The Degree of Practicing Organizational Agility at Al Al-Bayt University from Its Faculty Members' Perspective

Dr. Shirin Mohammad Abdel Aal

Faculty of Educational Sciences-Irbid National University, Jordan

Sherooabedaal@gmail.com

ملخص الدراسة:

هدفت الدراسة التعرف إلى درجة ممارسة الرشاقة التنظيمية في جامعة آل البيت من وجهة نظر أعضاء هيئة التدريس فيها. تكونت عينة الدراسة من (381) عضو هيئة تدريس تم اختيارهم بالطريقة العشوائية البسيطة. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة قامت الباحثة ببناء استبانة مكونة من أربع مجالات لقياس مستوى ممارسة الرشاقة التنظيمية وتكونت من (26) فقرة، وتم استخدام المنهج الوصفي. أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن درجة ممارسة الرشاقة التنظيمية في جامعة آل البيت جاءت بدرجة قليلة. كما أظهرت النتائج وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تُعزى لأثر الجنس في جميع المجالات باستثناء مجال التمكين وجاءت الفروق لصالح الذكور. كما أظهرت النتائج وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تُعزى لأثر الرتبة الأكاديمية في جميع المجالات باستثناء مجال التمكين وجاءت الفروق لصالح رتبة أستاذ، ووجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تُعزى لأثر الكلية وجاءت لصالح الكليات العلمية

Abstract

The research immediate aim was to find out the degree of organizational agility practice at Al al-Bayt University from the perspective of its faculty members. The study sample was (381) members, selected by a simple random method. To deliver the study goals, the researcher designed a questionnaire of four axes to measure the level of organizational agility practice. It contained (26) items, and the descriptive approach was applied. The results of the research showed that the degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University was low. The findings also indicated statistically significant differences attributed to gender in favor of males in all areas except the area of empowerment. The results also showed statistically significant differences attributable to academic level in favor of the position 'professor' in all fields except empowerment. Moreover, there were statistically significant differences attributable to the faculty and were in favor of scientific faculties.

Keywords: organizational agility; Al al-Bayt University; faculty members.

Introduction

Rapid changes require educational institutions to come to terms with new developments and changes in their internal and external environment, as it is difficult for the administrative staff to keep up with the usual administrative practices and stagnation in administration, accompanied by rigid regulations and laws. This forced interested departments to find new approaches, characterized by the flexibility required to adapt to the rapidity of these changes, which requires the availability of effective management to improve educational institutions.

External changes are no longer alone responsible for slack and stagnant administration. There are other types of changes that affect institutions from within, the most important of which is the structure of the organization and the necessity of introducing functional and administrative changes that help the institution abandon useless practices. Among the most important organizational changes to implement organizational agility are the following workplace planning and be flexibility and innovation in work procedures because work routines are a strong justification for organizations to adopt organizational agility (Al-Barbari, 2022).

Management scholars show great interest in developing administrative approaches and searching for flexible and advanced management approaches suitable for facing the challenges and changes faced by the management of educational institutions. This explains the tendency for progressive solutions to improve and develop quality in education; therefore, the concept of organizational agility emerged as a tool that contributes to the flexibility and development of educational institutions in the face of various environmental challenges (Omar, 2020).

The organizational agility approach is an effective approach that adapts to and keeps pace with all changes in the external environment and abandons traditional and regular practices that are not directed towards achieving the organization's goals with the requirements of rapidity, efficiency, and quality. Such practices lead to a decline in the organization's performance in an age of speed and continuous change, so the organization replaces them with novel actions and work mechanisms, which allow the institution to work faster and more efficiently to achieve goals with great efficiency, especially since work in universities involves many changes and pressures (Abu Assi, 2021).

Organizational agility has several characteristics, including scanning the environment, responding to change, assessing and developing skills, providing employees with decision-making skills, access to knowledge, collaboration, and integration of information technology systems. It is also characterized by the desire and ability of colleges and universities to quickly change from an university offering education to an institution committed to constant improvement and that avoids stagnation in operations and focuses on monitoring and using information technology (Deer, 2018).

Walter (2021) pointed out that organizational agility is the key to strategic success in facing changes and developments that may occur in the organization's internal and external environment. Organizations seek to enhance and maintain their competitive position by providing high-quality services, achieving employee satisfaction, and increasing the speed of providing new services and eliminating activities that do not add value to the organization. Organizational agility also contributes to the understanding that the changes facing educational institutions are more comprehensive and responsive by applying transparency in leadership, employees' empowerment, focusing on innovation, using appropriate budget models, and collaborating to increase technological investments that expand the size and capabilities of the institution.

