

# Organizational Agility among Academic Leaders at Umm Al-Qura University & Ajloun National University: Faculty Members' Perspective

Amjad Mahmoud Daradkah<sup>1,\*</sup>, Turki Kdims Alotaibi<sup>2</sup>, Sameer Subae Fadhallah<sup>2</sup> and Hazem Ali Badarneh<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Ajloun National University, Ajloun, Jordan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia

<sup>3</sup>Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan

Received: 2 Feb. 2023, Revised: 25 Apr. 2023, Accepted: 10 May 2023.

Published online: 1 Jun. 2023

**Abstract:** The paper pinpoints organizational agility among academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the faculty members' various perspectives according to gender, university, faculty, academic rank, and the number of years of experience. The descriptive approach is used to achieve the research objectives. The research sample consists of (475) randomly selected faculty members. A 17-item questionnaire is used as a research instrument. The findings indicate that the degree of organizational agility is medium with a mean of (3.25) without statistically significant differences due to the university and faculty variables. The results also show differences due to the variables of gender, academic rank, and number of years of experience in favor of males, the two categories of assistant professor, professor, and the category of 5-10 years, respectively. Given these findings, the research recommends enabling employees to participate in decision-making and use modern techniques and mechanisms that contribute to developing work and evaluating work environments.

**Keywords:** Organizational Agility, Umm Al-Qura University, Ajloun National University, faculty members.

## 1 Introduction

The rapid and significant changes are a feature of the developments that the world is facing today, as these changes can be observed in all aspects of life, especially in the university environment, which can be considered one of the most affected institutions by these changes. The changes have intensified the competition among these universities, as these universities have faced many shifts in their academic programs, policies, and learning and teaching methods. Bearing in mind that human capital is the most important factor in the success of the organization with the increase in the degree of progress and technology, the significance of preserving it remains a major challenge facing the organization on an ongoing basis, which will push it to adopt flexibility as its approach.

In this vain, organizational agility is one of the most appropriate solutions in this domain in terms of reducing procedures, responding quickly to the changes surrounding the work environment, whether internal or external, using innovative methods to face future challenges, and investing in opportunities that raise the efficiency and effectiveness of work, and thus open to the external environment can be easier. The distance from centralization is also evident in the involvement of workers in it, and therefore this will undoubtedly lead to an improvement in the quality of work life, which in turn works on a balance between family and work life for workers, and this is the key to success for the individual (*Al-Otaibi, 2022*).

Organizational agility (OA) is one of the strategies that support the speed of response and flexibility in adapting and harmonizing with the environments of the institutions. However, the speed of response and flexibility to achieve organizational goals does not only require transforming institutions into agile ones, but it is necessary to work on building and enhancing their impact by making human resources more ready when performing work (*Al-Zamil & Al-Dosari, 2021*). Abdelwahhab (2011) has emphasized that organizational agility is necessary to face daily events and stimuli at work, especially since work in universities carries many surprises, stimuli, and pressures on one hand. On the other hand, Al-Sanea (2013) believes that it is one of the requirements for adapting to work requirements in a changing environment.

Agility is reflected in facing changes and uncertainty in the surrounding environment, which is one of the inherent features

\*Corresponding author e-mail: [amdaradkah@yahoo.com](mailto:amdaradkah@yahoo.com)

of organizations. Agility within the institution aims to understand and identify basic competencies and capabilities on the first hand. On the other hand, agility outside the institution aims to interpret the environment clearly and identify competing institutions (*Al-Kubaisi & Nuri, 2013; Youssef & Yassin, 2021*). Organizational agility can be utilized to achieve rapid success and invest in changes for the benefit of the organization. Agility in itself is an organizational necessity thanks to the dynamism of academic work; therefore, organizational agility for the university must be a culture understood and adhered to by all employees (*Al-Zamil & Al-Dosari, 2021*).

