

The Relationship Between Organizational Intelling and Strategic Thinking of Managers: Case Study of Crouse

Hossein Sheikhi and Mehdi Irannejad Parizi
Executive Management Group, Faculty of Management and Economics,
Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch Tehran, Iran

Abstract: The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking of managers in case study of Crouse Company in which 66 managers of the company were selected as the sample from the population of 210, using Cochran formula. In order to collect data, questionnaires for organizational intelligence and strategic thinking with a 5-point Likert scale were developed with demographic variables. Correlation and regression analysis were used to test the hypotheses. Results showed a significant and direct relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking. There is a significant relationship between strategic insight and strategic thinking and this relationship is direct as well. There is a significant and direct relationship between common destiny and strategic thinking. There is a significant and direct relationship between the desire for change and strategic thinking. There is a significant and direct relationship between unity and strategic thinking. There is a significant and direct relationship between the morale and strategic thinking. There is a significant and direct relationship between the use of knowledge and strategic thinking. There is a significant and direct relationship between the pressure of performance and strategic thinking. The results of the regression analysis showed that thinking variable regression in organizational intelligence is statistically significant.

Key words: Organizational intelligence, strategic thinking, crouse companies, regression, variable

INTRODUCTION

Advances in the field of individual intelligence created a major impact in shaping the concept of organizational intelligence. This change is known as to process information and adapting to the new environment (organization) (Salasel *et al.*, 2009).

The first hypothesis was based on the premise that the ability to analyze data and interpret to achieve goals is a similarity that exists between individual and organizational intelligence. So, organizations can use it to adapt people more to the environment. On the other hand, intelligence is a scientific and experimental process that emphasizes the successes or failures of an organization. More precisely, it is based on the experiences that re likely to be used for more efficient performance of the organization (Azma and Mostafapour, 2012). In other words, organizational intelligence enables us to make organizational decisions. organizational intelligence is to have a comprehensive knowledge of all the factors that affect the organization; having in-depth knowledge of all factors such as customers, competitors, the economic environment, operations and organizational processes that affects the quality of management decisions in the organization (Beikzade *et al.*, 2010).

Organizational intelligence is the organization's capacity to mobilize all available intelligence and to centralize this ability to achieve missions (Tekica *et al.*, 2014). On the other hand, for survival and development of organizations, they need to continually improve their performance. Human resources are the capital and source of any fundamental change and innovation in organizations (Ghare *et al.*, 2012).

Most managers believe that organizations need to continually change to survive in changing environmental conditions, so the tendency of managers to run effective and intelligent approaches in organizations is obvious. Organizational intelligence is one of the elements which present managers must have to gain a deep knowledge of all environmental factors and then to make the organization intelligent and as a result, they can better manage their organizations in the volatile and competitive world (Munteana *et al.*, 2014).

Organizational intelligence creates intelligent organization by focusing on understanding of knowledge and learning; an organization that learns to intelligently manage the knowledge. Organizational learning is an essential component of organizational intelligence. In order to increase organizational intelligence, organizations must be able to learn and adapt to new conditions.

Based on the latest evidence and research results, one can say that the organizational intelligence as a mental ability is made up of components that undermines all areas of everyday human life (Nofal and Yusof, 2013).

Understanding organizational intelligence helps to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the organization. In today's extremely competitive, unstable and dynamic world, quality and timeliness of organizational intelligence does not only mean the difference between profit and loss but it also creates the difference between survival and bankruptcy. However, as we go to higher levels of an organization, the importance of organizational intelligence is more than smart intellect rises (Gholami *et al.*, 2011).

Thus, organizational behavior is of importance for manager is an organization in managing to achieve strategic objectives. Managers should take advantage of their mental abilities to think strategically for background of strategic planning in order to achieve organization's objectives (Mohammad *et al.*, 2009).

Generally, strategic thinking is the "insight and understanding of the situation and taking advantage of opportunities". This insight helps to identify the realities of the market and its rules correctly and on time and innovative and value-creating solutions is created to meet these conditions.

Therefore, in this study we tried first to introduce organizational intelligence, one of the new and effective concepts in organizational survival to highlight this scientific concept. Secondly, by finding the relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking of managers and then use organizational intelligence as a criterion for the selection of effective and efficient managers.