Organizational agility, as one of the innovative methods, gives educational institutions the ability to survive and grow despite the continuous and unexpected changes in the environment. It is also the ability to predict, perceive, and respond to fluctuations in the environment to create a competitive environment and enable effective management to manage potential opportunities and risks by implementing a set of specific tasks that enable organizations to respond quickly and effectively to changes in the environment (Nafei, 2016).

(Cheng & Zhong 2020, 100) defined organizational agility as 'an organization's ability to deal with changes that appear unexpectedly in the external environment and provide quick and innovative solutions that take advantage of these changes as opportunities for prosperity and growth.' (Babazadeh & Titkanloo 2019, 17) also defined it as 'an organization's ability to respond quickly to sudden and unexpected changes.'

Organizational agility is based on a set of dimensions, the most important of which is decision-making agility. It is the ability to collect, record, analyze, and evaluate information from many and varied sources to identify opportunities and work to exploit them and work to reduce the impact of environmental threats on the organization on the one hand and develop strategic plans that help it transform and use available resources effectively and efficiently. In contrast, decision-making includes a number of interconnected activities, particularly collecting, recording, and analyzing data from various sources to determine the consequences of the organization's actions and tasks (Ghoneim, 2020).

Effective decision-making is considered an essential part of the administrative process. It is a process closely linked to all management functions and its various activities. It is also a cyclical process that occurs in parallel with the progress of the administrative process itself. Agile universities should be prepared to face changing situations and situations of vulnerability or uncertainty, and thus must make decisions in light of the three criteria identified by Al-Masry (2016): the speed of making decision, the ability to implement decisions concretely, and responding quickly to changes. Providing an effective information and data system, developing university policies, regulations, and laws in line with local and global systems and surrounding variables, and expanding the circle of participation in decision-making are among the best ways to improve the agility of decision-making (Hamouda, Al-Qudsi, and Ali, 2018).

Acting Agility is the capacity to quickly and dramatically rearrange organizational resources, alter activities and relationships depending on actual plans, and execute tasks and procedures that enable effective adaptive adjustments to be developed and executed (Al-Nashili, 2020). Sensing agility is the capacity of an organization to quickly look into, keep track of, and document environmental change-related events. It implies strategically monitoring developments that can significantly affect an organization's strategy, competitive activities, and future performance (Park, 2011). Further, Empowerment Agility is considered one of the main administrative dimensions, focusing on the transformation from the rigid institutional model of control and leadership to an agile institution, which involves a change in administrative practices related to operations and functions and the transition from a central institution to a less centralized model by increasing the delegation of authority and granting powers. Thus, Employee empowerment has a strong positive relationship with job satisfaction, the quality of administrative decisions, institutional affiliation, clarity of job responsibilities, workplace design, effectiveness of control procedures, clarity of relationships between administrative units, and creativity. As a result, employee empowerment is effective and efficient in terms of efficiency and productivity in universities. (Al-Sakarna, 2013).

Vaishnavi, Suresh, & Dutta (2019) suggested an approach for enhancing the level of organizational agility in universities that has three main axes. The first dimension is developing an agility strategy. This stage is crucial as it ensures focusing on the significance of organizational agility and how to develop it. At this stage, managers must consider the internal conditions and external factors associated with agility - how their impact can change with the development of efficiency, corporate competitiveness, and individual needs - and consider the organization's strategy and goals. These actions are created taking into account the particulars of the environment, institutional analysis and the firm's points of strength and weakness.

The second dimension is implementing the necessary actions to achieve the pre-determined strategic goals. This includes altering available procedures to facilitate the promotion of agility at different organizational levels and functions, defining new procedures and processes to prioritize them in achieving and promoting agility, thus ensuring that the organization's employees have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to agility, ensuring the availability of technological techniques and systems, and determining effective skills to reach intended agility goals and provide appropriate support.

40

The third dimension is to evaluate how agility works in the organization. In this stage, it is important to determine the use of appropriate indicators to accurately evaluate the development of agility in the organization. This process allows you to evaluate key aspects of effectiveness, alignment between business goals and agility, and increasing the impact of agility on business performance.

The research problem and questions

Universities deal with a variety of issues, including organizational issues and ongoing changes in the demands of students and staff across all categories and professions. This is indicated by Abdel Mawla's (2019) research, which confirmed that organizational agility at the university level was low. As a result, the traditional administrative methods of the academic departments at Al al-Bayt University are no longer appropriate in the face of these rapid changes. This necessitates the university to take steps to build a new set of administrative skills focused on taking in and comprehending modern advances and their implications and knowing future possibilities. Therefore, university departments must adopt a contemporary administrative approach adapted to the needs of the times in order to improve the level of institutional performance of these departments by taking advantage of agility. organization, which is considered a fundamental foundation for improving its performance, Accordingly, this research aimed to reveal the level of organizational agility practice at Al al-Bayt University from the faculty members' perspective, by discussing the below questions:

1. What is the degree of organizational agility practice at Al al-Bayt University from the perspective of faculty members?
2. Are there statistically significant differences at the level ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the research sample members regarding the degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University due to the variables of gender, academic position, and faculty?

