

The organizational agility in private universities in Jordan's, as perceived by faculty members

By

Buthiana Elies Awais
Ajloun National University
Email: Univeaj@gmail.com

Ensaf Mohammad Bader
Ajloun National University
Email: ensafBader@anu.edu.jo

Yousef Abdullah alamer
Ministry of Education, Jordan
Email: alamer.yousef11@gmail.com

Abstract

The study sought to determine the level of organizational agility practiced by faculty members at private universities in the Northern Region, Jordan. The cluster sample method was used to select (283) faculty members for the study. To meet the study's aims, researchers created a questionnaire with three sections to measure the degree of organizational agility practice, which comprised of (26) paragraphs, and they employed the descriptive survey method. The study's findings revealed a low level of organizational agility practice in private universities. The findings also revealed substantial disparities due to the impact of gender in all fields except empowerment in favor of males, and academic rank in all fields except empowerment in favor of the professor rated. The university variable had no effect on the results.

Keywords: Organizational agility, universities in the northern region, and faculty members.

Introduction

Rapid change has compelled educational institutions to deal with internal and external developments. Administrative employees are finding it difficult to keep up with these changes due to the traditional administrative procedures and the administrative inertia of regulations and laws, which has led concerned departments to seek new and flexible methods of adapting to the rapidity of these changes. To develop educational institutions, successful management is required.

External factors are no longer the sole cause of degeneration, drooping, and administrative inertia. Other forms of changes that affect institutions from inside include organizational structure and the need to make functional and administrative adjustments that assist the institution in discontinuing ineffective practices. One of the most significant organizational changes that necessitates the application of organizational agility is the necessity for institutions to plan employment, be flexible in work procedures, and renew them. While routine work is a compelling reason for educational institutions to embrace the concept of organizational agility (Al-Barbari, 2022).

In the last years of the twentieth century, researchers showed great interest in management to develop administrative methods and searched for flexible and sophisticated administrative methods that suites for dealing with the challenges and renewed changes faced by educational institution management, represented by the search for radical solutions to improve developing the quality of education. As a result, the notion of organizational agility has arisen as a instrument that assists educational institutions in their flexibility and evolution in order to handle varied environmental difficulties (Omar, 2020).

Organizational agility is one of the important entry points that accommodates all changes in the external environment and keeps pace with them by abandoning routine traditional practices that do not achieve the institution's goals with the required speed, efficiency, and quality, making its performance slow in an era characterized by speed and constant change, and replacing them with new practices and working mechanisms that make the institution faster and more agile in an era characterized by speed and constant change (Abu Assi, 2021).

Al-Hamdan (2020) described agile management as an organization's ability to perform management that is characterized by rapid response and rapid adjustment of the method of work to meet the demands of change. Environmental survey, response to change, skills evaluation and development, empowering people with decision-making abilities, access to knowledge, cooperation, and information system integration are all hallmarks of organizational agility. It is also distinguished by higher and university education institutions' readiness and ability to rapidly transform from an institution that provides education to one that works on continuous improvement and development while avoiding performance stagnation and relying on keeping up with and employing information technology (Deer, 2018).

The value of organizational agility in educational institutions is that it aids in the understanding of fundamental competences and the identification of their capabilities. Its significance is not confined to internal matters; it also aids in understanding the external environment and identifying counterpart institutions. It also provides organizational agility, flexibility, and receptivity to new occurrences, allowing them to plan ahead of time, examine past alternatives, and direct their efforts toward new developments. One of the cornerstones to problem solving is agility, especially when there is disruption in the organization's internal and external contexts (Amin Eid, 2021).

According to Qandil (2020), the importance of organizational agility is to assist them in anticipating risks, speeding decision-making and implementation, continuous improvement, the ability to adapt, learn, and change to meet challenges, eliminating structural constraints by implementing flexible structures that provide an appropriate environment for experimentation, innovation, joint learning, and achieving efficiency and effectiveness in performance. Organizational agility also enables firms to successfully complete a sequence of tasks outlined in an open management system model, which leads to new inventions (Farah, Badawi and Bakir, 2019).

Cheng and Zhong (2020, 100) defined organizational agility as: "The ability of the organization to deal with unexpected changes in the external environment and provide quick and innovative solutions that take advantage of these changes as opportunities for prosperity and growth". Madrous (2021, 286) also referred to the concept of organizational agility as: "the ability to sense the upcoming change, prepare for and even responding to it quickly and flexibly, and reading variable in the environment in which the organization is active and predicting what is coming".

The most significant characteristic of organizational agility is decision-making: It is the ability to collect, record, analyze, and evaluate information from multiple and diverse sources in order to identify opportunities and work to exploit them, as well as reduce the impact of threats in the surrounding environment on the one hand, and develop strategic plans that help it reshape and exploit its resources on the other (Ghanaim, 2020).

