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Abstract

Today, increase in productivity, is one of the most effective ways to achieve economic growth. In fact, an efficient and skilled manpower is the most important asset and wealth of every country. The purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between the elements (dimensions) of organizational health and the productivity of manpower. After determining the validity and reliability, the standard questionnaire of OHI and Feldman’s organizational health (1996) and the Hersy and Goldsmith’s Workforce Productivity (1980) were used. This research has studied 150 employees of the National Iranian Oil Products Distribution Company (NIOPDC) in Bushehr region which after the census 117 employees returned their questionnaires. After analyzing the data with the help of SPSS19 Software, Regression Analysis, and Pearson Correlation Coefficient, it was found that a positive and significant relationship exists between the organizational health and the productivity of manpower. Among the seven dimensions of organizational health, "institutional unity“ and "morale”, respectively, have had the greatest impact on the productivity of manpower.
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Introduction

In the past decade, different economic theories have created a revolution in organizational operations. This revolution has affected the traditional forms of asset, such as buildings and equipment and has raised new forms of asset. These intangible assets play a large role in the development and growth of organizations. The term asset, day by day, includes more variables. Some of them, for example, are human capital, customer capital, intellectual capital, and health capital (Nazari, 2009).

Organizations do not operate in a vacuum rather they are constantly influenced by internal and external factors and pressures which are imposed upon them. In the past, there was a risk-free environment and so a greater security for the organizations. But, today is different. The present world is a world of change and transformation (Sharifzadeh and Mohammadimoghdam, 2009).

In today's competitive world, as a philosophy based on improvement strategy, productivity is the most important goal of any organization. As a chain, it can encompass the overall activities of all the sectors in the society. The mission of management and the main objective of organizational management is the efficient use of various resources such as: labor, capital, materials, energy, and information (Allahverdi, et al, 2010).

Given these circumstances, today's manpower productivity has become a decisive factor, because the existence and survival of any organization is consistent with the achievement of productivity. In order to apply to improve its efficiency, it is important for an organization to first identify the necessary factors, and then follow the appropriate action according to their importance (Goudarzi and Attaiee, 2009).

It should be noted that organizational change would have some consequences or implications. Thus, each organization which is faced with such change must deal with its implications appropriately. Perhaps the most profound change affecting individuals are changes in the beliefs, values, and assumptions which would leave an impact on the performance of the individuals and ultimately on the health of the organization (Tofighi, et al, 2011).

A healthy organization is that organization which is capable of both achieving its efficiency and overcoming the barriers (Ghorbani, et al, 2012). The health of an organization shows the useful interpersonal links among the employees in work environment. Besides, by creating positive environment in workplace, incentives for success, and similar set of values in employees, healthy organizations can accomplish their goals and missions (Savas and Karakus, 2012). The management's role, as a major factor in the creation and promotion of organizational health, is particularly important (Sharyatmadari, 2009). Since paying heed to the dimensions of the health of an organization can help the organization to achieve productivity, lack of such attention can lead to inefficiency; hence every organization must pay special attention to the dimensions of organizational health.

Thus, based on the aforementioned, the present study tries to examine the relationship between dimensions of organizational health and productivity of manpower. The overall aim of this article is to answer the following question: Does a significant link exist between dimensions of organizational health and productivity of manpower?
Review of Literature

Although many studies have been taken to examine the relations of organizational health with other variables or over the relations of manpower productivity with different variables, no study has been conducted on the role of organizational health in the productivity of manpower so far. With this introduction, a theoretical overview of the article will be presented in the following manner.

Organizational Health

The term "organizational health" was first used in 1969 by Miles. He defines a healthy organization as, "not only lasts within its own environment but also for a very long period of time completely adopts itself and continuously develop and expand its techniques of survival and adaptation." What is clear in this definition is that a healthy organization successfully deals with the deterrent external factors and directs these forces effectively and consistently toward the goals of the organization (Salarzahi et al, 2012). Based on the World Health Organization's definition of health, Brown in 2001 presented an innovative definition of organizational health. He defines "health" in three dimensions of physical, mental and social states. According to Brown, the physical health of an organization means a healthy structure, design, power exercise, communication processes, and division of labor (Tofighi, et al, 2011). In an article by Ranj doubt and Mirzaei (2012), exchange of information, organizational commitment, flexibility and creativity, are referred to as characteristics of a healthy organization. Also, according to feffer 2001, the term "healthy organization" is referred to those organizations in which there is a fair manpower relationship not only among the employees but also between the executive managers and the employees. These executive managers, feffer believes, behave more like leaders than chiefs or directors (Ansari, et al, 2009).