Organizational agility consists of three important dimensions related to the decisions of any organization in the world. The first dimension is orientation, which relies on continuous monitoring of the internal and external environments to identify and evaluate changes in “external” social trends, such as changes in competitor behavior and new technology on one hand. On the other hand, the internal trends and changes include workforce, expansion challenges, or R&D outputs (*Kristensen & Shafiee, 2019*). Orientation capabilities require quickly identifying external changes proactively to take advantage of these changes and exploit them as opportunities, depending on previous experience and knowledge (*Karlstedt & Hellenborg, 2020*).

Decision-making agility, which is the second dimension, is represented in the ability to collect, accumulate, structure, and evaluate information according to various sources to explain the implications of business without delay. Decision-making requires several interrelated activities that explain many events and identify opportunities and threats in the surrounding environment to seize opportunities and reduce the impact of threats (*Nafei, 2016*). The third dimension represented in response agility “application” depends on the organization's ability to respond by changing its practices, structures, human and material resources, operations, products, or services by mobilizing and transforming resources to respond to the opportunities oriented by the organization (*Deksny 2018*). Orientation and response capabilities are interrelated, as organizations are unable to orient effectively, and at this time the response will be ineffective and opportunities and resources will be lost. Therefore, orientation and response capabilities must be aligned to capture opportunities effectively (*Trinh, Molla, & Peszynski, 2012*). With this detailed introduction, the literature review and research problem are provided in the next sections.

## 2 Literature Review

Studies and scholarship related to Organizational agility and its impact on managers, leaders, and employees are still few. In a related study, Omar (2020) aims at identifying suggestions for improving organizational agility practices. The descriptive approach is adopted as a research method to achieve the research objectives. The questionnaire is used as a research instrument applied to a sample of (79) faculty members. The findings indicate the necessity to spread an organizational culture that promotes response to surrounding variables and proactive decision-making to confront and exploit surrounding changes and give the administrative staff more power to make decisions in their field of work.

Moreover, Mansour (2020) aims to identify the requirements for developing administrative performance at the Faculty of Education at Mansoura University in light of the organizational agility approach (OAA) from the point of view of faculty members and present a vision for activating administrative performance. The descriptive approach is used to achieve the research objectives. The questionnaire is used as a research instrument applied to a sample of (73) faculty members. The findings indicate that the faculty member's evaluation of the administrative performance came at a medium degree, offering a proposed vision for the development of administrative performance in light of the organizational agility approach.

On a parallel line, Youssef and Yassin (2021) aim at identifying the role of organizational agility in managing organizational conflict at Al-Hadbaa University College. The descriptive and correlative approach is used to achieve the research objectives. The questionnaire is used as a research instrument applied to a sample of (45) faculty members. The findings show that the levels of organizational agility and organizational conflict in the college are of an acceptable degree, with a correlation between organizational agility and methods of organizational conflict management.

Al-Zamil and Al-Dosari (2021) aimed at identifying the reality of organizational agility, obstacles to its application, and methods to improve it at Princess Noor bint Abdulrahman University in Riyadh. The descriptive and analytical approach is used to achieve the research objectives. The questionnaire is used as a research instrument applied to a sample of (100) university employees. The results indicate that the reality of organizational agility at Princess Noura bint Abdulrahman University is of a high degree. The findings show that the university does not face obstacles in the application of organizational agility, such as the ignorance of some administrative units of decision-making mechanisms and the lack of enjoyment of the elements of adaptation to environmental changes, for the level of these obstacles is medium. The results show that the most prominent methods used to activate and improve organizational agility are the use of information systems in decision-making and educating leaders about managing technical knowledge and the university's reliance on a high-speed and high-quality information and communication network.

In the same mood, Al-Nashili (2022) confirms that modern organizations are always looking for agility because they are facing increasing pressure to search for new techniques of effective competition. Organizational agility enhances the provision of high-quality services, and thus agility becomes an important factor in the productivity of the organization, in addition to the need of many organizations in the work environment for strategies to adapt to rapid changes.