The focus of the administrative process in all of the administration's tasks and activities is effective decision-making. It is also a recurring process that follows the same administrative procedure. Universities that are agile must be able to deal with changing situations, shortcomings, and uncertainties. As a result, their decisions must be based on three factors (Al-Masri, 2016). These are: the speed with which decisions are made, the likelihood of effective decision execution, and the ability to respond quickly to change. Among the most essential strategies to improve decision-making agility are to provide an effective information and data system, develop university rules, regulations, and laws in accordance with local and global legislation and surrounding developments, and extend participation in decision-making (Hamouda, Al-Qudsi and Ali, 2018).

Acting Agility is the ability to reshape organizational resources, modify processes, and restructure relationships based on actual plans dynamically and radically. It is to carry out tasks and processes for adapting to changes efficiently and making these changes in the shortest possible time (Nashli, 2020). Awareness agility: it is the organizational ability to examine, monitor and capture events from environmental change in a timely manner. The awareness function refers to the process of strategic monitoring of events that can have a significant impact on organizational strategy, competitive action, and future performance (Park, 2011), in addition, Empowerment Agility: is one of the most important administrative dimensions that focuses on shifting from the model of a rigid, controlling, and authoritative institution to an agile and capable institution. This results in changing the administrative practices of operations and functions and moving from a centralized pattern to a less centralized pattern through increased delegation authorities and granting powers. The process of empowering employees is supported by efficient and effective performance and productivity in universities. There is a strong positive relationship between empowerment and job satisfaction of employees, quality of administrative decisions, affiliation to the institution, clarity of the role of job responsibility, job design, and effectiveness of control methods. The clarity of relations between administrative units and creativity (Sakarna, 2013).

Vashnavi, Sirsh and Dota (2019) mentioned a framework for developing and improving organizational agility in universities that includes three basic dimensions: The first dimension: Developing a strategy for agility, this step is very important because it ensures a focus on why organizational agility is needed and what needs to be done to develop it. Through this phase, managers must take into account internal and external factors related to agility, and how their impact may vary with the evolution of the organization competitiveness, and the requirements of individuals, as well as taking into account the organization's strategy and objectives. These procedures are formed in the light of the characteristics of the institution's environment, in addition to identifying current strengths and weaknesses throughout the organization.

The second dimension: Implement actions necessary to achieve predefined strategic objectives, including modifying existing processes to help facilitate building agility at various levels and organizational functions, then identifying new procedures and processes to prioritize them in achieving and enhancing agility, and providing the members of the organization With knowledge, skills and attitudes related to agility, and finally ensuring the existence of

technologies and technological systems in addition to identifying effective human competencies to achieve the desired agility results and provide appropriate support.

The third dimension: it is vital at this stage to determine the use of appropriate indicators to make an accurate assessment of the organization's agility development. This procedure can evaluate key aspects of performance, align business goals with agility and determine how to increase the impact of agility on the performance of the institution.

Researchers believe that organizational agility contributes significantly to the conduct of administrative work in universities and helps reduce the time and effort spent in implementing regulations and laws that require procedures and steps that waste working time, reduce the morale of administrators and reduce their performance. Due to the great importance of organizational agility in the administrative process and its contribution to helping the university keep pace with various environmental changes and improve its level, this study revealed the degree of organizational agility practiced in private universities in the Northern Region from the point of view of faculty members.

The problem statement

Educational institutions, especially universities face many challenges and organizational problems, and the continuous changes in the needs of students and employees in all categories and job positions (Abdel Mawla's, 2019), which confirmed that organizational agility at the university was low, so the traditional administrative methods for academic departments in private universities are now inappropriate considering these rapid changes. This makes it imperative for universities to move towards building new administrative capabilities based on understanding the contemporary changes and knowing their dimensions and future possibilities. Therefore, the Academic departments should adopt contemporary administrative approaches that suit the requirements of the times to improve the degree of institutional performance through organizational agility which is a key pillar in improving their performance.

The research questions

Based on the research problem which seeks to reveal the degree of agility practice in northern universities from the point of view of faculty members, by answering the following questions:

1. What is the degree of organizational agility practiced in private universities in the Northern Region from the point of view of their faculty members?
2. Do faculty members' views on the degree of organizational agility practice in private universities in the Northern Region differ according to (gender, academic rank, and university)?

Study objectives

The current study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

1. Identify the degree of organizational agility practice at the private university in the Northern Region because of its importance in achieving flexibility and speed in

- administrative procedures, in order to recommend improving the degree of practicing organizational agility.
2. To gain a deeper understanding of the impact of some study variables (gender, academic rank, and university) on the degree of organizational agility from the point of view of faculty members, to investigate and identify these differences.