Organizational intelligence: Organizational Intelligence is a new concept in the field of organizational management literature and 21st century. Albrecht (2003) explained this concept in his book "the power of the mind at work". Albrecht defined organizational intelligence as an organization's intelligence and capacity in its mental strength and focusing on this mental strength to fulfill organization's objectives. According to Albrecht law, folly could be expressed as organizations threat themselves in addition to competitors and environment organizations threats (Nasabi, 2009).

Karl Albrecht points out three factors of intelligent individual, intelligent communities and intelligent organization for success in business. Various definitions of organizational intelligence has been presented by many experts, some of them are mentioned below.

Glynn believes organizational intelligence is the union and interaction of every member in the organization. Organizational intelligence is a social process by which its theories are based on human intelligence theories (Glynn, 1996). McMaster (1998) defined organizational intelligence in 1998: organizational intelligence is an organization's ability to collect information, innovation, knowledge creation and knowledge-based activities.

Halal (2006) considered intelligence as organization's ability to create and take advantage of the desirable knowledge in accordance with the environmental conditions. According to him, organizational intelligence is organization's capacity for knowledge creation and application of strategies in order to achieve interoperability with the surrounding environment. Halal adds that the ability to process complex information is organizational intelligence. Simic defined organizational intelligence as intellectual ability to solve organizational problems. The consistency of the technical capabilities and human potentials in order to solve problems is focused. Generally, organizational intelligence involves overall information, experience, knowledge and understanding of organizational issues.

Matsuda (1992) is one of the founders of the organizational intelligence theory, he defines organizational intelligence as the combination of two factors: human intelligence and machine intelligence. According to Matsuda, organizational intelligence is defined generally as mental abilities of an organization. So, Matsuda's organizational intelligence has two components as a process as a product.

Organizational intelligence is to have a comprehensive knowledge of all the factors that affect the organization. Having in-depth knowledge of all factors such as customers, the community and the audience, clients and competitors, the economic environment, operations and processes (financial, sales, production, human resources, etc.) that affects the quality of organization's management decisions is called organizational intelligence. Organizational intelligence, enables you to decide on all the factors affecting the companies and organizations.

Albrecht model: Karl Albrecht noted in a book titled "The Power of Minds at Work: Organizational Intelligence in Action" in 2002 that one of the functions of collective intelligence is to avoid folly. According to him, success in business requires three elements of intelligent individual, intelligent communities and intelligent organization. Albrecht defined organizational intelligence as an organization's intelligence and capacity in its mental strength and focusing on this mental strength to fulfill organization's objectives. He considers seven indicators for organizational intelligence.

According to him, the seven indicators are not as a set of behaviors or structural features or specific operational process or method, they are adjectives. Each of these attributes or intelligences have different antecedents and causal factors. Antecedents can include eligible leadership, appropriate products and processes, market demand, integrated missions, vivid goals, core values and policies that determine the rights and behavior of staff. In each indicator, antecedents can be identified that influence maximizing intelligence.

Strategic insight: Any organization needs a concept, a systematical principle and in a definition of its purpose. Leaders of organizations must respond to these questions: Who are we? What are we for? What is our philosophy? Why should people and even people of the world accept us and be grateful for what we do? Strategic insight refers to “the organization’s ability to create, develop and articulate organization’s goals”. The strategic insight default is that leaders are able to express the sense of achievement, develop it and even re-create whenever necessary.

Common destiny: This means that employees are able to reach vision through synergy and reach to this sense that “we are all riding on the same boat.” This sense creates a sense of unity spirit. In reverse, when the people in an organization are without a vision and a shared sense of success, it is not hoped to get the boat to its destination.

Desire for change: In some organizational cultures, performance, thinking and reacting to the environment is matched in a way that any change or evolution indicates a problem and even chaos. While in others, the word “change” suggests, the acquisition of new and exciting trade and in other words it is “a chance to start new work.” People in these environments feel well for the need to re-model business as an exciting challenge and consider it as an opportunity to learn new ways to succeed. In addition, the desire for change and evolution is the driving factor of all the changes that are necessary to achieve the strategic vision.