Al-Aqraa and Ashour (2022) aim to investigate the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational agility and find out if there is a role for demographic variables; gender, educational qualification, number of years of experience, and job title towards the impact of organizational commitment on orientation agility at the Directorate of Education in Qalqilya Governorate, Palestine. The descriptive, correlative, and analytical approach is used to achieve the research objectives. The questionnaire is used as a research instrument applied to a sample of (66) randomly selected male and female university employees. The results confirm the presence of a moderately direct relationship between the effect of organizational commitment on organizational agility in the Directorate of Education. The results confirm that the responses of the study sample towards the impact of organizational commitment on organizational agility at the Directorate of Education in Qalqilya Governorate are high in areas related to orientation agility and the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational agility with a percentage between (70) and (79%) and medium in areas related to decision-making agility with a percentage between (60) and (69%).

### 3 Problem Statement

The adoption of the approach of organizational agility among universities is on the rise as a suitable method for accepting and adapting to changes in the university environment. However, several universities face obstacles that limit the application of organizational agility because the application of organizational agility must be carried out according to organized steps and procedures. The university should follow realistic and flexible policies and goals, and prepare activities that are compatible with those goals. At the Arab level, the universities face great challenges in light of their efforts to keep pace with the plans that aim to implement them to confront these obstacles, in addition to the volume of changes and the intensity of competition witnessed by universities, which requires that there be an urgent and actual need to investigate the degree of application of organizational agility.

Organizational agility is one of the strategies that support the speed of response and flexibility in adapting to the organization's environments (*Al-Salhi, Al-Saqal & Al-Sultani, 2021*). The results of Mansour's study (2020) indicate that the approach to organizational agility enhances administrative performance in universities and gives leaders mechanisms to solve problems and face future challenges. Organizational agility is, therefore, one of the strategies that support the speed of response and flexibility in adapting and harmonizing with the university environments, as it can benefit from modern administrative concepts and employ them within its practice in an attempt to improve its organizational effectiveness. Accordingly, the research problem is reflected in examining the reality of the organizational agility of the academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the point of view of faculty members.

#### 3.1 Research Questions

Given the research problem, the research questions are:

1. What is the reality of the organizational agility of academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the perspective of faculty members?
2. Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between the means of responses of faculty members to the reality of organizational agility among academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University due to the variables of gender, university, faculty, academic rank, and the number of years of experience?

#### 3.2 Research Objectives

The following objectives are articulated to answer the research questions.

1. Identify the reality of the organizational agility of academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the perspective of faculty members.
2. Fine out if there are statistically significant differences at the significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between the means of responses of faculty members to the reality of organizational agility among academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University due to the variables of gender, university, faculty, academic rank, the and number of years of experience.

#### 3.3 Significance of the Research

The significance of the research is reflected in its title, research problem, and scope of research, which is the organizational agility of academic leaders, since achieving this quality in the university environment, is a goal that universities today seek to accomplish, along with being one of the modern topics that need more research, analysis, and investigation. The current study draws its significance from the strength of the existing topic, as the study deals with a significant and vital topic in

administrative thought represented by organizational agility and its role in developing the university education management system and improving its administrative environments.

What is more, this study may help officials in universities and those in charge of the educational development process to identify the reality of organizational agility among academic leaders to contribute to increasing the effectiveness of teaching and learning, improving the university environment, and achieving its goals in this domain. This study is new in the area of educational administration and can enrich Arabic libraries and theoretical literature. It is hoped that this study will benefit academic leaders in making decisions that allow the activation of the practice of organizational agility in universities. Hopefully, this study will be a starting point for other future studies in which other variables will be added. Lastly, it is hoped that this study can play a key role in selecting academic leaders in universities and setting the related codified standards.

