision and the subsequent choices regarding re-volunteering or abstaining from volunteering, which included self-efficacy and altruism, program reputation, requisite skill sets, and performance capability; additionally, four themes pertaining to the volunteering experience were identified, encompassing emotional impact, career progression, professional knowledge, and professional growth and performance capability. [Darvishmotevali et al. \(2020\)](#) in their study titled The Relationship Between Environmental Uncertainty, Organizational Agility, and Organizational Creativity in the Hotel Industry, concluded that organizational agility serves to mitigate the adverse effects of both competitive and technological uncertainties on organizational creativity. Furthermore, in highly dynamic and intricate environments characterized by pronounced environmental uncertainty, organizations should endeavor to minimize administrative bureaucracies to effectively navigate environmental challenges.

An effective development program is instrumental in fostering an environment conducive to recognition, support, and professional development; it facilitates the enhancement and refinement of competencies necessary for fulfilling the trainers' missions, thereby averting occupational burnout and underscoring its significance ([Mathur & Gupta, 2016](#)). Conversely, organizational agility serves as a foundational element for performance enhancement ([Raimi et al., 2015](#)). In accordance with the articulated introduction, the investigator endeavors to elucidate the inquiry, what constitutes the model of organizational development utilizing the organizational agility paradigm within the General Department of Education in the province of Sistan and Baluchistan?

Material and Methods

In terms of methodological framework, the present study adopts a mixed-methods approach, encompassing both qualitative and quantitative dimensions. Given that expert opinions will be solicited through interviews within this research endeavor, the initial phase is characterized by an inductive approach; conversely, the subsequent phase employs a descriptive methodology, as the data acquired for the organizational development model is integrated with the organization's agility framework. The entirety of this investigation is classified as exploratory in nature. The qualitative segment of the study population comprises individuals possessing university-level education,

including experts, academics, professors, and distinguished members of the scientific community, in addition to specialists from the research university, alongside professors and curriculum planning authorities, as well as heads of educational groups who have notable executive experience across various educational levels, collectively referred to as the so-called knowledgeable elites. (Academic experts or professors specializing in educational management and public administration were also included, specifically those holding Ph.D. qualifications with a minimum of 10 credible scientific publications in JCR Journal, authorship of books, and recognition as leading researchers). This cohort was designated for the qualitative segment of the research. In the current investigation, a total of 25 experts pertinent to the field were intentionally selected as samples in the initial phase. The statistical population for the quantitative aspect of this research is identified as the managers and employees of the General Department of Education of Sistan and Baluchistan province, totaling 681 individuals. A distribution of 400 questionnaires was executed among the target population, yielding a return of 362 completed questionnaires, which were subsequently subjected to analysis. Both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were employed for data analysis. In the descriptive segment, the characteristics of the studied population, variables, and questionnaire inquiries were elucidated through graphical representation, alongside frequency reporting and the calculation of frequency percentages, as well as indicators of central tendency and dispersion. The Delphi method was implemented in the qualitative phase of the study. In the inferential segment, research hypotheses were evaluated utilizing SPSS software for the descriptive statistics section of the investigation, in conjunction with PLS. Ultimately, the selection of SPSS and PLS software was contingent upon the specific requirements and challenges encountered during the research process.

Results

The results derived from the qualitative segment indicated that a cohort comprising 19 males and 6 females was present among the 25 experts who contributed to this research endeavor. A total of 11 individuals possesses a master's degree, whereas 14 individuals hold a doctoral degree. Among the 15 faculty members, there exists a distribution of 8 associate professors, 5 assistant professors, and 2 professors. Furthermore, with respect to the gender demographics of the respondents, 52.2% (corresponding to 189 individuals) are male, while 47.8% (corresponding to 173 individuals) are