The importance and the significance of study

The importance of study is in two respects:

Theoretical importance

This study is one of the important studies in terms of its subject matter, in order to contribute to enriching the field of specialization of educational administration and theoretical literature with studies on the degree of organizational agility in private universities. It is also hoped that this study will provide a cognitive and scientific addition and open the way for researchers to conduct more Studies on organizational agility and how to use it to develop education in universities and raise their efficiency.

Practical importance

It is hoped that the results of this study will be reflected on universities as they provide researchers with mechanisms and methods to improve the application of organizational agility that will help universities meet challenges and contribute to managing the change process and the development and improvement it can lead to, and those responsible for management at the university through activating the organizational agility portal to increase the effectiveness of management to become more flexible in dealing with surrounding changes, and also to provide faculty members and decision makers in universities with information that serves as feedback on their job performance, so as to help improve the degree of education and improve its quality.

Study limits and limitations

This study is determined by the following limits:

Objective limit

Identify the degree of practicing organizational agility in private universities in the Northern Region from the point of view of faculty members. Agility includes the following dimensions (empowerment, sensing, practice, decision-making).

Spatial limit

The study was applied at the private university in the Northern Region - Jordan: (Ajloun National University, Jadara University, Irbid National University, Jerash University, Philadelphia University).

Time limit

It was applied during the first semester of the academic year 2022/2023.

The human limit

Faculty members in private universities in the Northern Region.

Terminologies

The study included the following terminological and procedural definitions:

Organizational agility: “A set of administrative procedures that enable the organization to respond quickly to surrounding events. It includes a number of elements, including: Speed, flexibility, responsiveness, agility of decision-making, exploitation of opportunities, and adaptation to the environment. It helps the organization overcome various challenges and enables it to manage knowledge efficiently. It is the valve of success to face different competitive environments” Atkinson, p et al., 2020).

The researcher defines organizational agility procedurally as: The degree to which administrators in private universities practice flexibility in regulations and laws to conduct the administrative process. It is measured by the overall degree of responses of the study sample members to the organizational agility instrument.

Literature review

The current study dealt with several Arab and foreign studies that dealt with the subject of organizational agility. They were presented according to their chronological sequence from the most recent to the oldest:

Zamil and Al-Dossary (2020) conducted a study aimed at identifying the reality of organizational agility at Princess Noura bint Abdulrahman University in Riyadh and ways to improve it. The study used a descriptive analytical method on a sample of (110) employees at Princess Noura bint Abdulrahman University in Riyadh. The study indicates that the reality of organizational fitness at Princess Noura bint Abdulrahman University was high. There were no significant differences due to the impact of gender and academic rank. It was found that Princess Noura University does not face obstacles in implementing organizational agility.

While Menon and Suresh (2020) attempted to assess the organizational agility of a higher education institution at Amrita University in India. The descriptive analytical method was employed on a sample of (589) university faculty members. The study discovered that the institution's speed of movement and organizational agility have been low, and the university must use its resources and work proactively to capitalize on changes.

Atkinson et al. (2020) presented research on the impact of competitive intelligence on organizational agility via strategic flexibility and organizational innovation. Using basic, random samples, the study sample comprised of (83) directors of a corporation in Iran. Structured equation modeling (SEM) with partial least squares was used to analyze it (PLS). The findings revealed that competitive intelligence had an indirect effect on organizational agility via strategic flexibility, which was a variable in the study. Competitive intelligence has an impact on organizational innovation as well, but the human aspect is the most significant because it is the cornerstone to a successful company strategy.

Al-Enezi (2019) did a study to discover the relationship between organizational agility and competitiveness among academic leaders at Kuwait University from the perspective of faculty members. A descriptive survey method was employed on a sample of (405) faculty members at Kuwait University to fulfill the study's purpose. The study discovered that academic leaders at Kuwait University have a high level of organizational agility. It was also discovered that there were statistically significant disparities in the replies of the study sample members according to the sex variable, with males outnumbering females. The rank variables academy and years of experience had no statistically significant differences.

Abdul Mawla's (2019) study attempted to disclose the needs for implementing organizational agility as seen by faculty members at King Khalid University by identifying the justification for implementing organizational agility at King Khalid University based on an analysis of its strategic plan. The descriptive survey method was utilized in the study, which included 411 faculty members from the faculties of arts, education, and computer science. The findings revealed that faculty members at King Khalid University had a low level of approval for the availability of organizational agility characteristics.