The desire to work: The desire for participation of employees (more than the standard); social psychologists call the energy that employees spend more than their commitment as “optional effort”. In organizations that the desire to work in employees is low or lost, the staff are engaged only to perform the duties of their job but in organizations that the love to work exist, staff tend to participate at a higher level than what they are expected to.

Unity and agreement: Is the structure and organizational systems and laws and regulations to promote group learning and staff collaboration and ultimately, creating value and achieving the missions in intelligent organizations.

Application of knowledge: Reflects the capacity that the culture and atmosphere of an organization creates to make use of their information and intellectual resources. In this regard, it is appropriate that knowledge learning be considered as a statement of knowledge identity instead of a structural or technological propositions statement. Organizational intelligent includes the free flow of knowledge throughout the organization and the balance between the preservation of valuable information and access of the key elements of organization to this information when required. Supporting and encouraging new ideas and questioning the status quo are the other features of this organizational intelligence aspect.

Performance pressure: It is not enough that only managers be involved or in other words lead to strategic objectives and the results. In an intelligent organization, each individual is accountable for its performance. When people in an organization are expected to be responsible to each other in accordance with their duties and organization’s mission, the culture of “responsibility acceptance” will form. And every new person who would want to join the organization, feels this common sense of people in the organization.

Strategic thinking: Today, strategic thinking is proposed as a very important and valuable element in macroeconomic management in organizations and business systems. Generally, strategic thinking is an “insight and understanding of the situation and taking advantage of opportunities”. This insight helps to identify the realities of the market and its rules correctly and on time and new solutions and valuable solutions can be created for problems (Monavarian *et al.*, 2012). In other words, opportunity is whatever the market has not yet replied to or the need to meet exists in the market and the strategy is to have a plan and think and proper vision. To achieve organizational goals to meet those needs with respect to the interactions as well as disturbances in today's business relations and organizations, strategic thinking enables the manager to understand what is effective in achieving the desired objectives. And how these factors create value for the customer?

This thought is achievable through properly understanding the rules of the market and responding creatively which is very important in today’s unstable and

evolving business environment because without this idea, the organization's efforts to achieve strategies that have been developed will not be effective.

Employees and managers ideas and thoughts in the field of strategic management is known as strategic thinking. According to Mintzberg (1994)'s view, strengthening the strategic thinking leads to better strategies implementing. He believes that managers who are capable of strategic thinking are able to encourage other employees to find innovative solutions for organization's success. They look as organizations in such a way that it should be and not the way it is now. Thus, we can consider strategic thinking as a prelude to future planning. Strategic thinking ability is vital to remain competitive in a turbulent and global environment (Moshabaki and Khazaei, 2008).

However, strategic thinking must be considered in two different but related individual and organizational levels. Organizations which successfully combine these two levels, earn the vital viability in which becomes is an enduring source of competitive advantage for them. Henry Mintzberg, considers strategic thinking as a unified view of the business in mind, Gary Hamel considers it as artistic architecture on the basis of creativity and understanding of business strategy. Ralph Stacey knows it as planning on basis of learning. Each of these interpretations offer a view for this approach without any claim to be a whole expression of the approach (Mintzberg, 1994).

Strategic thinking is divided into individual and organizational levels: (Aghajanian and Rostami, 2013) strategic thinking at the individual level strategic thinking at the individual level consists of three main elements:

- General understanding of the organization and its environment
- Creativity
- Vision for the future

Strategic thinking at the organizational level:

Organizational level provides a context in which one can enjoy individual strategic thinking. Organizations need to create structures, processes and systems that:

- Create ongoing strategic dialogue between the senior management team
- Take advantage of the ingenuity and creativity of all employees (Moshabaki and Khazaei, 2008)

Managers using strategic thinking (Jams, 2010) consider the organization's situation as it is and as it will be. Then, in order to gain competitive advantage in the future market, they re-consider the approaches of using

resources. Strategic thinking will allow managers to assess the cost-benefit risks in their decisions. Strategic thinking answers the questions when it comes to strategic planning.