female. Regarding age distribution among the respondents, 4.1% (equivalent to 15 individuals) are under 35 years of age, 29.3% (equivalent to 106 individuals) are between the ages of 35 and 45, 32.6% (equivalent to 118 individuals) are between the ages of 45 and 55, and 0.34% (equivalent to 123 individuals) exceed 55 years of age. In terms of educational attainment among the respondents, 7.5% (equivalent to 27 individuals) hold bachelor's degrees, 71.0% (equivalent to 257 individuals) possess master's degrees, and 21.5% (equivalent to 78 individuals) have obtained Ph.Ds. Concerning the distribution of the respondents' professional experience, 1.6% (equivalent to 22 individuals) have less than 5 years of experience, 21.8% (equivalent to 79 individuals) have between 5 and 10 years, 0.39% (equivalent to 141 individuals) possess between 10 and 15 years, and 33.1% (equivalent to 120 individuals) boast more than 15 years of experience.

The outcomes of the three phases of the Delphi methodology

In the inaugural phase of the Delphi process, a questionnaire encompassing dimensions and components was disseminated, which had been extracted for the purpose of formulating a model of organizational growth or enhancing organizational agility. This questionnaire was presented to the Delphi panel, comprising members of the expert group, to solicit their insights and perspectives regarding the significance and relevance of each dimension, alongside the components of the research model. During this phase, a total of 8 dimensions (4 related to development and 4 associated with agility) were delineated for the proposed model, drawing upon theoretical foundations, existing literature, established theories, and both internal and external research contexts. These dimensions were made accessible to the Delphi panel members (25 experts) for their evaluation and feedback. The opinions and perspectives of the expert group members concerning each of the proposed dimensions for the aforementioned model are documented in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of experts' views regarding the dimensions of the organizational development model with the organizational agility approach in the first stage

Variable	Dimension	Agree		Disagree	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Organizational agility	Responsiveness	19	76	6	24
	Flexibility	25	100	0	0
	change	25	100	0	0
	Performance management	19	76	6	24
Organizational development	Professional development	22	88	3	12
	Organizational development	25	100	0	0
	Individual development	19	76	6	24
	Educational development	22	88	3	12

Table 1 illustrates that all dimensions delineated for the two constructs of agility and organizational development have been validated by the experts. Following the validation of the dimensions in the preliminary stage, the researcher delineates the specific components within the validated dimensions, subsequently presenting them to the experts for endorsement in the subsequent stage. In the second phase, the components corresponding to each dimension were identified and presented to the experts for assessment of consensus on a five-point scale, which included the response options of strongly agree, somewhat agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Any variable that garners a minimum of 70% agreement from the Delphi panel members and achieves a score of 3 or above is retained within the model and deemed significant at this juncture; conversely, those that do not meet this criterion are excluded from the model. Table 2 presents the perspectives and insights of the expert group members concerning each of the proposed dimensions related to the aforementioned model.

Table 2. Frequency distribution of experts' views regarding the dimensions of the organizational development model with the organizational agility approach in the second stage

Dimension	Component	Opinions and views of experts					Descriptive indices		Result
		Very disagree	Disagree	Relatively agree	Agree	Very agree	Mean	SD	
Responsiveness	Response to social change	0	0	6	7	12	4.24	0.83	Accepted
	Response to environmental	0	0	11	5	9	3.92	0.90	Accepted
	Response to environmental	0	0	8	8	9	4.04	0.84	Accepted
Flexibility	Flexible work environment	0	0	10	8	7	3.88	0.83	Accepted
	Flexible workforce	0	0	13	9	3	3.60	0.70	Accepted
	Flexible strategy	0	0	10	9	6	3.84	0.80	Accepted
Change	Continuous improvement	0	0	12	6	7	3.80	0.86	Accepted
	Attitude towards environmental	0	0	8	12	5	3.88	0.72	Accepted
	Continuous internal and external	0	0	11	5	9	3.92	0.90	Accepted
performance management	Improving performance	3	6	6	6	4	3.08	1.28	Accepted
	Identifying opportunities and	0	0	10	8	7	3.88	0.83	Accepted
	Empowering employees	2	3	6	11	3	3.40	1.11	Accepted
Professional development	Research	5	6	4	4	6	3	1.50	Accepted
	Education	1	8	3	7	6	3.36	1.28	Accepted