### 3.4 Research Terms & Definitions

In this study, the term “organizational agility” is mentioned, and its procedural definition is as follows:

Organizational agility is defined as the ability that requires the use of benefits and opportunities and the positive confrontation of competitive threats that result from large and unexpected changes (*Nouri & Mousawi, 2020, p. 20*). Also, Zitkiene and Deksnys (2018, p. 118) define it as the organizational ability to recognize unexpected changes in the environment and respond appropriately quickly and effectively by using and reshaping internal resources, thus gaining a competitive advantage from this process. Procedurally, it is defined as the degree obtained by the academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University through the faculty members’ responses to the 17-item questionnaire related to organizational agility distributed into 3 domains; orientation agility, decision-making agility, and application agility.

### 3.5 Research Limitations

The findings of this research can be generalized in light of the following limitations:

1. Human Limitations: This research is limited to a sample of faculty members from Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University.
2. Spatial Limitations: This research is conducted at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University.
3. Temporal Limitations: This research is conducted in the first semester of the academic year 2022/2023.
4. Objective Limitations: This research is limited to identifying the organizational agility among academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the faculty members' various perspectives.

The generalization of the findings of the current research is determined by the psychometric characteristics of the research instrument in terms of validity and reliability.

## 4 Method and Procedures

### Research Approach

The analytical descriptive approach is used to achieve the research objectives because it is the most appropriate method for such a study, along with using the questionnaire as an instrument for collecting data related to the study.

### Research Sample & Population

With the nature of the research objective and problem, the research population consists of all (2195) faculty members at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University with the rank of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. A sample of (475) faculty members is randomly selected and distributed as shown in Table (1).

**Table 1:** The Distribution of the Research Sample According to the Research Variables

Variable	Categories	Number	Total
Gender	Female	120	475
	Male	355	

University	Umm Al-Qura	405	475
	Ajloun National	70	
Faculty	Scientific	133	475
	Humanities	342	
Academic Rank	Professor	95	475
	Associate Professor	154	
	Assistant Professor	226	
Number of Years of Experience	From (1) to Less Than (5)	206	475
	From (5) to Less Than (10)	170	
	(10) Years and Above	99	

### Research Instrument

Using theoretical literature and studies (*Sharif & Al-Khashab, 2021; Al-Zamil & Al-Dosari, 2021*), a 2-part research instrument is developed.

1. Personal Information: It includes gender, university, faculty, academic rank, and number of years of service.
2. The Degree of Organizational Agility: It consists of (17) items distributed into three domains; orientation agility, decision-making agility, and application agility. A 5-point Likert scale is adopted, as five levels are identified as follows: (5) very high, (4) high, (3) medium, (2) low, and (1) very low.

### Research Instrument Validity

The content validity is used to check the research instrument validity by reviewing the questionnaire in its initial forms from (10) experienced and specialized faculty members in Saudi and Jordanian universities. The comments, modifications, and recommendations proposed by the validators are taken into account, as the items have obtained an approval rating of (80%) or more. The necessary action is taken with the items suggested to be deleted, modified, or reformulated, and thus the questionnaire in its final form consists of (17) instead of 20 items.

### Research Instrument Reliability

The research instrument reliability is checked by calculating the reliability coefficient by applying Cronbach’s Alpha formula on all domains. The Cronbach’s Alpha formula measures the extent of consistency in the respondents' answers to all the items in the questionnaire as shown in Table (2).

**Table 2:** The Reliability Coefficients of the Organizational Agility Questionnaire Using the Internal Consistency Reliability Method

Domains	Internal Consistency Reliability Method
Orientation Agility	0.85
Decision-making Agility	0.84
Application Agility	0.86
The Entire Organizational Agility	

As shown in Table (2), the reliability coefficients of the organizational agility questionnaire have ranged between (0.84) and (0.86), where the highest reliability coefficient is the application agility and the lowest is the decision-making agility, demonstrating the presence of appropriate stability coefficients for the research instrument.