"Organizational health" almost is a new concept and it includes the ability of an organization to perform its functions, to effectively grow and improve itself. In fact, a healthy organization is where employees intend to stay and work in there and act as useful and efficient personnel (Khalesi, et al, 2012). Organizational health, as well as, has been defined as the ability of organization to adapt to its environment, to create harmony among its members, and to achieve the goals (Cemaloğlu, 2007). Parsons (1967) suggests that there are three levels of control: technical, organizational, and managerial. He concludes that healthy organizations possess all these three levels of control (Savas and Karakus, 2012).

Herzberg considers that the following factors such as employees' attitudes and perceptions, governance practices, policy organization, nature and extent of supervision, job security, working conditions, status, salary level, employees' personal life, and mutual relations among supervisors, colleagues and subordinate staff, are significant in maintaining a healthy organization. He believes that lack of such factors can make employees dissatisfied who may finally quit. This can put the existence of an organization at risk (Sharyatmadari, 2009). Another factor that has been proposed is the culture of organizational health which has a positive impact on the promotional activities of organizational health (Wen Lin, 2013).
Dimensions of Organizational Health

Leiden and Klingle (2006) have provided eleven separate but interrelated dimensions for organizational health, these are: communication, participation and involvement, loyalty and commitment, morale, organizational reputation, ethics, appreciation of the performance, goal setting, leadership, development and utilization of resources (Ansari, et al, 2009).

In their study, Tofighi and others (et al, 2011), write about seven dimensions, these are: organizational knowledge, employee's morale, healthy work environment, planning and organizing, teamwork, employee's involvement, and organizational effectiveness.

According to Hoy and Miskel (2008), there are seven dimensions for organizational health.

1) Institutional unity: organization's ability to adapt to the environment to maintain unity, cohesion, and integrity of their programs.

2) Management influence: manager's ability to influence his superiors, urging them to pay more attention to the problems of the organization, preventing administrative barriers and hierarchy, and independence from the superiors; this is efficiency in leadership.

3) Considerations: it refers to the manager's leadership behavior which is friendly and open. It is a reflection behavior which includes respect, mutual trust, cooperation and support.

4) Structure: it is about the behavior of manager in determining the working relations with employees, job expectations, performance standards, and methods of work.

5) Support sources: providing basic materials used in an organization.

6) Morale: it refers to a sense of friendliness, openness, and mutual trust among the members.

7) Scientific emphasis: a state that an organization seeks excellence and strives for achieving scientific and cultural excellence (Salarzahi et al, 2012).

Manpower Productivity

Today, productivity is more than an economic measure in the assessment of the socioeconomic activities and efforts. Its elevation has great effects on other economic phenomena (Mousavi & Sadeghi, 2011). In the present era, productivity is regarded as a method, concept, and attitude about work and life (Pedram, 2011). Put differently, productivity is about an optimal use of the available resources to achieve the specified goals (Alvani, et al, 2012). Since one of the most important factors of reducing or increasing the organizational productivity is the human resource factor, one of the issues that will concern the managers of leading organizations in the coming decades, is the attempt to increase the professional productivity of their employees (Ansari and Aliabadi, 2009). According to Alfred Marshall, the most valuable investment is investment in the development of manpower. In the history of productivity, at the beginning, little attention was paid to the "manpower or human resource productivity" and most of the developments in the field of productivity were called as "capital productivity". However, changing the approach to human resources and care for it was resulted from a shift of traditional human resource management to strategic management of human resources. The strategic management of human
resources emphasizes that the strategic role that human resource plays can increase the efficiency of organizations (Sharifzadeh & Mohammadimoghadam, 2009).

To improve productivity and efficiency, first of all, the foremost factors affecting the productivity of manpower must be studied. The most important factors affecting the productivity of manpower can be classified in the following way: education, training, work experience, management quality, investment in equipment, technology, and social environment (Ansari & Aliabadi, 2009).

In their research, Karimi and Pirasteh (2003), write that the value of fixed assets per employee, organizational development, and personnel training, are the important factors affecting labor (manpower) productivity. In a different study, Mehrabian and others (2011) regard the following as significant factors affecting labor (manpower) productivity: organizational support, clarification and documentation, good services, willingness and motivation of the employees, creditability of the decisions, employee's empowerment, and leadership style.