	Communication networks	2	4	8	8	3	3.24	1.12	Accepted
Organizational development	leadership	4	3	4	5	9	3.48	1.50	Accepted
	Organizational communication	0	0	6	8	11	4.20	0.81	Accepted
	Organizational team	6	3	3	7	6	3.16	1.54	Accepted
	Time management	4	3	3	9	6	3.40	1.41	Accepted
Individual development	Interpersonal communication	2	2	7	5	9	3.68	1.43	Accepted
	Innovation	2	2	6	7	8	3.68	1.24	Accepted
	Professional ethics	4	3	2	10	6	3.44	1.41	Accepted
Educational development	Using workshop tools	4	4	5	8	4	3.16	1.34	Accepted
	Using new technology	3	4	7	4	7	3.32	1.37	Accepted
	Mastery of standard educational content	2	3	6	11	3	3.40	1.11	Accepted
	Aptitude test	0	4	8	5	8	3.68	1.10	Accepted

In the subsequent phase of the Delphi methodology, a survey constructed from the validated elements underwent assessment and scrutiny across a continuum. In the tertiary phase of the Delphi process, the utilization of the One-sample T-test to juxtapose the mean value of each dimension against a benchmark value of 3 indicates that all dimensions finalized during this stage, as delineated in Table 3, were approved.

Table 3. Descriptive index and inferential statistics based on experts' opinions regarding the dimensions of the organizational development model with the organizational agility approach in the third stage

Dimension	Component	Descriptive indices		Inferential indices			Consensus index	Result
		Mean	SD	T	DF	P		
Responsiveness	Response to social change	4.24	0.83	13.98	24	0.001	1.12	Accepted
	Response to environmental changes	3.92	0.90	13.98	24	0.001	1.15	Accepted
	Response to environmental changes	4.04	0.84	18	24	0.001	1.15	Accepted
Flexibility	Flexible work environment	3.88	0.83	18	24	0.001	1.21	Accepted
	Flexible workforce	3.60	0.70	18	24	0.001	1.28	Accepted
	Flexible strategy	3.84	0.80	41	24	0.001	1.27	Accepted
Change	Continuous improvement	3.80	0.86	14.90	24	0.001	1.26	Accepted
	Attitude towards environmental changes	3.88	0.72	14.90	24	0.001	1.24	Accepted
	Continuous internal and external environmental	3.92	0.90	13.22	24	0.001	1.23	Accepted
performance management	Improving performance indicators	3.08	1.28	13.60	24	0.001	1.29	Accepted

	Identifying opportunities and needs of the organization	3.88	0.83	13.52	24	0.001	1.91	Accepted
	Empowering employees	3.40	1.11	33.26	24	0.001	1.56	Accepted
Professional development	Research	3	1.50	21.76	24	0.001	1.57	Accepted
	Education	3.36	1.28	20.13	24	0.001	1.26	Accepted
	Communication networks	3.24	1.12	22.03	24	0.001	1.34	Accepted
Organizational development	leadership	3.48	1.50	19.66	24	0.001	1.26	Accepted
	Organizational communication	4.20	0.81	19.66	24	0.001	1.55	Accepted
	Organizational team	3.16	1.54	13.34	24	0.001	1.32	Accepted
	Time management	3.40	1.41	42.05	24	0.001	1.15	Accepted
Individual development	Interpersonal communication	3.68	1.43	50.04	24	0.001	1.54	Accepted
	Innovation	3.68	1.24	50.04	24	0.001	1.55	Accepted
	Professional ethics	3.44	1.41	26	24	0.001	0.98	Accepted
Educational development	Using workshop tools	3.16	1.34	41	24	0.001	1.12	Accepted
	Using new technology	3.32	1.37	12.02	24	0.001	1.15	Accepted
	Mastery of standard educational content	3.40	1.11	14.12	24	0.001	1.32	Accepted
	Aptitude test	3.68	1.10	26.13	24	0.001	1.42	Accepted

Evaluation of the overall research measurement model (structural equation model)

Table 4 illustrates the comprehensive assessment of the measurement model fit. According to the information presented in this table, the overall model exhibits a satisfactory fit.