Commenting on previous studies

Comparing the current study with previous studies, researchers found that this study was characterized by combining four areas of organizational agility. This study focused on improving and developing administrative processes in universities considering the continuous improvement and development movement in the university environment and what may contribute to raising efficiency and effectiveness of universities. It has also distinguished itself from other studies by showing results that apply to practical reality in the study environment.

Similarities and differences

Methodology

Most of the studies used the descriptive survey method, such as the study of Abdul Mawla (2019), Khavari (Khavari, 2016), and Razaghi and Moghaddam (2015). The descriptive analytical method was used in the study of Zamil and Dossary (2020), and the study of Menon and Suresh (2020). While this study differed in its selection of a cluster sample representative of the study population.

The sample

All previous studies have been applied to faculty members in universities such as; Menon and Suresh (2020), Al-Enezi (2019), Abdul Mawla (2019), Khavari (2016), Razafi and Moghaddam (2015) studies, or to administrators exclusively as a study Atkinson et al. (2020).

The instrument

The current study was similar to previous studies by using the questionnaire as an instrument to collect information from the studied sample.

Take advantage of previous studies

Previous research has been cited as essential references in the theoretical literature of the various aspects of the study and in the interpretation of the findings. The current study differed from earlier studies in that it was one of the few that dealt with the study of organizational agility in private universities in the Northern Region within the researchers' knowledge limits. This study also explored additional dimensions that had not been covered in previous investigations.

Method and procedures

This part deals with the study methodology, community, sample, and used study instrument.

Study methodology

The descriptive analytical method was used for study purposes.

Study population and sample

The study population consists of all faculty members in private universities in Irbid, Ajloun, Jerash governorates and Philadelphia university which very closest to Jerash governorate more than it is closest to the capital city, Amman, during the second academic year (2022/2023). This study was applied to a sample selected by the cluster method that consist of (283) faculty members. Table (1) shows the distribution of sample members according to their variables.

Table 1: *Frequencies of study sample members by sex, academic rank, and university*

The variable	Categories	Frequency	Percent (%)
Sex	Male	191	67.0
	Female	92	33.0
Academic rank	Professor	27	10.0
	Associate professor	181	64.0
	Assistant professor	75	27.0
University	Ajloun National	59	21.0
	Jadara	53	19.0
	Irbid Ahlia	43	15.0
	Jerash	37	13.0
	Philadelphia	91	32.0
TOTAL		283	100.0

Table (1) shows there 191(67%) males of respondents. In term of academic rank, there are: 27 (10.0%) professors, 181 (64%) associate professor, and 75 (27%) assistant professor. Respondents are working in four universities, those are: 59 (21%) in Ajloun university, 53(19%) in Jadara university, 43(15%) in Irbid Ahlia university, 37(13%) in Jerash university, and 91 (32%) in Philadelphia university.

Research Instrument

To meet the study's objectives, the researchers created a questionnaire to assess organizational agility in private Jordanian universities in the Northern Region, drawing on theoretical literature and previous research such as; Zamil and Al-Dossary (2020) and Abdul Mawla (2019). The instrument, which consisted of (26) paragraphs and they were located at four dimensions. Each dimension reflects a different aspect of organizational agility, and they are organized as follows: The awareness dimension has (7) paragraphs, and the application/practice dimension includes (7) paragraphs. It has (6) paragraphs in its basic form, (7) paragraphs in the dimension of decision-making, and (6) paragraphs in the dimension of empowerment.

Instrument validity

To ensure of the instrument validity, the study instrument was presented to a group of arbitrators with competence and experience from faculty members in different Jordanian universities in the field of educational administration, measurement, and evaluation. They were

asked to give their opinions on the validity of the questionnaire paragraphs for the subject of study. Its quality, the extent to which it belongs to the field in which it was placed, and the integrity and clarity of the language. They were also asked to propose any other observations they may consider appropriate, whether addition, deletion or merger, to make the appropriate amendment. Based on the agreement of the arbitrators (72%), the study instrument was adopted in its form. The final instrument consists of (26) paragraphs.

Instrument Reliability

To ensure the reliability of the study instrument, the internal consistency coefficient was calculated according to Cronbach's alpha equation, which measures the consistency in respondents' response to all paragraphs in the questionnaire, Table (2).

Table 2: Cronbach's alpha coefficient

Domain	Internal consistency
Awareness	0.91
Application/practice	0.87
decision making	0.92
Empowerment	0.85
Total	0.89

Table (2) shows the internal consistency coefficients according to Cronbach's alpha equation. These values were considered appropriate for the purposes of this study.