Objectives of the research

The research seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- Determining the level of organizational agility practice at Al al-Bayt University in terms of its role in enhancing flexibility and rapidity of administrative practices to suggest enhancing organizational agility practice.
- Reaching a better comprehension of the effect of some research variables (gender, academic position, and faculty) on the level of organizational agility from the perspective of faculty members in order to investigate and identify these differences.

Significance of the research

The significance of this research arises from two aspects:

Theoretical significance: This research is considered among the most important research works in terms of content. Its importance comes from its contribution to enriching educational management and previous literature through research on of organizational agility practiced at universities. The present study would bring forth a good scientific addition and new knowledge and represent a breakthrough for new research on organizational agility and its employment in developing training in universities and increase their level of efficiency.

Empirical significance: It is expected that the findings of the present research will have an impact in universities, as it will provide them with techniques to improve the implementation of organizational agility, which will assist universities face difficulties and contribute to the management of change and the development and improvement it can lead to. This is done by activating the organizational agility approach to make management more effective and flexible in dealing with environment changes, faculty members, and decision makers at the university by providing information that are uses as feedback on the level of their job performance, allowing them to help raise the level of education and enhance its quality.

Research limitations

- Thematic limitation: Identifying the degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University from the perspective of its faculty members.

- Spatial limitation: Al-Bayt University - Al-Mafraq Governorate.

- Temporal limitation: the period 2021-2022.

- Human limitation: Faculty members at Al al-Bayt University.

- Determinants of the research: the degree of availability of validity and reliability indicators in the research tool, the degree to which the research sample represents the community to which it belongs, and the objectivity of the sample members towards the elements of the research tool.

Terminology of the research
- Organizational agility:

"A set of administrative procedures that enable rapid response to surrounding events, and include a number of elements, including: speed and flexibility, responsiveness and agility in decision-making and exploitation of opportunities, and adaptation to the environment. It helps the organization to overcome various challenges and enables it to manage knowledge efficiently. It is the valve of success to face different competitive environments" (Bin Saeed, 2020, 18).

The researcher defines it procedurally as: the level of practice of administrators at Al al-Bayt University for flexibility in regulations and laws to control the management process. It is assessed by the total responses of the research sample members to the tool for organizational agility.

- Faculty members: the people entrusted with teaching duties at Al al-Bayt University from all academic positions (lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor).

Previous studies
The research reviewed a number of Arab and foreign studies, presented in chronological order from newest to oldest.

Al-Zamil and Al-Dosari (2020) attempted to evaluate the actual status of organizational agility and ways to enhance it at Princess Noura bint Abdul Rahman University in Riyadh. The research applied the descriptive analytical approach on a study sample of (110) employees at Princess Noura bint Abdul Rahman University in Riyadh. The research concluded that the reality of organizational agility at Princess Noura bint Abdul Rahman University was high, with no statistically significant differences attributable to the effect of gender and academic position. It was found that Princess Noura University does not face obstacles in applying organizational agility.

Menon and Suresh (2020) sought to evaluate the organizational agility of a higher education institution at Amrita University in India. The research used the descriptive analytical method on a sample consisting of (589) faculty members at the university. The study concluded that organizational agility at the university was low, and that the university needs to take advantage of its resources and work proactively to take advantage of the change.

Al-Ansari (2019) aimed to identify the degree to which academic leaders in Saudi universities practice organizational agility. To achieve this, the descriptive analytical approach was used, and a questionnaire was distributed to a sample of (342) male and female leaders in Saudi universities. The research concluded that the degree of decision-making agility and empowerment agility among academic leadership in Saudi universities were average. The results did not show statistically significant differences attributable to the variable of gender.

Hamdan (2019) also aimed to identify the level of application of organizational agility dynamics in Saudi universities in light of international models, and to identify the level of their contribution to achieving organizational excellence. The descriptive approach was used, and a questionnaire was distributed to a sample of (450) academic leaders, in each of King Saud University, Abdulaziz University, and King Faisal University. The results showed that the level of application of organizational agility engines in Saudi universities was weak, and that the level of contribution of organizational agility dynamics to achieving organizational excellence was high.

Khavari (2016) aimed at identifying the level of university organizational agility at the branches of the Islamic Azad University in Mazandaran Province, Northern Iran. The research used the descriptive approach, and the study sample consisted of (270) faculty members at the branches of the Islamic Azad University in Mazandaran Province. The results showed that the level organizational agility scores in universities was higher than the assumed level, and there was a large gap between the present reality and the degree required to be reached to achieve organizational agility.