### Research Variables

#### 1. Independent Variables

**Gender:** Female and Male



**University:** Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University

**Faculty:** Scientific and Humanities

**Academic Rank:** Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor

**Number of Years of Experience:** From (1) to Less Than (5) Years, From (5) to Less Than (10) Years, and (10) Years and Above.

## 2. Dependent Variables

It is the organizational agility among academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the faculty members' various perspectives.

## Statistical Processing

The following statistical methods are used to answer the research questions and process the data statistically.

1. Means, standard deviations, ranks, and degrees are used to answer the first research question.
2. The five-way variance ANOVA test is used to answer the second research question, and Scheffé's test for post-comparisons is used to determine significance.
3. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is used to find the internal consistency coefficient of the research instrument.

The degree of organizational agility is also determined by applying the following equation:

Length of One Category = (the Highest Value of the Alternative - the Minimum Value of the Alternative) ÷ Number of Levels =  $(5-1) \div 3 = 1.33$ . And by adding (1.33) to the Minimum Value of the alternative (the minimum); the criterion for expressing those levels is: the Mean ranging between (1-2.33) indicates a Low Degree, the Mean ranging between (2.34-3.67) indicates a Medium Degree, and the Mean ranging between (3.68-5) indicates a High Degree.

## 5 Results & Discussion

### First: Findings related to the First Research Question

What is the reality of the organizational agility of academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the perspective of faculty members?

To answer this question, the means, standard deviations, ranks, and degrees of individual responses to the items related to the three domains of the study instrument and the entire instrument are calculated. Table (3) illustrates those findings.

**Table 3:** Means, Standard Deviations, Ranks, and Degrees of Individual Responses to the Three Domains of the Research Instrument and of the Entire Instrument

Organizational Agility Domains	Means	Standard	Rank	Degree
Orientation Agility	38.3	0.95	1	Medium
Decision-making Agility	17.3	0.96	3	Medium
Application Agility	21.3	04.1	2	Medium
Total	25.3	0.93	25	Medium

As shown in Table (3), the degree of the reality of organizational agility is medium, with a mean of (3.25) and a standard deviation of (0.93). All domains of the research instrument are of a medium degree, as the means have ranged between (3.38) and (3.17). The order of the domains in terms of the mean is as follows: orientation agility in the first rank, application agility in the second rank, and decision-making agility in the third rank, which is an acceptable result because organizational changes are accelerating in institutions.

University administrative environments are facing many changes that are difficult for universities to keep up with due to a shortage of some cadres, a lack of qualifications to find quick and appropriate solutions to confront them, or the preoccupation of academic leaders with other issues related to the educational process, which may lead to a lack of interest in such methods. The result of this first research question agrees with the results of (*Al-Aqraa & Ashour 2022*). However, the results differ

from the results (*Youssef & Yassin, 2021; Al-Zamil & Al-Dosari 2021*).

**Second: Findings related to the Second Research Question**

Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between the means of responses of faculty members to the reality of organizational agility among academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University due to the variables of gender, university, faculty, academic rank, and the number of years of experience?

This question has been answered as follows:

**1. Gender Variable**

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of individual responses to the items related to the “organizational agility questionnaire” and the entire instrument are calculated. Table (4) illustrates the means and standard deviations of the faculty members' responses to the organizational agility questionnaire according to the university variable.

**Table 4:** Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Responses to the Items of the “Organizational Agility” and the Entire Instrument According to Gender Variable

Domain	Gender	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Orientation Agility	Male	355	3.62	0.85
	Female	120	2.90	0.96
Decision-making Agility	Male	355	3.35	.940
	Female	120	2.81	.0 90
Application Agility	Male	355	3.34	1.07
	Female	120	2.94	0.93
The Entire Domains	Male	355	3.44	.890
	Female	120	2.88	0.89

**2. University Variable**

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of individual responses to the items related to the “organizational agility questionnaire” and the entire instrument are calculated. Table (5) illustrates the means and standard deviations of the faculty members' responses to the organizational agility questionnaire according to the university variable.