Table 4. Fit indices of the overall measurement model

CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMSR	X ² /DF
0.901	0.914	0.051	0.087	2.60
CFI>0.9 TLI>0.9 RMSEA<=0.09 SRMSR<=0.10 X ² = 1640.60 DF=631				

As evidenced by the table 4, all fit indices pertaining to the model fall within the range of optimal values. Consequently, the suitability of the overarching measurement model in aligning with the data acquired from the statistical population is substantiated.

What is the framework of the organizational development model employing an organizational agility approach within the General Department of Education in the province of Sistan and Baluchistan?

In this context, organizational development encompasses four dimensions, while organizational agility similarly comprises four dimensions. The standardized coefficients and their respective rankings in this context are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Organizational development with the organizational agility approach and prioritizing influence in the model

Variable	Dimension	Standardized coefficient	Priority
Organizational development	Professional development	0.814	3
	Organizational development	0.798	7
	Individual development	0.803	5
	Educational development	0.765	8
Organizational agility	Responsiveness	0.829	2
	Flexibility	0.805	4
	change	0.901	1
	Performance management	0.799	6

The data elucidated in Table 5 indicates that the facets of organizational development (specifically, professional development) exhibit the most significant impact coefficients, while the dimensions of organizational agility (pertaining to change) are similarly influential, demonstrating the highest impact coefficients.

Discussion

The findings of the inquiry into the principal objective of formulating a model for organizational development utilizing an organizational agility perspective within the General Department of Education of Sistan and Baluchistan province indicate that the dimensions related to organizational development (specifically, professional development) exhibit the most significant impact coefficients, while the dimensions associated with organizational agility (particularly, adaptability) also demonstrate the highest impact coefficients within influential relationships; this aligns with the research conducted by [Shabani Bahar et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Bashir and Hussan \(2020\)](#). Through a systematic examination of the theoretical underpinnings of this research alongside the findings of other scholars, it becomes evident that organizational development constitutes a deliberate endeavor aimed at fostering a transformation that seeks to empower organizational members to perform their requisite tasks with enhanced efficacy compared to prior performance. Organizational development serves as a mechanism for the advancement of the institution. The principal focus of organizational development is directed toward the human aspects inherent within the organization. The identification of organizational challenges through an understanding of the current state and the enhancement of efficiency via corrective initiatives undertaken within the employer's framework is referred to as action or intervention. Action or intervention comprises a series of methodical and organized endeavors through which specific organizational units engage

in activities designed to facilitate ongoing organizational development. Argeris further articulated intervention as an engagement within an existing system of relationships and connections; it signifies involvement among individuals or entities aimed at providing assistance. Organizational development seeks to align individual and organizational objectives to foster cohesive and effective teams within the workplace, in accordance with the institution's mission and interests. This objective mitigates adverse behaviors and curtails resistance to change within the organization by promoting accountability and voluntary participation in ongoing improvement initiatives. The public sector necessitates agility to a greater extent than the private sector due to the diversity of its clientele and the imperative to satisfy their needs and demands, thereby facilitating development and excellence in terms of speed, quality, and, fundamentally, cost. Empirical evidence indicates that agile governmental institutions realize an enhanced success rate (approximately twenty percent) in executing transformational initiatives relative to their counterparts. Governments that allocate resources towards increased speed, enhanced flexibility, and superior responsiveness are more likely to attain their objectives, as political, social, economic, and technological factors exert rapid influences on governmental operations and decision-making. Consequently, citizens and entrepreneurs demand expedited and specialized services, necessitating the formulation, compilation, and implementation of policies at a pace surpassing that of previous eras; undoubtedly, by undertaking these actions, institutions will achieve success in fulfilling their missions and attaining their organizational objectives.