Strategic thinking can enables us to achieve the desired model through more logical and strategic planning. Models that occasionally can led to a dramatic improvement. Strategic thinking enables managers to understand what is and what is not effective in achieving the desired goal and why and how factors create value for the customer? This insight creates judgment for the factors of value creation.

Strategic thinking is not to predict the future, strategic thinking is early diagnosis of characteristic of competition and opportunities that competitors ignore. Strategic thinking creates a competitive advantage by identifying and strengthening activities that create a unique value for the customer. Strategic thinking appears in the form of simple and deep rules. The rules create certain mental model and will be the daily decisions basis and overall direction of the organization. Strategic thinking creates motivation and commitment for the organization and its stakeholders.

Literature review: Savar and Moghadam (2013) studied the relationship between organizational intelligence and entrepreneurship in manufacturing companies of Gilan province. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational intelligence and entrepreneurship in manufacturing companies of Gilan province. The study is descriptive correlative and the population is the managers of the manufacturing companies. Total 119 of 207 managers were selected as the sample using random sampling technique in 1391. Albrecht Robbins organizational intelligence questionnaire was used for data collection. And after verifying the validity through the content and reliability of the questionnaire through Cronbach's alpha, obtained information were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistical calculations. The results show that there is a significant relationship between each components of organizational intelligence (strategic vision, a common destiny, desire for change, courage, unity and agreement, knowledge application and one should try to create interaction between human resources (as organizational intelligence capita ls) and performance pressure) and entrepreneurship components (creativity, risk taking, independence, motivation, determination and will). The results show, in addition to promoting the intelligent manufacturing tools and attention to technology intelligent tools in manufacturing companies. In this study, the organizational intelligence is considered as an organization's capacity to generate knowledge and using it for strategic fit with environment. The results

showed a significant relationship between organizational intelligence and components of entrepreneurship. The lack of coordination in the ideals of managers and employees of manufacturing companies led to reduced entrepreneurial and organizational performance.

Rahmani and Asgharzade (2013) conducted a study titled. "The Relationship Between Organizational Intelligence and Strategic Thinking of Managers in Business Environment" case study of Qeshm and Sarkhun gas refinery company. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking organizational in 1392. The study population consisted of all managers were in Qeshm Gas Refinery Company; the total number of 40 people were selected as sample. And were studied through Albrecht organizational intelligence questionnaires and strategic management questionnaire. This is a correlation study and the results confirmed the hypothesis of the study that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking of managers.

Lefter *et al.* (2008) conducted a study titled "Organizational Intelligence of Romanian companies; the prospect of human capital" to offer an overview of the position of the Romanian employees according to Albrecht's seven dimensions of organizational intelligence. The research seeks to find the differences between large organizations with >150 employees and small organizations, respectively with the assumption that human resources and organizational culture and leadership differences between the two organizations can significantly affect the perceptions of organizational intelligence and performance. The results show that only 13% of employees in large and medium-sized companies were familiar with the concept of organizational intelligence and small companies' employees do not even know this concept. However, analysis of this study indicates that organizational intelligence was at moderate and higher levels.

Marjani and Soheilipour (2012), concluded in study on "the relationship between intelligence and performance in the basis of Karl Albrecht Model" that there is a relationship between business intelligence and employees' performance.

Mendelsohn showed that the organizational intelligence has strong impact on the financial performance of organizations. Organizations that have high intelligence, enjoy higher growth and profitability. They capture external data and ensure that the right decisions are taken within the organization. Prejmeream found in their research that smart universities have high intelligence and despite their exceptional position, they are exposed to events and changes of environment.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study is descriptive and objectively it is applicable. Since, it examines various factors, it examines the correlations. In this study, library and field methods were used for data collection, in which 66 managers of the company were selected as the sample from the population of 210, using Cochran formula. Through questionnaires of organizational intelligence and strategic thinking, comments and views of employees on the relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking is measured. As well as the reliability through Cronbach's alpha coefficient for organizational intelligence was equal to 0/85 and for strategic thinking it was 0/89. And data analysis was done through Spearman correlation test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The conceptual model

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant relationship between strategic vision and strategic thinking (Table 1). Using Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is confirmed.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant relationship between common destiny and strategic thinking (Table 2). Using Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is confirmed.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant relationship between desire for change and strategic thinking (Table 3). Using Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is confirmed.