Study instrument correction standard

Likert's scale has been adopted to correct the study instruments by giving each of its paragraphs one of its five grades (very high, high, medium, low, and very low). They represent numerically (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) respectively. Here, the extent of the category should be determined, according to the following equation: Class length = (highest value — lowest value) divided by the number of options in the staging, so: Class length = (5-1) /5 = 0.8. Then add the answer (0.80) to the end of each category. Thus, the criterion for judging the grade is (Al-Kilani and Al-Sharafien, 2011, 431):

- (1 to - 1.8) degrees', then it would be ranked "too low".
- (1.8 - 2.61) degrees', then it would be ranked "low".
- (2.6 - 3.42) degrees', then it would be ranked "medium".
- (3.4 - 4.23) degrees', then it would be ranked "high".
- 4.24 and above, then it would be ranked "too high".

Study variables

The current study included the following variables:

First: Independent variables

- Gender: It has two categories (male and female).
- Academic rank: It has three levels (professor, associate professor, assistant professor).

- University: It has five levels (Ajloun National University, Irbid Ahlia University, Jerash University, Jadara University and Philadelphia University).

Second: The independent variable

The perspectives of faculty members in private universities in the Northern region.

Third: Dependent variable

The degree of practice of organizational agility in private universities in the Northern Region.

Statistical methods

Researchers used the following statistical analyses:

1. To answer the first question, means and standard deviations were used.
2. To answer the second question, ANOVA test was used to investigate the differences between the means for the overall score.
3. MANOVA test was used to investigate the differences between the means of the study areas to answer the second study question.
4. The Scheffe' Test was used to identify the variable that made statistically significant differences.

Results and discussions

This part included the results of the study, which aimed to identify the degree of practice of organizational agility in universities in the Northern Region from the point of view of faculty members by answering the following study questions:

First: Results related to the first question, what is the degree of practice of organizational agility in private universities in the Northern Region from the point of view of their faculty members?

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of the degree of exercise of organizational agility in universities in the Northern Region were extracted from the point of view of faculty members, table (3).

Table 3: Means and standard deviations of the degree of exercise of organizational agility in universities in the Northern Region from the point of view of faculty members are ranked in descending order according to their means.

Rank	The number	Domain	Mean	SD	grade
1	1	Awareness	2.85	0.62	medium
2	4	Empowerment	2.67	0.59	medium
3	2	Application/practice	2.47	0.53	Low
4	3	decision making	2.35	0.50	Low
		Organizational agility	2.59	0.52	Low

Table (3) shows that the means of the organizational agility dimensions' ranged from (2.35 ±0.50 -2.85±0.62), and the overall mean of organizational agility was (2.59±0.52).

The results related to this question showed that the degree of exercise of organizational agility from the point of view of the faculty as a whole was low. This was due to the traditional

hierarchical organizational structures prevailing in universities, which focus on routine operations systems to perform tasks, and the failure of universities develop plans periodically in accordance with continuous changes, in addition to the poor skills and abilities of some university administrators and employees in formulating realistic goals that include outstanding high performance and poor availability of expertise to build flexible and targeted strategies. This may be due to resistance to change employees or some administrators, and the prevailing stereotypes in most of the procedures followed in universities that prevent excellence and competitiveness, and the desire and adherence to continue traditional methods of performing different processes and activities within universities.

The results of this question were consistent with Menon and Suresh (2020) and Abdulmawla (2019) studies, the results of which showed that the degree of organizational agility was practiced to a small degree. It differed with Zamil and Al-Dossary (2020) and Khavari (2016) studies, which produced a high degree of results. The means and standard deviations of the estimates of the study sample members were calculated on the paragraphs of each field separately. They were as follows:

The first dimension: Awareness

To show the degree to which the study sample members estimate the paragraphs of the awareness dimension, means and standard deviations were extracted, Table (4).

Table 4: *The means and standard deviations of the paragraphs related to the awareness dimension are arranged in descending order*

Rank	The number	Paragraphs	Mean	SD	grade
1	3	Internal and external environment analysis	3.14	0.86	Medium
2	6	Develop new methods of work according to changes in the surrounding environment	3.02	0.83	Medium
3	1	Examine and monitor events that have an environmental impact	2.94	0.71	Medium
4	7	Develop its current services to keep pace with rapid renewal	2.87	0.73	Medium
5	2	Discover available opportunities	2.84	0.65	medium
6	5	Develop the necessary plans to cope with emergency changes	2.80	0.68	medium
7	4	Anticipate and prepare for changes that may occur	2.37	0.67	low
Awareness dimension			2.85	0.62	medium

Table (4) shows that the means ranged from (2.37 ±0.67 -3.14±0.86), and the mean for the field of awareness dimension was (2.85±0.62). This result is due to the importance of awareness in decision-making and implementation. Organizational agility requires proactive action, providing distinct and innovative administrative outputs, and providing new opportunities to gain new competitive advantages that qualify them to gain public satisfaction. All this is done only through awareness. This result is due to the inclusion of the vision, mission, and objectives of universities to develop their practices through training in modern

and flexible administrative and leadership methods, and through universities developing appropriate mechanisms to aware the changes surrounding it and accurately predict them.