Conceptual Model and Hypotheses

After the literature review and theoretical overview, the research's conceptual model (table 1) will be presented as under. The variable dimensions of organizational health have been taken into consideration according to the views of Hoy and Miskel (2008).
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**Table 1: Research’s conceptual model**

Based on the conceptual model the hypotheses are as follows:
Primary Hypothesis

There is a significant relationship between the organizational health of the National Iranian Oil Products Distribution Company (NIOPDC) in Bushehr region and the organizational productivity (efficiency).

Secondary Hypotheses

1) There is a significant relationship between institutional unity and manpower (labor) productivity.
2) There is a significant relationship between management's influence and manpower (labor) productivity.
3) There is a significant relationship between management's consideration and manpower (labor) productivity.
4) There is a significant relationship between structure and manpower (labor) productivity.
5) There is a significant relationship between support sources and manpower (labor) productivity.
6) There is a significant relationship between the employees' morale and manpower (labor) productivity.
7) There is a significant relationship between scientific emphasis and manpower (labor) productivity.

Methodology

This study is descriptive and based on correlative method. For information on theoretical foundations and review of literature, library method is followed. In this respect, various sources such as, books, journals, articles, and websites related to organizational health and productivity of manpower, were utilized.

The statistical population includes a group of individuals or entities that at least share one common characteristic (Sarmad, et al, 2009, p.177). Therefore, the statistical population studied in this research was all the employees (150 individuals) of the NIOPDC in Bushehr Province.

Statistical sample means a limited number of targeted population; this sample represents the main features of a society. In this study, due to the low number of the participants the census method is used; 117 questionnaires were returned.

Data required for this study were collected from two methods:

A) Library method: To collect information about literature review and research review, books, articles, Internet, and databases were used.
B) Field method: In this manner, questionnaires were distributed to the targeted population and necessary information about the management's leadership style and the rate of employees' organizational learning, were obtained.

Tools & Data Collection Method

1) **Questionnaire for Personal information:** Based on the need of the research the questionnaires collected included personal data relating to gender, age, educational qualification, and work experience of the participants.

2) **Questionnaire for organizational health:** tools of the research include the revised questionnaire of organizational health instrument (OHI) of Hoy and Feldman (1996) which Sharifi (2010) had previously assessed its reliability and validity in his own research project and obtained 96 percent of Cronbach's alpha's coefficient. There are 44 questions in this questionnaire which, with the help of five-point Likert scale (always, often, sometimes, rarely, never), it assesses the components of institutional unity, management influence, considerations, structure, support sources, morale, and scientific emphasis.

3) **Questionnaire for manpower productivity:** this questionnaire is based on the Achieve model which was presented by Hersy and Goldsmith in 1980. This questionnaire, with 26 questions, via Likert scale, assesses seven dimensions of manpower's productivity model.

Reliability and Validity of Survey Instrument

Despite the usage of the studies conducted in the country to determine the validity of organizational learning questionnaire, views of the experts and university professors also has been taken into account and according to the consensus of opinions this questionnaire has validity. Moreover, to determine the reliability, the method of Cronbach's alpha was used. The obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the organizational health and manpower (labor) questionnaires were 86.1 % and 86.4 %, respectively.

Data Analysis: Demographics

Based on the 117 sample questionnaires, the following demographics obtained:
First, data were collected and summarized and then their normality (abnormality) was examined. To examine the normality of the obtained data, Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test was applied. The results are presented in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognizing Population Variable</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>30 to 40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work experience</strong></td>
<td>Till 5 years</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Normality of the Tested Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Unity</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Morale</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z Asymp. Sig.(2 tailed)</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>2.223</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>2.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUU</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this test, the null implies that the distribution of such data does follow a normal distribution and the opposing hypothesis assuming the contrary. Based on the result of Table 2, the Significance Level of all variables is less than % 5. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected and the opposite assumption is confirmed. Hence, it can be said that the distribution of the obtained data from the questionnaires, is abnormal. For this reason, to test the hypotheses, Spearman's Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Variable Regression Analysis were applied in a step-wise manner.

First Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "organizational health" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr Province.