**Table 5:** Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Responses to the Items of the “Organizational Agility” and the Entire Instrument According to University Variable.

Domain	University	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Orientation Agility	Umm Al-Qura	405	3.38	0.93
	Ajloun National	70	3.37	0.95
Decision-making Agility	Umm Al-Qura	405	3.16	0.99
	Ajloun National	70	3.19	0.95
Application Agility	Umm Al-Qura	405	3.20	1.05
	Ajloun National	70	3.21	1.04
The Entire Domains	Umm Al-Qura	405	3.25	0.93
	Ajloun National	70	3.25	0.92

**3. Faculty**

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of individual responses to the items related to the “organizational agility questionnaire” and the entire instrument are calculated. Table (6) illustrates the means and standard deviations of the faculty members' responses to the organizational agility questionnaire according to the faculty variable.

**Table 6:** Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Responses to the Items of the “Organizational Agility” and the Entire Instrument According to Faculty Variable.

Domain	Faculty	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Orientation Agility	Scientific	342	3.35	.970

	Humanities	133	3.46	.870
Decision-making Agility	Scientific	342	3.14	.990
	Humanities	133	3.23	.860
Application Agility	Scientific	342	3.25	1.04
	Humanities	133	3.10	1.03
The Entire Domains	Scientific	342	3.25	.950
	Humanities	133	3.27	.850

#### 4. Academic Rank

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of individual responses to the items related to the “organizational agility questionnaire” and the entire instrument are calculated. Table (7) illustrates the means and standard deviations of the faculty members' responses to the organizational agility questionnaire according to the academic rank variable.

**Table 7:** Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Responses to the Items of the “Organizational Agility” and the Entire Instrument According to Academic Rank Variable.

Domain	Academic Rank	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Orientation Agility	Assistant	226	3.48	1.21
	Associate	154	3.20	0.60
	Professor	95	3.43	.520
Decision-making Agility	Assistant	226	3.34	1.07
	Professor	154	2.89	.740
	Associate	95	3.21	.870
Application Agility	Assistant	226	3.57	1.01
	Professor	154	2.60	.860
	Associate	95	3.32	.930
The Entire Domains	Assistant	226	3.46	1.08
	Professor	154	2.92	.670
	Associate	95	3.32	.710

#### 5. Number of Years of Experience

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of individual responses to the items related to the “organizational agility questionnaire” and the entire instrument are calculated. Table (8) illustrates the means and standard deviations of the faculty members' responses to the organizational agility questionnaire according to the academic number of years of experience variable.

**Table 8:** Means and Standard Deviations of Individual Responses to the Items of the “Organizational Agility” and the Entire Instrument According to Number of Years of Experience Variable.

Domain	Number of Years of Experience	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Orientation Agility	From (1) to Less Than (5) Years	206	2.84	1.26
	From (5) to Less Than (10) Years	170	3.75	.850
	(10) Years and Above	99	3.33	.670
Decision-making Agility	From (1) to Less Than (5) Years	206	2.72	1.03
	From (5) to Less Than (10) Years	170	3.55	.920
	(10) Years and Above	99	3.06	.820
Application Agility	From (1) to Less Than (5) Years	206	2.97	1.03
	From (5) to Less Than (10) Years	170	3.56	.950
	(10) Years and Above	99	3.03	1.04



The Entire Domains	From (1) to Less Than (5) Years	206	2.84	1.08
	From (5) to Less Than (10) Years	170	3.62	.860
	(10) Years and Above	99	3.15	.780

The Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is also conducted as shown in table (9).

**Table 9:** MANOVA Test Results for the Differences among the Means of the Faculty Members' Responses of the Organizational Agility Questionnaire According to the Research Variables.