Paragraph (3), which provides for “analysis of the internal and external environment”, came in the first order with a mean of (3.14 ± 0.71) . This result is due to the ability of universities to develop dynamic response to expected and sometimes unexpected changes by redesigning administrative processes. The redistribution of organizational resources and the restructuring of the organizational structure, which enhances their ability to continue. This result may be due to universities seeking to develop action plans that guide the restructuring of resources, the development and facilitation of administrative procedures, and the existence of modern strategic planning methods that include the existence of an executive action plan that is constantly updated based on the results of the analysis of the internal and external environments of universities.

Paragraph (4), which reads “Anticipate and prepare for changes that may occur”, came in the last rank with a mean of (2.37 ± 0.74) . Researchers attribute this result to the poor availability of flexible organizational and functional structures in universities, the ambiguity of funding processes necessary for these expectations, in addition to the lack of availability highly qualified and efficient human resources with renewed expertise that enable them to improve and develop continuously.

The second dimension: Application/practice

To show the degree of estimation of the paragraphs of the dimension of application/practice, means and standard deviation have been extracted, Table (5).

Table 5: Means and standard deviations of the paragraphs related to the dimension of application/practice are arranged in descending order

Rank	The number	Paragraphs	mean	SD	grade
1	12	Providing flexible academic services that meet the aspirations of higher education	2.97	0.90	medium
2	9	Perform tasks to adapt to changes efficiently	2.75	0.61	medium
3	10	Give quick feedback to surrounding environmental changes	2.38	0.75	low
4	13	Involve academic leaders in setting goals	2.35	0.70	low
5	11	Restructuring operations to achieve their goals effectively	2.24	0.63	low
6	8	Invest all its resources effectively	2.11	0.53	low
Application/practice dimension			2.47	0.53	low

Table (5) shows that the means ranged from $(2.11 \pm 0.53-2.97 \pm 0.90)$. The mean for the field of application/practice was (2.47 ± 0.53) . The reason is due to poor interest in modifying administrative processes to be better able to cope with any change that occurs in the internal and external environments, and the difficulty of making changes due to most of the prevailing traditional systems, the rigidity of regulations, laws and instructions that regulate the functioning of universities, and the need for universities to have a wide range of specialized training programs for their employees and administrators.

Paragraph (12), which provides for “providing flexible academic services that meet the aspirations of higher education”, ranked first with a mean of (2.97 ± 0.90) . The reason is to provide an organizational guide that defines work rules and procedures, clearly describes tasks, reviews

it and updates the job description periodically and continuously for each Jobs, focusing on identifying internal strengths and weaknesses in the university and seeking proposals that support strengths and address weaknesses, in addition to reducing the gap between actual performance and expected performance to improve the practical and academic degree in universities.

Paragraph (8), which reads “Investing all its resources effectively”, ranked last with mean of (2.11 ± 0.53) . This is due to the low awareness among the administrative and financial system of the importance of applying organizational agility, a weak culture of continuous improvement and development among many university employees, overlap and duplication between many jobs and administrative processes at times, in addition to the dependence of some employees on others in the performance of tasks, indifference, evasion of responsibility, blame on others or for the ambiguity of certain regulations, and laws.

The third dimension: decision making

To show the degree of estimation of paragraphs in the decision-making dimension, means and standard deviations were extracted, Table (6).

Table 6: *The means and standard deviations of the paragraphs related to the decision-making field are arranged in descending order*

Rank	The number	Paragraphs	Mean	SD	grade
1	17	Drawing clear lines of communication between colleges	2.64	0.74	medium
2	20	Develop flexible systems through which some decisions are amended to serve the interests of students	2.59	0.67	low
3	16	Striking a balance between centralization and decentralization	2.32	0.68	low
4	18	Set standards that maximize opportunities to counter threats	2.25	0.64	low
5	19	Adopting databases that contribute to linking organizational units to facilitate decision-making	2.23	0.62	low
6	15	Developing legislation that allows the participation of all administrative levels in decision-making	2.20	0.60	low
7	14	Adopting clear foundations for making objective decisions	2.18	0.60	low
decision making dimension			2.35	0.50	low

Table (6) shows that the means ranged from $(2.18 \pm 0.60 - 2.64 \pm 0.74)$, with a mean for the decision-making field (2.35 ± 0.35) . The reason is that some administrative units have different knowledge of decision-making mechanisms, which hinders their adoption procedures, and that universities still follow the traditional method of making decisions are sometimes without taking into account the surrounding internal and external circumstances. They are still subject to central thinking in the decision-making process, especially decisions related to the administrative, financial, and developmental affairs of the university, in addition to varying transparency among some administrators in making decisions following up on their implementation, the complexity of procedures and weak databases.