Table 3: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about organizational health and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Health</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>There is a Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data of Table 3, it is considered that in the Significance Level (.000) the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient between organizational health and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr is .808. Therefore, there is a significant positive correlation between these two variables. So, with confidence over %99, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is a direct relationship between "organizational health" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Second Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "organizational institutional unity" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.
Table 4: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about institutional unity and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>There is a Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in Table 4 confirms that in the Significance Level (.000) the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient between organizational institutional unity and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr is .881. So, there is a significant positive correlation between these two variables. Thus, with confidence over %99, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is a direct relationship between organizational health and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Third Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "management influence" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Table 5: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about management influence and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Influence</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>There is a Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data of Table 5, in the Significance Level (.001) the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient between management influence and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr is .292. Thus, with confidence over %99, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is a direct relationship between Management Influence and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Fourth Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "considerations" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.
Table 6: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about considerations and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>There is no Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Significance Level .140 is larger than .05, so it can be said that there is no significant relationship between "considerations" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Fifth Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "structure" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Table 7: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about structure and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>There is a Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in table 7 indicate that in the Significance Level (.000) the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient between "structure" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr is .426. Thus, with confidence over %99, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is a direct, significant, and positive relationship between "structure" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Sixth Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "support sources" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.
Table 8: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about support sources and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Sources</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>There is a Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in table 8 show that in the Significance Level (.000) the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient between "support sources" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr is .595. Thus, with confidence over %99, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is a direct, significant, and positive relationship between "support sources" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Seventh Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "working morale" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Table 9: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about working morale and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Morale</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>There is a Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents that in the Significance Level (.000) the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient between "working morale" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr is .884. Therefore, with confidence over %99, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is a direct and significant relationship between "working morale" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

Eighth Hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between "scientific emphasis" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.
Table 10: A summary of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test about scientific emphasis and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Variable</th>
<th>Second Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Emphasis</td>
<td>Productivity of Manpower</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>There is a Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presents that in the Significance Level (.000) the Spearman's Correlation Coefficient between "scientific emphasis" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr is .472. Therefore, with confidence over %99, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is a direct and significant relationship between "scientific emphasis" and productivity of manpower at NIOPDC in Bushehr.

In this study, in order to explain the role of each component of organizational health on manpower (labor) productivity, the model of Multiple Linear Regression has been applied in stepwise manner. In this analysis, elements of organizational health have been regarded as predictor variable and those of manpower productivity have been considered as criterion variable. It should be noted that in the stepwise Regression model, the order of entry of variables is based on the correlation coefficient. The results of these tests are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Stepwise Regression Model related to the contribution of each component of organizational health on manpower productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R 2</th>
<th>Adjusted R 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutional Unity</td>
<td>.933  a</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>766.725</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Working Morale</td>
<td>.948  b</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>500.658</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see in the above table in Step 1, due to its high correlation coefficient, the variable of institutional unity has entered into Regression Equation with dependent variable and has explained % 87.1 of the variance in manpower productivity which with reference to F it can be observed that 766.725 amount of this explained variance in Step 1 is in .000 Significance Level.
In Step 2, due to its high correlation coefficient, the variable of working morale has entered into Regression Equation with dependent variable and has brought R 2 to % 89.9 and has increased explanatory power to % 7.2. With reference to the amount 500.658 in F section, this much of explained-variance in the Significance Level of Step 2 is .000. Since other variables were less correlated with dependent variable they enjoyed weak explanatory power. Thus, they were removed from the model.

**Conclusions and Suggestions**

Nowadays, productivity or efficiency, especially manpower productivity has become an undeniable necessity. In order to survive and compete, organizations need productivity without which they become weak (Shahgholian, 2009). In this study, the views of Hoy and Miskel (2008), consisting of seven dimensions, were applied for organizational health. These dimensions have referred to the following: institutional unity pointing at organizational ability to environmental compatibility; management's influence referring to ability in controlling the subordinates; structure dimension refers to the management's behavior in defining the relations; support dimension refers to the support of resources in providing basic materials; morale dimension talks of sense of friendly spirit; the dimension of considerations considering the openness and mutual trust among the members of organization; and, scientific emphasis focuses on scientific excellence (Bahrami, et al, 2010).

The findings indicate that there is a positive and significant relationship between organizational health and productivity of manpower. However, except for "considerations", all other dimensions of organizational health have had a significant positive relationship with productivity of manpower. Among the different dimensions of organizational health, only "institutional unity" and "morale" have had the highest correlation with manpower productivity. However, in regard with the findings of this study, to improve the quality of working life and organizational health as well as to increasing the manpower efficiency, the following suggestions are presented as under.

1) If the information on manpower productivity is delivered accurately, relevantly, and timely employees would be less likely exposed to adverse health conditions.
2) To be a healthy organization, management support should be extended to the employees and organizational goals should be clear and transparent.
3) In order to have a dynamic and stimulating organization there is a need for holistic and systematic approach to the system from the management. Management should be capable of mobilizing all the elements of the organization to reach manpower productivity, to achieve organizational productivity.
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