Effect	Hotelling's Trace	Value	Sig.
Gender	Hotelling's Trace	.170	.000
University	Hotelling's Trace	.005	.514
Faculty	Hotelling's Trace	.035	.001
Academic Rank	Wilks' Lambda	.746	.000
Number of Years of Experience	Wilks' Lambda	.851	.000

The Five-Way ANOVA test is also conducted as shown in table (10).

**Table 10:** Five-Way ANOVA Test of the Faculty Members' Responses of the Questionnaire of the Organizational Agility Questionnaire According to the Research Variables.

Source	Type IV Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	21.647	1	21.647	32.056	.000
University	.302	1	.302	.448	.504
Faculty	.565	1	.565	.837	.361
Academic Rank	21.695	2	10.847	16.064	.000
Number of Years of Experience	36.606	2	18.303	27.104	.000
Error	315.353	467	.675		
Total	5434.799	474			

As shown in table (10), there are no differences due to the faculty and university variables due to the same educational environment for the two universities, and there are differences due to the variables of gender, academic rank, and the number of years of experience. Table (4) also shows differences in favor of the male category, as they have obtained higher means than the females. The reason is attributed to the small number of females who occupy leadership positions and can emphasize giving lectures, conducting research, and partnering with the local community. Scheffé's test is also used to determine the sources of these differences for the academic rank variable, as shown in table (11).

**Table 11:** Scheffé's Test Results for the Differences among the Means of the Respondents' Responses on the Entire Domains of Study According to the Academic Rank Variable

Academic Rank	Mean	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
		3.46	2.92	3.32
Assistant Professor	3.46		0.54*	0.14
Associate Professor	2.92			*0.40
Professor	3.32			

\* Statistically significant at the significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

Table (11) shows that there are statistically significant differences between the means of the responses of those with academic rank "assistant professor and professor" on the one hand. On the other hand, there are statistically significant differences among the means of the responses of those with an academic rank "associate professor" in the entire domains of study in favor of the responses of those with an academic rank "assistant professor and professor". The reason is attributed to the fact

that the assistant professor category is keen to prove their presence in their faculties, while the professor category is attributed to the reason that they have reached the limit of completeness in practice. As for the number of years of experience variable, a Scheffé's test is conducted for post-comparisons as shown in table (12).

**Table 12:** Scheffé's Test Results for the Differences among the Means of the Respondents' Responses on the Entire Domains of Study According to the Number of Years of Experience Variable.

Number of Years of Experience	Mean	From (1) to Less Than (5) Years	From (5) to Less Than (10) Years	(10) Years and Above
		2.84	3.62	3.05
From (1) to Less Than (5) Years	2.84		*0.78	0.21
From (5) to Less Than (10) Years	3.62			*0.57
(10) Years and Above	3.05			

\* Statistically significant at the significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

Table (12) shows that there are statistically significant differences between the means of the responses of those with the number of years of experience “from (1) to less than (5) years and (10) years and above” on the first hand. On the other hand, there are statistically significant differences among the means of the responses of those with the number of years of experience “from (5) to less than (10) years” in the entire domains of the study in favor of the responses of those with the number of years of experience “from (5) to less than (10) years”

## 6 Conclusion

In a few words, the organizational agility among academic leaders at Umm Al-Qura University and Ajloun National University from the faculty members' various perspectives according to gender, university, faculty, academic rank, and the number of years of experience is identified. The findings indicate that the reality of organizational agility is medium with a mean of (3.25) without statistically significant differences due to the university and faculty variables. The results also show differences due to the variables of gender, academic rank, and number of years of experience in favor of males, the two categories of assistant professor, professor, and the category of 5-10 years, respectively. Given these findings, the research recommends enabling employees to participate in decision-making and use modern techniques and mechanisms that contribute to developing work and evaluating work environments.