Paragraph (17), which provides for “drawing clear lines of communication between colleges”, ranked first with a mean of (2.64 ± 0.74) . The reason is due to the effective use of information technology in the decision-making process, the university's keenness to provide adequate training and qualification, and the quality of available communication channels. In universities, this is because the decision-making process requires an effective communication network to collect data, information and facts.

While paragraph (14), which reads “Adopting clear foundations for making objective decisions”, ranked last with a mean of (2.18 ± 0.60) , the reason may be due to the lack of a specific and clear philosophy that leads the decision-making process, and the ambiguity of regulations and instructions for some employees, which is an obstacle to participation in Make decisions.

The fourth dimension: empowerment

To show the degree of appreciation of the paragraphs of the empowerment dimension, means and standard deviations were extracted, Table (7).

Table (7): Means and standard deviations of the paragraphs related to the empowerment dimension are arranged in descending order

Rank	The number	Paragraphs	mean	SD	Grade
1	25	Job descriptions make it possible to achieve goals	3.04	0.001	Medium
2	22	Develop training programs to improve work performance	3.01	0.96	Medium
3	21	Delegation of authority to increase the effectiveness of performance	2.64	0.73	Medium
4	23	Develop legislation that clarifies powers	2.56	0.74	Low
5	26	Moving from a centralized administrative style to a less centralized style	2.49	0.68	Low
6	24	Develop systems that support the work of the team	2.28	0.66	Low
Empowerment			2.67	0.60	Medium

Table (7) shows that the means ranged from $(2.28 \pm 0.66 - 3.04 \pm 0.001)$. The mean for the field of empowerment as a whole was (2.67 ± 0.60) . This is due to the adoption by universities of a culture of support for empowerment that considers individual attitudes and behaviors, and the existence of an administrative leadership that has an organizational culture that works to form task forces that have highly skilled and willing to cooperate, adopt change, remove work difficulties and problems, and encourage employees to participate in decision-making.

Paragraph (25), which states “job descriptions that enable goals to be achieved”, ranked first with a mean of (3.04 ± 0.001) . This is due to the university's interest in the work environment and its motivation for creativity and innovation among employees. The university seeks to provide working methods through which it focuses on training and development functional.

Paragraph (24), which reads “Developing systems that support the work of the team”, ranked last with a mean of (2.28 ± 0.66) . The mean of the empowerment field as a whole was (2.67 ± 0.60) . This is due to the lack of empowerment elements and requirements in the university environment and among its leaders, such as lack of delegation of authority, effective communication, poor training, lack of administrative trust requirements, participation requirements and poor teamwork at university.

Second: Results related to the answer to the second question: Do faculty members' views on the degree of organizational agility practice in private universities in the Northern Region differ according to (gender, academic rank, and university)?

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of the degree of exercise of organizational agility were extracted according to the variables of gender, academic rank and university, Table (8).

Table (8): Means and standard deviations of the degree of exercise of organizational agility by gender, academic rank, and university

The variable	categories	mean	SD
Sex	Male	2.63	0.46
	Female	2.43	0.67
Academic rank	Professor	2.71	0.39
	Associate professor	2.54	0.57
	Assistant professor	2.49	0.55
	Ajloun National	2.66	0.42
University	Jadara	2.54	0.57
	Irbid Ahlia	2.44	0.59
	Jerash	2.43	0.45
	Philadelphia	2.52	0.46

Table (8) shows an apparent variation in means and standard deviations of the degree of exercise of organizational agility due to different categories of variables of gender, academic rank, and university. To show the significance of statistical differences between means, variance analysis was used, Table (9).

Table 9: variance analysis of the impact of gender, academic rank, and university on the degree of exercise of organizational agility

The source of contrast	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Average squares	P value	Statistical significance
Sex	2.234	1	2.234	6.438	0.003
Academic rank	2.064	2	1.032	2.759	0.018
University	1.647	4	0.412	1.187	0.051
The mistake	95.728	276	0.347		
total	102.037	283			

Table (9) shows the following:

The results showed that there were significant differences in the degree of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) due to the effect of the sex variable in all areas except for empowerment. The differences were in favor of males. This result may initially explain that most of the study sample members were males. This result is also explained by the presence of males, they have

more contact with the work environment than females because females always seek to harmonize their working life with their family life and their requirements.

This result is due to the different physical and psychological nature between males and females. Females are more affected by surrounding factors, while males are better able to exercise self-control and thus perform administrative work more impartially and practically. Males have different characteristics from females in the ability to do in various jobs, there are jobs that do not suit the female nature in the ability to work for a longer period of time.