Kerachi, Abbaspour and Rahimian (2014) also conducted a study that aimed to determine the level of application of organizational agility indicators in public universities in Fars Province in Iran, based on the five components of agility (motivators, capabilities, facilitators, barriers, consequences). The descriptive survey method was used, and the questionnaire was distributed to a sample of (310) faculty members. The results showed that the level of application of organizational agility was average, and that there were no statistically significant differences between the views of faculty members on the use of university agility components due to the gender variable. However, there were statistically significant differences due to the variables of academic position, experience, type of university, and organizational position.

Comment on previous studies
By reviewing previous studies, it becomes clear that they varied between local, Arab, and foreign studies, and that they differed among themselves according to the purpose for which they were conducted. The researcher benefited from them in the theoretical literature related to organizational agility and choosing the appropriate approach, building her own research tool, and learning about the results of previous studies to compare them to the results of the present research.

The current research differs from previous studies in that it addressed the topic of organizational agility from different aspects, represented by the difference in the population, the sample to which this research was applied, and the fields that it addressed. This research is similar to all previous studies in terms of the place of application, which is universities. It is also similar in the use of some variables, such as gender and academic position, in addition to its treatment of the topic of organizational agility.

The position of the current research compared to previous studies: The most important thing that distinguishes the present research from previous studies is that it is the first research that addressed organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University, and it is one of the few studies in Jordanian universities as a whole to the best of the researcher's knowledge.

Method and procedures
This section discusses the research methodology, population, sample, and the research tool applied:

Research methodology: The descriptive approach was used as the most appropriate for the purposes of this research.

Research population: The research population consisted of all faculty members at Al al-Bayt University in AL Mafraq Governorate during the year 2021/2022; the number reached (798) faculty members.

Research sample: This research was applied to a sample determined by a simple random method, at a rate of (30%) of the population size; its number reached (381) faculty members out of the total population size. Table (1) illustrates the distribution of the research sample members based on its variables.

Table 1 The research sample was distributed according to gender, academic position, and faculty.

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	301	79.0
	Female	80	21.0
Academic position	Professor	125	32.8
	Associate Professor	181	47.5
	Assistant Professor	75	19.7
Faculty	Sciences	151	39.6
	Humanities	230	60.4
	The total	381	100.0

Research tool

In order to achieve the objectives of the research, the researcher prepared a questionnaire to measure organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University. A questionnaire was created consisting of (28) items distributed over four areas, each area represents a dimension of organizational agility: the sensing dimension and its (7) items, the application/practice dimension has (6) items, the decision-making dimension has (8) items, and the empowerment dimension has (7) items, in its initial form.

Validity of the research tool

To ensure the validity of the tool used, after completing its design, it was presented to experts with experience in educational management, assessment, and evaluation. They were asked to provide their comments on the suitability of the items to the research topic, their quality, the degree which they belong to the major in which they were positioned, and the integrity and unambiguity of the wording. The sample also were told to suggest the comments they might find appropriate, such as adding, deleting, or merging, in order to take appropriate action. Based on the approval of the experts (80%), the research tool was approved in its final form and consisted of (26) items, two of which were deleted because they were not related to the field to which they belong.

Reliability of the research tool

To ensure the reliability of the tool, it was verified using the test-retest method by applying the tool to a survey sample consisting of (30) faculty members from outside the research sample, and re-applying it two weeks later to the same sample; then the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for their estimates in both times. The reliability coefficient was also calculated using the internal consistency method according to the Cronbach Alpha equation, which measures the extent of consistency in the respondent's answers to all the items in the questionnaire, as shown in Table (2).

Table 2 Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient and repeat reliability of the domains and the total score

Field	Repetition reliability	Internal consistency
Sensor	0.88	0.91

Application/practice	0.85		0.87	
Making Decision	0.89		0.92	
Empowerment	0.84		0.85	
Total	0.90		0.89	

Research variables
First: the moderating variables

- Gender: has two categories (male, female).

- Academic position: has three levels (professor, associate professor, assistant professor).

- Faculty: has two categories (scientific, humanities).

Second: the main variable

- Degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University.

Statistical methods
To answer the research questions, the researcher used the following methods:

1. Arithmetic means and standard deviations in the first question.

2. The three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test to verify the differences between the means for the total score, as well as the three-way multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) test to verify the differences between the means for the fields of study in the second question.

Research results and discussion
Results of the first question: What is the degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University from the perspective of its faculty members?

Here, the arithmetic means and standard deviations of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University were calculated from the perspective of faculty members, and Table (3) shows this.