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant relationship between morale and strategic thinking (Table 4). Using Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H_0 is rejected and hypothesis H_1 is confirmed.

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant relationship between unity and strategic thinking (Table 5). Using

Table 1: Spearman correlation coefficient test between strategic vision and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	0/073
Level of significant	0/000
Sample value	0/65

Table 2: Spearman correlation coefficient test between common destiny and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	0/074
Level of significant	0/000
Sample value	65

Table 3: Spearman correlation coefficient test between desire for change and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	0/032
Level of significant	0/000
sample value	65

Table 4: Spearman correlation coefficient test between morale and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	0/060
Level of significant	0/000
sample value	65

Table 5: Spearman correlation coefficient test between unity and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	0/075
Level of significant	0/000
sample value	65

Table 6: Spearman correlation coefficient test between knowledge application and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	038/0
Level of significant	000/0
sample value	65

Table 7: Spearman correlation coefficient test between performance pressure and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	038/0
Level of significant	000/0
sample value	65

Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H₀ is rejected and hypothesis H₁ is confirmed.

Hypothesis 6: There is a significant relationship between knowledge application and strategic thinking (Table 6). Using Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H₀ is rejected and hypothesis H₁ is confirmed.

Table 8: Summary of model results

Model summary				
Model	Correlation coefficient	Determination coefficient	Adjusted determination coefficient	Estimation standard error
1	0/a331	0/110	0/007	0/56213

*Predictors: constant, common destiny, strategic vision, desire to change, courage, unity and agreement, knowledge application, performance pressure

Table 9: Results of multi-variable regression analysis of thinking value in organizational intelligence sub-components

Model	Index of changes	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean square	F	Significance level
1	Regression	1/000	7	0/00	34	0/000
	Remaining	1/00	57	0/007		
	Total	2/00	64	-		

Table 10: Spearman correlation coefficient test of organizational intelligence and strategic thinking

Variables	Values
Correlation	0/048
Level of significant	0/000
sample value	65

Hypothesis 7: There is a significant relationship between performance pressure and strategic thinking (Table 7). Using Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H₀ is rejected and hypothesis H₁ is confirmed. Main hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational intelligence and strategic thinking.

As can be seen, correlation coefficient, determination coefficient, adjusted determination coefficient, estimation standard error are shown in in Table 8, it can be said that the correlation of thinking variable in a linear combination of entered variables into the equation is equal to 0/331. The determination coefficient determination is obtained 0/110 and adjusted determination coefficient is 0/007, i.e., about 11% of the thinking variable variance explained and justified through independent variables of intelligence aspect.

The results of the regression analysis in Table 9 shows that the variable regression in thinking in organizational intelligence sub-components is statistically significant (Sig. = 0/00) and the sub-component determines part of the dependent variable variance. Using Spearman correlation analysis, the results in hypothesis 1 to show that the obtained sig value equal to 0/000 at a significant level of 0/01 and confidence level of 99% is <0/01. Thus, hypothesis H₀ is rejected and hypothesis H₁ is confirmed (Table 10).

CONCLUSION

The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between organizational intelligence and

strategic thinking of managers in case study of Crouse Company in which 66 managers of the company were selected as the sample using Cochran formula. Questionnaires of organizational intelligence and strategic thinking with a 5-point Likert scale were developed with demographic variables to test the hypotheses.

Shapiro Wilk test was used for data normalization test. The results showed that the data were not normally distributed in all aspects of organizational intelligence. As a result, non-parametric tests should be used for hypotheses test (Spearman). After analysis of the questionnaire and the analysis of secondary and primary assumptions, the results showed that there is a significant relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking and this relationship is direct.