When an individual is nurtured in all dimensions of his existence such that he possesses mastery over his intellect, emotions, ethics, and physical being, and when confronted with diverse life situations, he selects the most optimal or suitable resolution grounded in his capabilities, knowledge, and experiential background, he can be deemed a distinguished individual. Upon attaining maturity and cultivating his inherent talents, facilitating his advancement, transformation, and renewal, he arrives at a state of self-sufficiency, autonomously navigating the complexities of life. A person of exceptional caliber does not rely on the assistance of others nor does he require oversight or guardianship from external sources. His profound flourishing in existence allows him to render life more manageable and pleasurable through his autonomy. It is imperative to acknowledge that an evolving individual is nurtured within the framework of a progressive organization and concurrently contributes to the organization's development. Analogous to

individuals, the dynamic organization possesses certain characteristics, of which the most salient are delineated as follows. Organizational development constitutes a deliberate endeavor aimed at facilitating a form of transformation, with the objective of equipping organizational members to execute their responsibilities more effectively than previously. Hence, organizational development serves as a conduit for the revitalization and advancement of the organization. Cataloging all initiatives undertaken under the guise of organizational development proves to be a formidable task ([Tajneya et al., 2021](#)).

Organizations must embody a critical attribute, namely the capacity for continuous change and adaptation; in essence, the sustainability and advancement of contemporary organizations is contingent upon their ability to synchronize with rapid changes, development, and growth. Continuous alterations within the environment render development, evolution, and organizational development unavoidable across diverse contexts. Organizations necessitate enhancement, expansion, and organizational development to align with environmental fluctuations. Organizational development is a systematic approach through which an organization augments its internal capabilities to achieve optimal effectiveness and sustain it; in other words, organizational development is a strategy that enhances the performance of the organization's personnel and fundamentally relies on the processes of educating and transforming the values and attitudes of both managers and employees within the organization ([Schneider et al., 2017](#)). The education, enlightenment, and cultivation of individuals as autonomous and self-directed entities, culminating in the delegation of authority for independent leadership devoid of external supervision, constitutes one of the hallmarks of progressive organizations. In light of the research findings and the delineation of the organizational development model utilizing an agile framework within the General Department of Education of Sistan and Baluchistan Province, it is recommended that managers and officials integrate the human resource development strategy into the organizational strategies to foster a unified vision, promote intellectual synergy, and embrace innovative concepts. Furthermore, it is imperative to disseminate the principles of systemic thinking related to the evolving organization among its members and to undertake initiatives aimed at enhancing the agility of the organization.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Ethics statement

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by ethics committee of Islamic Azad University.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the study conception and design, material preparation, data collection and analysis. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Funding

The authors did (not) receive support from any organization for the submitted work.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

- Bashir, A., & Hussan, S. (2020). A Teachers' Perceptions about Continuous Professional Development at Secondary Level: A qualitative Study. *Kashmir Journal of Education*, 2(I), 1-19.
- Burke, W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of management*, 18(3), 523-545.
- Dadashzadeh Asl, M., Kosari, M., & Nobakht, M. B. (2012). The role of effective factors in creating the motivation of academic faculty members of Islamic Azad University, Astara branch. *Quantitative Studies in Management*, 4(4), 215-234.
- Darvishmotevali, M., Altinay, L., & Köseoglu, M. A. (2020). The link between environmental uncertainty, organizational agility, and organizational creativity in the hotel industry. *International journal of hospitality management*, 87, 102499.
- Grieves, J. (2000). Introduction: the origins of organizational development. *Journal of Management Development*, 19(5), 345-447.