Table 3 Arithmetic means and standard deviations of the degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University from the perspective of faculty members, arranged in descending order according to the arithmetic means

Rank	No	field	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	Degree
1	1	sensor	2.85	.62	Average
2	4	Empowerment	2.67	.59	Average
3	2	Application/practice	2.47	.53	Low
4	3	Making Decision	2.35	.50	Low
		Organizational agility	**2.59**	**.52**	**Low**

Table (3) explains that the arithmetic means were between (2.35-2.85), and the arithmetic mean for organizational agility as a whole reached (2.59).

The results regarding the question imply that the degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University from the view of the sample was low. This may be attributed to the lack of knowledge of

organizational agility due to the novelty of the approach and the limited understanding of it at the university, in addition to the limited human and financial resources necessary to ensure organizational agility for the university's faculties and departments. Also, there is the weakness of the skills and capabilities of some university management members and staff in formulating reachable objectives that include exceptional performance, with the limited capabilities and the experience required when developing a flexible and targeted strategy. This may be attributed to the university's delayed response to the requirements of the local labor market, which could lead to the university achieving agile performance.

The findings of this question support Menon & Suresh (2020) and Hamdan (2019), whose findings displaced low agility. However, the study contradicted Al-Zamil and Al-Dosari (2020), Al-Ansari (2019), and Khavari (2016), whose results showed high agility.

As for the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the research sample member's estimates on the items in each domain separately, they were as follows:

The first area: sensing
To find out the extent to which the research sample appreciated the items in the field of sensing, the arithmetic means and standard deviation were calculated, as shown in Table (4).

Table 4 The arithmetic means and standard deviations for the items related to the field of sensing are arranged in descending order

Rank	No	Items	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	Degree
1	3	Analysis of the internal and external environment	3.14	.86	Average
2	6	Developing new work methods based on changes in the surrounding environment	3.02	.83	Average
3	1	Examining and monitoring events with environmental impact	2.94	.71	Average
4	7	Developing its current services to keep up with rapid renewal	2.87	.73	Average
5	2	Exploring available opportunities	2.84	.65	Average
6	5	Developing the necessary plans to confront emergency changes	2.80	.68	Average
7	4	Anticipating changes that may occur and prepare for them	2.37	.67	low
		Sensor	2.85	.62	Average

Table (4) proves that the arithmetic mean for the sensing field was average, reaching (2.85). The reason for this may lie in the importance of the sensing task in decision making and its application, as organizational agility primarily requires adopting proactive measures in the workplace, providing clear and novel administrative results, and opening chances for competitive benefits that qualify it to achieve satisfaction that cannot be achieved only by sensing. This is attributed to the university's vision, mission, and goals, including the development of its practices through training in modern and flexible administrative and

leadership methods and the university's development of sufficient mechanisms to recognize and accurately anticipate the changes around it.

In terms of questionnaire items, item (3) ranked first, which stipulates "analyzing the internal and external environment" with an arithmetic mean of (3.14). Perhaps the reason is the university's ability to build a dynamic response to expected and sometimes unexpected changes through the university restructuring administrative procedures, redistributing organizational resources, and reshaping the organizational structure, which boost its ability to continue. The university's efforts to establish action plans that direct resource restructuring, the development and facilitation of administrative procedures, and the use of contemporary strategic planning techniques, including the presence of an executive procedural plan that is continuously updated based on the findings of the analysis of the university's internal and external environments, are also believed to contribute to this finding.

In contrast, item (4) ranked last; it states: "Anticipating the changes that may occur and prepare for them," with arithmetic mean of (2.37). This may be attributed to a weakness in flexible organizational and functional structures at the university and the unclarity of the financing processes followed for these predictions. This is besides the lack of qualified and highly efficient staff possessing progressive experience that enables continuous improvement and development.

The second area: application/practice
To display the extent of rating for the application/practice field items, the arithmetic means and standard deviation were calculated as shown in table (5).

Table 5 Arithmetic means and standard deviations for items related to the field of application/practice, arranged in descending order

Rank	No	Items	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	Degree
1	12	Providing flexible academic services that meet the aspirations of higher education	2.97	. 90	Average
2	9	Executing tasks related to adapting to changes efficiently	2.75	.61	Average
3	10	Giving quick reactions to surrounding environmental changes	2.38	.75	Low
4	13	Involving academic leaders in setting goals	2.35	.70	Low
5	11	Restructuring operations to achieve their goals effectively	2.24	.63	Low
6	8	Investing all its resources effectively	2.11	.53	Low
		Application/practice	2.47	.53	Low

Table (5) shows that the arithmetic mean for the field of application/practice was low, reaching (2.47). This might be because of the university's need for several trainings for its staff and managers. Another reason might be the lack of concerned about altering administrative processes to respond to internal and external environmental changes and the difficulty of introducing rapid changes due to most of the traditional and

prevailing systems and the weak application of the rules, regulations, laws, and instructions that govern the work of the university.