REFERENCES

- Aghajanian, S. and M. Rostami, 2013. Determining the elements of strategic thinking structure. *J. Manage. Sci.*, 8: 1-13.
- Albrecht, K., 2003. *The Power of Minds at Work: Organizational Intelligence in Action*. AMACOM, New York, USA., ISBN-13: 9780814407370, Pages: 260.
- Azma, F. and M.A. Mostafapour, 2012. Business intelligence as a key strategy for development organizations. *Procedia Technol.*, 1: 102-106.
- Beikzade, J., M.B. Alayi and K. Eskandari, 2010. The investigation of the relationship between organizational intelligence of managers with their performance in state organizations of Azarbayijan Sharghi province. *Manage. Res.*, 3: 143-163.
- Ghare, M., M. Ferdowsi and F.S. Marashian, 2012. The relationship between intelligence and its components with the job performance of managers in physical education and sports institutions of Ahvaz. *Manage. Applied Res. Biol. Sci. Sports*, 2: 73-80.
- Gholami, S., H. Ghafourian and D. Manavipour, 2011. Business intelligence and performance management relationship. *Ind./Organiz. Psychol. News*, 2: 89-99.
- Halal, W.E., 2006. *Organizational Intelligence*. Melcrum Publishing Ltd., London, UK.
- Jams, I., 2010. Entrepreneurial strategic thinking for nonprofit organizations. <http://ijayconsulting.com/downloads/entrepreneurial-strategic-thinking.pdf>.
- Lefter, V., M. Prejmerean and S. Vasilache, 2008. The dimensions of organizational intelligence in Romanian companies-a human capital perspective. *Theoret. Applied Econ.*, 10: 39-52.
- Marjani, A.B. and M. Soheilipour, 2012. The relationship between organizational intelligence and staff performance based on the model of Karl Albrecht (the case of Iran branch, China national petroleum company). *Int. J. Bus. Social Sci.*, 3: 152-158.
- Matsuda, T., 1992. Organizational intelligence: It's significance as a process and as a product. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Economics, Management and Information Technology*, August 31-September 4, 1992, Tokyo, Japan.
- McMaster, M.D., 1998. Organizational intelligence. <http://www.parshift.com/Speakers/Speak011.htm>.
- Mintzberg, H., 1994. The fall and rise of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Rev.*, 72: 107-114.
- Mohammad, J., Y. Gholami and M. Saif, 2009. The relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational learning among staff and faculty members of Azad university and providing a model to promote organizational learning, leadership and management. *Azad Univ. J. Garmsar Branch*, 3: 63-86.
- Monavarian, A., H. Aghazadeh and M. Shahamatnezhad, 2012. Assessment of strategic thinking in Tehran municipality directors. *Bus. Manage.*, 4: 129-146.
- Moshabaki, A. and A. Khazaei, 2008. Elements of strategic thinking in Iranian organizations. *J. Bus. Manage.*, 1: 105-118.
- Muntean, M., L.G. Cabau and V. Rinciog, 2014. Social business intelligence: A new perspective for decision makers. *Procedia-Social Behav. Sci.*, 124: 562-567.
- Nasabi, N.S., 2009. The relationship between organizational intelligence and creativity in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences in 1387. *Proceedings the 3rd Conference of Human Resource Empowerment, (HRE'09)*, Human Resource Empowerment Foundation, Tehran, Iran.
- Nofal, M.I. and Z.M. Yusof, 2013. Integration of business intelligence and enterprise resource planning within organizations. *Procedia Technol.*, 11: 658-665.
- Rahmani, Z. and M. Asgharzade, 2013. The relationship between organizational intelligence and strategic thinking in business environment (Case study: Sorkhun and Qeshm gas refinery company). *Proceedings the 1st National Conference on Business Management, (BM'13)*, Hamadan, Iran.
- Salasel, M., M. Kamkar and M. Golparvar, 2009. The relationship of intelligence and its components with organizational citizenship behaviors of Ehya company employees. *Knowledge Res. Applied Psychol.*, 11: 26-37.
- Savar, H.A.R. and E.M. Moghadam, 2013. The relationship between organizational intelligence and entrepreneurial issues in companies of Gilan province. *Dev. Technol. Parks Incubators J.*, 9: 24-36.
- Tekic, Z., M. Drazic, D. Kukolj and M. Vitas, 2014. From patent data to business intelligence-PSALM case studies. *Procedia Eng.*, 69: 296-303.