- Harraf, A., Wanasika, I., Tate, K., & Talbott, K. (2015). Organizational agility. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 31(2), 675.
- Heydari Amin, F., Hashemiannejad, F., & Sadat Naseri, N. (2023). Identification of Organizational Excellence Dimensions with an Organizational Agility Approach in the Department of Education of Sistan and Baluchestan Province. *Iranian Evolutionary Educational Psychology Journal*, 5(2), 320-331.
- Hosseinzadeh, A., & Safarei, s. (2018). Investigating the Role of Staff Capability in Knowledge Sharing (Case Study: National Organization for Educational Measurement). *Higher Education Letter*, 11(41), 199-218.
https://journal.sanjesh.org/article_31060_0f7a7c25f1d9811b77ae6cf9cf41f073.pdf
- Kazemi Kia, H., Ahmadi, A., & Ahghar, Q. (2017). Model design and validation of organizational agility *Educational Leadership and Management Quarterly*, 12(3), 225-241.
- Lewis, L. (2019). Organizational change. In *Origins and traditions of organizational communication* (pp. 406-423). Routledge.
- Mathur, S., & Gupta, U. (2016). Transforming higher education through digitalization: insights. *Learning*, 3(1), 1-20.
- Mohammadi, S., Nadaf, M., & Roshan, S. (2020). The Impact of Emotional Intelligence and Cultural Intelligence on Resistance to Changing Employees with the Mediating Role of Psychological Capital. *Social Psychology Research*, 10(39), 140-119.
<https://doi.org/10.22034/spr.2020.195157.1238>
- Moradi, N. A., Miri, M., & Mohtadi, M. M. (2021). Presenting a Native Model of Organizational Agility in Industrial Research Centers (Case Study: A Military Research Organization in the Maritime Field). *Journal of Improvement Management*, 14(4), 137-169.
<https://doi.org/10.22034/jmi.2021.126831>
- Parvin, N., Keshavarz, L., Farahani, A., & Rezaei Soufi, M. (2021). Analysis of dimensions and components of professional development of physical education teachers based on grand theory. *Organizational Behavior Management in Sport Studies*, 8(1), 11-28.
<https://doi.org/10.30473/fmss.2021.56796.2241>

- Pettigrew, A. M., Woodman, R. W., & Cameron, K. S. (2001). Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research. *Academy of management journal*, 44(4), 697-713.
- Raimi, L., Akhuemonkhan, I., & Ogunjirin, O. D. (2015). Corporate Social Responsibility and Entrepreneurship (CSRE): antidotes to poverty, insecurity and underdevelopment in Nigeria. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 11(1), 56-81.
- Salehi Omran, E., & Einkhah, F. (2023). Content Analysis of the Document of the Fundamental Transformation of Education in Relation to Vocational and Skills Training. *Educational and Scholastic studies*, 12(2), 37-37. <https://doi.org/10.48310/pma.2023.3034>
- Schneider, A., Wickert, C., & Marti, E. (2017). Reducing complexity by creating complexity: A systems theory perspective on how organizations respond to their environments. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(2), 182-208.
- Shabani Bahar, G. R., Ghareh, M. A., & Siavashi, M. (2020). Designing Structural Model of Development Professional, Organizational and Persona Faculty members of Physical Education and Sports Science. *Applied Research in Sport Management*, 8(4), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.30473/arism.2020.6811>
- Soparnot, R. (2011). The concept of organizational change capacity. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24(5), 640-661.
- Tajneya, J., Honari, H., & Amirtash, A. (2021). Structural Relationships between Organizational Indifference, Organizational Virtue, Organizational Justice and Quality of Work Life of Employees of General Departments of Sports and Youth in Northwestern Province of Iran. *Organizational Behavior Management in Sport Studies*, 8(1), 131-144. <https://doi.org/10.30473/fmss.2021.59940.2319>
- Turner, T. L., Zenni, E. A., Balmer, D. F., & Lane, J. L. (2021). How full is your tank? A qualitative exploration of faculty volunteerism in a national professional development program. *Academic Pediatrics*, 21(1), 170-177.
- Widayati, A., MacCallum, J., & Woods-McConney, A. (2021). Teachers' perceptions of continuing professional development: a study of vocational high school teachers in Indonesia. *Teacher Development*, 25(5), 604-621.