In terms of items, item (12), which states "providing flexible academic services that meet the aspirations of higher education," came in the first rank, with arithmetic mean of (2.97). The reason may be that Al Al-Bayt University provides an organizational guide that clearly sets rules and procedures and job descriptions, which are reviewed and updated periodically and continuously for all jobs. The focus of the concerned authorities is on identifying the university's internal strong and weak points and trying to submit suggestions supporting the strengths and fix the weaknesses, besides working to reduce the gap between actual and target performance to advance the practical and academic level at the university. This was confirmed by the Al-Yarmouk University website (2020). Item (8), which states "investing all its resources effectively," ranked last, with arithmetic mean of (2.11). The administrative and financial apparatus may not be aware of the significance of applying flexibility and duality to many administrative functions and processes at times, and some employees may rely on one another to complete tasks, abdicate responsibility and place blame on others, or there may be ambiguity in some rules, regulations, and laws.

The third area: making decisions

To determine the evaluation of the items in the field of making decision, the arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated, and table (6) shows this.

Table 6 The arithmetic means and standard deviations for the items related to the field of making decision, arranged in descending order

Rank	No	Items	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	degree
1	17	Establishing open channels of communication between the colleges	2.64	.74	Average
2	20	Establishing flexible systems by which some decisions are modified to serve the interests of students	2.59	.67	low
3	16	Balancing centralization and decentralization	2.32	.68	Low
4	18	establishing guidelines that take advantage of opportunities and address threats	2.25	.64	low
5	19	Adopting databases that contribute to linking organizational units to facilitate decision making	2.23	.62	low
6	15	Developing legislation that allows the participation of all administrative levels in decision making	2.20	.60	low
7	14	Establishing clear principles to guide objective decision-making	2.18	.60	low
		Decision making	2.35	.50	low

Table (6) proves that the arithmetic means for the field of decision making was low, reaching (2.35). The reason may be the lack of knowledge of some administrative units about decision making mechanisms, which complicates decision making procedures, as well as the concentration of making decision mechanisms in the hands of the university administration without taking into account the opinions and suggestions of administrators and university employees. This is in addition to the ambiguity of some of their employee's official tasks, the weak proportionality of the powers entrusted to them with the scope of tasks and responsibilities required from them, the complexity of procedures, insufficient databases, lack of information, and insufficient planning for effective decision making.

Item (17), "drawing clear lines of communication between faculty," came in first place, with an arithmetic mean of (2.64). This is due to the efficient use of information technology in decision-making, the university's commitment to offering proper training and credentials, and the excellence of communication channels available on campus. Decision making requires an effective communications network to collect data, information, and facts. Item (14), which reads "Adopting clear foundations for making objective decisions," ranked last, with arithmetic mean of (2.18). The reason may be the lack of a specific and clear philosophy that guides decision making, and the ambiguity of regulations and instructions for some workers, which constitutes an obstacle to participating in decision making.

Fourth area: Empowerment
To show the degree of rating of the empowerment domain items, the arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated as in Table (7).

Table 7 The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the items related to the field of empowerment, arranged in descending order

Rank	No	Items	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Degree
1	25	Job descriptions that enable objectives to be achieved	3.04	.001	Average
2	22	Developing training programs to improve and develop the performance of administrative and academic work	3.01	.96	Average
3	21	Delegating authorities to increase performance efficiency and effectiveness	2.64	.73	Average
4	23	Developing legislation that clarifies powers and responsibilities and coordinating them	2.56	.74	low
5	26	Moving from the central administrative style to the less centralized style	2.49	.68	low
6	24	Establishing systems that support the team's work	2.28	.66	low
		Empowerment	**2.67**	**.60**	Average

Table (7) displays that the arithmetic mean for the field of empowerment was average, reaching (2.67). The reason for this may be due to the university's adoption of a culture supportive to empowerment that takes into account individual trends and behaviors, as well as the presence of administrative leadership that enjoys an organizational culture that creates high-quality and ready-to-work groups to accept changes and solve difficulties and problems in the workplace and motivate staff to take part in decision making.

Item (25), "a job description that enables the achievement of goals," came in first place with arithmetic mean of (3.04). This could be due to the university's interest in the work environment and its stimulation of creativity and innovation among employees and the university's endeavor to provide work methods that focus on training and career development. Item (24), "Establishing systems that support the work of the team," ranked last, with arithmetic mean of (2.28). it could be attributed to the lack of the elements and requirements for empowerment in the university environment and among its leaders, which are represented by the lack of the elements for delegating powers, effective communication, weak training, and the lack of the requirements for administrative confidence and weak teamwork at the university.