## 7 Recommendations

Given the previous results, the study recommends creating a database that helps in making decisions, enabling workers to participate in decision-making, using modern technologies and mechanisms that help in the development of work, assessing work environments, and conducting correlational studies to clarify the relationship between organizational agility, servant leadership, administrative empowerment, and competitive advantage.

## Ethical Approval

This study was a systematic review does not contain any studies with human or animal participants performed by the author.

## Informed Consent

This was a systematic review for previously published studies no informed consent was needed in this study.

## Conflict of Interests

The author has not any conflict of interests with the information presented within this article.

## References

Abdelwahab, S. (2011). Mental flexibility and its relationship to both the perspective of the future tense and the goals of

- achievement among faculty members at the university. *Journal of Specific Education Research at Zagazig University*, 1(20), 19-75.
- Al-Aqraa, O & Ashour, N. (2022). The impact of organizational commitment on organizational agility in the Directorate of Education in Qalqilya Governorate. *Journal of Economic, Administrative and Legal Sciences*, 6(17), 69-98.
- Al-Kubaisi, S & Nuri, T. (2013). The impact of the Principles of the Decision Ring (OODA) on strategic agility: A field study in several Baghdad Hospitals. *Journal of Dinars, Colleges of Administration and Economics*, 1(3), 22-45.
- Al-Nashili, D. (2020). The role of organizational agility in achieving organizational commitment: A field study in the Arab Administrative Development - League of Arab States. *Arab Journal of Administration*, 40(3), 163-182.
- Al-Otaibi, S. (2022). The role of organizational agility in improving working life in government hospitals: A field study on the administrative staff in the Children's Hospital in Taif Governorate. *Journal of Economic, Administrative and Legal Sciences*, 6(11), 27-49.
- Al-Salhi, O., Al-Saqal, M., & Al-Sultani, M. (2021). The impact of organizational agility on organizational effectiveness: A field study in the Iraqi General Company for Leather Industries. *Journal of Research in Educational and Human Sciences, Literature, and Languages*, 2(4), 93-116.
- Al-Sanea, I. (2013). The impact of strategic agility determinants on organizational effectiveness: A case study of the Jordanian Cement Company Lafarge. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. College of Business Administration, Middle East University, Amman
- Al-Zamil, O and Al-Dosari, B. (2021). Organizational agility at Princess Noura bint Abdulrahman University in Riyadh and ways to improve it. *Journal of the Islamic University of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 29(4), 761-778.
- Deksny, M. (2018). Organizational agility high growth companies. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Mykolas Romeris University.
- Karlstedt, J & Hellenborg, S. (2020). Retaining organizational agility: How to stay competitive without competing. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Uppsala University.
- Kristensen S & Shafiee, S. (2019). Rethinking design to enforce organizational agility: A paper presented at 11th symposium on competence-based strategic management. Stuttgart Germany.
- Mansour, M. (2020) Developing the administrative performance of leaders at the Faculty of Education, Mansoura University, in light of the organizational agility approach. *Journal of Scientific Research in Rabia*, 1(21), 1-45.
- Nafei, W. (2016). Organizational agility: The key to organizational success. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(5), 299-310.
- Nouri, B & Mousavi, M. (2020). Effect of cooperative management on organizational agility with the mediating role of employee empowerment: Cuadernosede Gestion
- Omar, M. (2020). Improving organizational agility practices at South Valley University Faculties. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 39(2), 215-235.
- Trinh, T., Molla, A., & Peszynski, K. (2012). Enterprise system and organizational agility: A review of the literature and conceptual framework. *Communication of the Association for Information System*, 1(31), 178-198.
- Youssef, K & Yassin, S. (2021). Organizational agility and its role in managing organizational conflict: An analytical study of the opinions of a sample of employees at Al-Hadbaa University College. *Al-Anbaa University Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 13(1), 1-19.
- Zitkiene, R & Deksny, M. (2018). Organizational Agility Conceptual Model. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 14) 2(, 115-129.