This result was consistent with Al-Enezi's (2019) study, which showed significant differences attributed to the sex variable and were in favor of males. This result differed with the Zamil and Al-Dossary (2020) and Abdul Mawla (2019) studies, which showed that there were no statistically significant differences attributed to the sex variable.

The results showed that there are no statistically significant differences in the degree of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) due to the impact of the university variable. Researchers attribute this result to the interest of universities in continuous development and improvement and flexibility in administrative and educational services practiced in universities as well as competitiveness among private universities. These universities are also interested in keeping up with everything new in the scientific, practical and administrative fields and trying to apply it on the ground.

The results also showed significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) due to the effect of academic rank, with an F-value of (2.759) and a statistical significance of (0.018). To show statistically significant marital differences between means, dimension comparisons were used in a transparent manner as shown in Table (10).

Table 10: *Dimensional comparisons of the impact of academic rank on the degree of exercise of organizational agility*

Domain	Academic rank	Mean	Professor	Associate professor	Assistant professor
Organizational agility	Professor	2.71			
	Associate professor	2.54	0.16*		
	Assistant professor	2.49	0.21*	0.05	

Table (10) shows that there are significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between a professor on the one hand and both an associate professor and an assistant professor on the other. The differences were in favor of a professor in organizational agility as a whole. The reason for this is that members of the study sample with the rank of professor believe that practicing organizational agility is an important factor in achieving the goals of the university. This result is due to the fact that faculty members with the rank of professor have wider knowledge and experience in the field of teaching and completing administrative work and its organizational requirements as a result of their long period of work, which made them able to see the difference in changing the university's orientation from complexity in procedures to flexibility. This result is also due to the feeling of members of the study sample that those ranked as a professor hold administrative positions, practice routine work and listen to various complaints about obstructing or facilitating the performance of tasks, which made them have a clear knowledge and vision about the importance of applying organizational agility at the university. The results of the current study differed with the results of the Zamil and Al-Dossary (2020) and Al-Enezi (2019) studies, which showed that there were no significant differences due to the impact of academic rank.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, researchers recommend the following:

1. Deepen the concept of organizational agility by developing an organizational culture that supports change and development.
2. Ensure that training programs are held to enhance the organizational agility abilities of employees.
3. Conducting more research and studies related to organizational agility in universities and linking them to other variables such as job excellence.

References

- Abdel Mawla, El-Tayeb. (2019). The requirements for applying organizational agility as seen by the faculty members of King Khalid University. *Bisha University Journal of Humanities and Educational Sciences* 1 (4), 17-46.
- Abu Assi, H. (2021). A proposed vision to improve the performance of school leaders in secondary schools in light of the introduction of organizational agility. *Educational Journal -Sohag University*, 2(88), 900-950.
- Al-Enezi, Saeed Farhan and Joayan, Munawer (2019). The degree of organizational agility among academic leaders at Kuwait University and its relation to competitiveness. (Unpublished master's thesis), Mutah University, Jordan.
- Al-Hamdan, A. (2020). Organizational agility in higher education institutions "Saudi universities as a model, Al-Rushd Library, Riyadh.
- Al-Masri, M. (2016). A proposed strategy to improve organizational agility in secondary schools in Gaza governorate. *Journal of the Faculty of Education in Educational Sciences*, 2 (40), 257-341.
- Amin Eid, M. (2021). Achieving organizational agility for Egyptian universities using the simultaneous engineering portal from the point of view of university leaders. *Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 22 (4), 45-75.
- Atkinson, P., Hezaji, M., Nazarian, A., & Abasi, A (2020). Attaining organizational agility through competitive intelligence: the roles of strategic flexibility and organizational innovation. The University of Westminster. *Quality Management & Business Excellence*.
- 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).
- Hamouda, A., Al-Qudsi, A., & Ali, N. (2018). The impact of some human resources management practices in enhancing organizational agility capabilities. *Second International Conference at South Valley University*, 186-221.
- Menon, S. & Suresh, M. (2020). Organizational agility assessment for higher education institution. *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, 51(1), 561-573.
- Omar, D. (2020). Improving organizational agility practices at South Valley University faculties. *Hurghada Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 40-87.
- 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.

- Qandil, S. (2020). The impact of organizational agility on organizational excellence: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. (Unpublished master's thesis), Middle East University, Jordan.
- 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.
- Zamil, M., & Al-Dossary, H. (2020). Organizational agility at Adhamira Noura bint Abdulrahman University in Riyadh and ways to improve it. *Journal of the Islamic University of Educational and Psychological Studies-Islamic University of Gaza* 4 (29), 761-778.