Results of the second question: Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level (α = 0.05) in the responses of the study sample members regarding the degree of practicing organizational agility at Al al-Bayt University due to the study variables (gender, academic position, and faculty)?

The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the degree of practicing organizational agility were calculated according to the variables of gender, academic rank, and faculty as shown in table (8).

Table 8 Arithmetic means and standard deviations for the degree of practicing organizational agility by gender, academic position, and faculty

Variable	Categories	Arithmetic mean	standard deviation	No
Gender	Male	2.63	.46	301
	Female	2.43	.67	80
Academic position	Professor	2.71	.39	125
	Associate Professor	2.54	.57	181
	Assistant Professor	2.49	.55	75
Faculty	Sciences	2.66	.42	151
	Humanities	2.54	.57	230

Table (8) shows that the arithmetic means and standard deviations were apparently different due to the difference in the categories of research variables. To demonstrate the significance of the statistical differences between the arithmetic means, a three-way analysis of variance was used, as illustrated in table (9).

Table 9 Three-way analysis of variance of the effect of gender, academic position, and faculty on the degree of practicing organizational agility

Source of variance	Total of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F value	Statistical significance
Gender	2.234	1	2.234	8.776	.003
Academic position	2.064	2	1.032	4.054	.018
Faculty	1.647	1	1.647	6.467	.011

Error	95.728	376	.255
Total	**102.037**	**380**	

The results prove statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to the impact of the gender variable in all areas except the field of empowerment. The differences favored males. This result may initially explain the fact that most of the research sample members who responded to the tool were males. The reason for this may be due to females' preoccupation with family matters more than males because females always seek to find balance between their work life and their family life and its requirements. This result can be attributed to the physical and mental differences between men and women. Women are more vulnerable to the influence of external factors. On the other hand, men are more capable of self-control, which allows them to carry out administrative tasks more impartially and practically.

Men's characteristics also differ from women's in the ability to perform various tasks as some tasks do not suit the female personality and the ability to work for a long time. This may also be attributed to the fact that most of the male faculty members have scientific, research, and technical activity and external and internal training courses that enable them to know the procedures, their complexities, and their facilities. This result differed from those Al-Zamil and Al-Dosari (2020), which showed that there were no statistically significant differences attributed to the gender variable.

The results showed statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to the effect of the faculty variable and were in favor of the faculty of science. The researcher attributes this result to the desire of these faculties for continuous development and improvement and to make the administrative and educational services practiced at the university more flexible. This is besides following up on all innovations in the scientific, practical, and administrative fields and trying to put them into practice. This result may be attributed to the fact that the majors of scientific faculties often require a lot of instructions and official books and repetition of their application. Therefore, these faculties always strive for flexibility and speed in their work and administrative procedures. This result may be attributed to the continuous development in the university's external environment, which is monitored by the members of scientific faculties and makes them keener to see the university's procedures directed towards changing the routine in the systems and laws and moving to activate agility to improve job performance at the university.

The results also showed statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to the effect of academic position, as the F value reached 4.054 with a statistical significance of 0.018. To show the statistically significant pairwise differences between the arithmetic means, post hoc comparisons were applied using the Scheffé test, as shown in Table (10).

Table 10 Dimensional comparisons using Scheffe test for the effect of academic position on the degree of practicing organizational agility.

Field	Academic position	Arithmetic mean	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Organizational agility	Professor	2.71			
	Associate Professor	2.54	.16*		
	Assistant Professor	2.49	.21*	.05	

* A function at the significance level ($\square = 0.05$).

Table (10) indicates statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the position 'professor' from one side and 'associate professor' and 'assistant professor' from the other, in favor of professors. The rationale behind this might be because professors in the research sample think that organizational agility is crucial to attaining the objectives of the university. This may be because the faculty members with the position of professor who, by virtue of their long service period, have more experience in implementing administrative

work and related organizational requirements relevance, this enabled them to recognize the difference between changing trends in universities, procedural complexity, and flexibility. It may also be attributed to the research sample members' perception that their role as professors involves administrative duties, routine tasks, and listening to complaints about impeding or facilitating task completion, which gave them knowledge and a distinct understanding of the significance of implementing organizational agility at the university.

The outcomes of the present research differed from Al-Zamil and Al-Dosari (2020), as its results showed that there were no statistically significant differences attributed to the effect of academic position.

Recommendations
Based on the findings of this research, the researcher recommends the following:

1. Searching for mechanisms that help the university anticipate the changes surrounding it and prepare well for them, and give employees a realistic opportunity to submit innovative opinions and proposals.
2. Holding trainings to enhance the employees' organizational agility capabilities.
3. Conducting more research and studies on organizational agility in universities and linking it to other variables, such as functional excellence.

References

-Abu Assi, Hisham Abdel Aziz. (2021). A proposed vision for developing the performance of school leaders in secondary schools in light of the organizational agility approach. Educational Journal Sohag University 2 (88), 900-950.

-Al-Ansari, Kholoud Ahmed. (2019). The degree to which academic leaders in Saudi universities practice organizational agility. Iraqi University Journal, 3 (51), 501-516.

-Al-Barbari, Muhammad Ahmed Awad. (2022). Creative leadership as an approach to achieving organizational agility in industrial secondary schools in the three-year system in the Sharkia Governorate. Educational Journal, 2 (94), 830-927.

-Yarmouk University. (2020). Regulatory guide. Publications of the Department of Development and Planning. Retrieved from the electronic link https://ddp.yu.edu.jo/images/docs/DT2020.pdf on 6/27/2022. Al-Hamdan, Amal Rashid. (2019). Organizational agility to achieve organizational excellence in Saudi universities: a proposed model. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.

-Hamouda, Abdel Nasser Muhammad, Al-Qudsi, Abdel Aziz Ghaleb and Ali, Nadia Amin Muhammad. (2018). The impact of some human resources management practices in enhancing organizational agility capabilities, the Second International Conference at South Valley University, 186-221.

- Al-Zamil, Maha Othman and Al-Dosari, Haya Bakhit. (2020). Organizational agility at Adhamira Noura bint Abdul Rahman University in Riyadh and ways to improve it. Islamic University Journal for Educational and Psychological Studies_Islamic University of Gaza 4 (29), 761-778.

- Al-Sakarna, Bilal. (2013). Organizational and administrative development. Amman: Dar Al Masirah for Publishing and Distribution.

- Abdel Mawla, Al-Tayeb Muhammad. (2019). Requirements for implementing organizational agility as viewed by faculty members at King Khalid University. Bisha University Journal of Humanities and Educational Sciences, 1 (4), 17-46.

- Omar, Doaa Muhammad Sayed. (2020). Improving organizational agility practices in South Valley University colleges. Algardqa Journal of Educational Sciences, 3 (1), 40-87.

- Ghoneim, Manal Ahmed Muhammad. (2020). The impact of the quality of work life on organizational agility - an applied study on university hospitals in Menoufia Governorate. Scientific Journal of Financial and Administrative Studies and Research, 2 (1), 62-90.

- Al-Masry, Marwan. (2016). A proposed strategy to improve the level of organizational agility in secondary schools in Gaza Governorate. College of Education Journal of Educational Sciences, 2 (40), 257-341.

-Al-Nashili, Dina Hilmi Abbas Muhammad. (2020). The role of organizational agility in achieving organizational commitment: field research. Arab Journal of Management, 3 (40), 163-182.

Babazadeh, R and Titkanloo, S. (2019). The role of organizational agility on the relationship between organizational information ethnology capabilities and competitive performance; case study: Mellat bank**.** *Journal of Educational and Management Studies, 9* (4), 16-24.

Cheng, C., Zhong, H., & Cao, L. (2020). Facilitating speed of internationalization: The roles of business intelligence and organizational agility. *Journal of Business Research*, *110*, 95-103.

Deer, M. (2018). ***Organizational Agility and Agile Development Methods: An Evaluation Study*** (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California).

Khavari, S.. (2016). Assessing the Level Organizational Universities Agility; Case Study of Islamic Azad University in Mazandaran. ***Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences**, 7*(3 S2), 112.

Kerachi, B, Abbaspour, A & Rahimian, H. (2014). Application Level of Organizational Agility Indices at Universities. *Education Strategies in Medical Sciences, 7(1), 25-31.*

Menon, S. & Suresh, M. (2020). Organizational agility assessment for higher education institution. ***Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera**, 51*(1), 561-573.

Nafei, W. (2016). Organizational agility: The key to improve organizational performance. *International Business Research*, *9*(3), 97-111.

Park, Y. K. (2011). *The Dynamics of Opportunity and Threat Management in Turbulent Environments: The Role of Information Technologies*. ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Razzaghi, G and Moghaddam, A .(2015). Education System and Agility Culture. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies 2*(3), 1197-1213.

Vaishnavi, V and Suresh, M and Dutta, P. (2019). Modelling the Readiness Factors for Agility in Healthcare Organization: a TISM approach. *Benchmarking An International Journal 26* (7), 2372-2400.

Walter, A (2021). Organizational agility: ill-defined and somewhat confusing? A systematic literature review and conceptualization. *Management Review Quarterly, 71*(2), 343-391.