



Organizational agility in public and private schools

Farzaneh Eghbal ^{*a}, Seyed Ali Siadat ^b, Saeed Rajaeepour ^b, Reza Hoveida ^b

^a Ph.D. Candidate of Educational Management

^b Associate Professor, Faculty of educational sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Article history:

Received 20 March 2014

Received in revised form 10 April 2014

Accepted 28 April 2014

Keywords:

work motivation

organizational agility

public school

Private School

Accountability

Competence

speed and flexibility

Abstract

Introduction: Agility means the ability to respond to rapid and successful response to environmental changes and is an important factor for the effectiveness of schools. Agile school represents the response when exposed to internal and external changes. So, the present study aims to investigate and compare the organizational agility in public and private schools of Isfahan.

Materials and method: Employing stratified random sampling, 286 persons were selected by stratified random sampling. Researcher made questionnaire based on Sharif and Zhang's model (2000) were used to assess Organizational agility.

Results: finding presented significant differences between the mean score of agility at public and private schools. Additionally in regard of sub variables there was a significant difference between accountability and competence, but in the case of speed and flexibility no significant difference in average were found.

Conclusion: for achieving Better Organizational agility, quality of educational and fundamental services should be increased and the reduction of costs, internal satisfaction of the students should be considered in the face of rapid changes in education system and training time associated with changes in the education system.

*Corresponding Author: Email: f_ghbal@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Nowadays, developmental management and fundamental changes in education organization are the pillars of the growth and excellence of this organization and defects in this pillar will cause adverse consequences for the organization and the society. technology and technological changes, environmental, labor and management changes in the education system requires management changes in school and without changing, managers will not be able to comply with the objectives and policies of education system. In other words, we can say that the last events and solutions have lost their ability of meeting the challenges of organization and external environment and it seems better to replace them with the new views and incidents. Education Organization is a dynamic institution that is created to respond to the needs of society and its survival depends on effective constructive engagement with the environment. This interaction may continue while maintaining the quality of schools in responding to the needs of the community should have the enough flexibility so it is essential to change the education system (Striukova, 2008). But the important thing is that the speed of change is faster than in the ability of education and the school environment and has led them not be able to take advantage of the opportunities before to adaptation to changing conditions. That's where the debate agility training in the organization is proposed (Ambrose and Morello, 2004).

Agile word in the dictionary means to move fast, agile, active, agility and ability to move fast and easy, and being able to think quickly and with a clever method (Hornby, 2000). But the new issues of agility many definitions have been proposed, but none, not oppose each other; they do not violate each other (Dove, 1994). According to Goldman et al (1995) agility means abandoning old ways of doing things that way and now today, he says, have a good efficiency in the new competitive environment to further develop the flexibility and responsiveness of competitors is required. According to Sharifi and Zhang (1999) for organizational agility means the capability of each sensor, understanding and predict changes in the work environment. Such an organization must be

able to detect changes in the environment, viewing them as agents of growth and prosperity.

Maskell (2001) defines agility as the ability to Prosperity in an environment of constant and unpredictable change. In this regard, organizations should not be afraid of changes in their working environment, to avoid them, but the opportunity to gain a competitive advantage in their market environment imaginable. Arteta and Giachetti (2004) also know the agility an organization's ability to adapt to change and the opportunities that emerge in the aftermath of the transformation returns. Lee (2005) argues that organizational agility is the satisfaction of our customers and employees who seek and need the ability to respond to ongoing changes in the competitive environment may. As well as potential opportunities to use and develop their innovation capabilities and conditions to be stable (Algama, 2011).

Daolat Modeli (2006) argues that organizations are nimble and value creation characteristics of an information-based, focused on the merits, they have the flexibility to focus on the key values of customer focus lack of focus and organization hierarchies can be seen that there is trust between partner organizations. Osoli (2007) states that agile organizations understand further and willing to adapt to changes beyond the potential opportunities and earn a fixed position for their innovation and competence.

Definitions provided is general in what is generally definitions of agility, dynamic organization, status-oriented, flexible and growth oriented are visualization. Moreover, to assess and improve organizational agility patterns different approaches have been proposed by experts (Algama, 2011). Goldman et al (1995) introduce agility as harmony, satisfaction, customers, people, information, and the ability to control the changes. Lau (2003) used seven factors in evaluating enterprise agility of an organization's customers include building rich, responsive, dynamic structure, group work and partnership organization to create competitive advantage, leverage the relationship, and the impact of information technology Labor wins. Yosuf et al (1999) knew component integration and the integrity,

competence, team building, quality, change, market participation and education, as well as the staff as agility capabilities. Sharifi and Zhang (2001) have presented a model concept of organizational agility because it is the most comprehensive review of the theoretical literature, the most appropriate framework for agility would. So for agility capabilities of this model has been used in schools. The model consists of three main parts, the first episode of the dexterity of the drivers and pressures for change in the organization is uncertain and unpredictable It will have to use the appropriate method. Agility means for achieving agility in the second part of the model that includes the organizational Structure, personnel, information technology, innovation and creativity. The third part, as the basis for maintaining and developing capabilities that are agile agility are the four elements of accountability (the ability to detect and respond to changes quickly, and the advantage), Competence (the ability to achieve the aims and objectives of the organization implies Flexibility (the ability to stream to multiple business processes from different targets) and speed (ability to perform activities in the shortest possible time).

Several studies have been conducted on organizational agility In all these studies, researchers have attempted to proceed agility of the organization and its relationship with the environment could affect the agility of organizations .It went on to point out that some of this research are:

Heydari et al. (2012) in a study entitled " The relationship between structural empowerment and organizationalexcellence,organizationalagilitycapabilitiesinIsfahan public universities" showed that the instruments enabling enterprise agility and excellence and functionality of a meaningful relationship exists the staff is the best predictor of organizational capabilities, processes, products and services, leadership, partnership and resource strategy:

Nick Poor and Salajegheh (2012) in a study entitled "The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational agility of government agencies Kerman" concluded between enterprise agility and its components (accountability, competence,

flexibility and speed of the work). Is associated with job satisfaction?

Lahhafi (2011) in a study entitled "The relationship between teamwork and organizational agility in city government and private banks Send" came to the conclusion that there is significant relationship between team work and organizational agility on organizational agility component of effective. Shahin and Lellahgany (2011) in a study entitled "Evaluation of agility in services and applications in the university" to conclude that a significant impact on applying the principles of agility and diversity of services offered by the University of flexible components is known as the most important factor of organizational agility.

Yarmohammadian et al. (2011) in a study entitled "Status agility in Esfahan city hospitals" showed that between agility in government hospitals and private hospitals, there is no significant relationship between agility at Esfahan city hospitals upper-middle and hospitals to improve agility, strategy and organizational structure of the flexible ways, providing outsourcing services, professional development and training of staff to deal with the changing environment is required.

As can be seen in various organizations of research has been done, but swift research in the field of school education system has not been done. This study considered the fundamental and rapid change, fundamental change in public and private schools and competition between schools. The study aimed to investigate and compare the following hypotheses agility city has public and private schools. The average agility in city public schools and non-profit organizations, there are significant differences. The average size of agility in city public schools and non-profit organizations, there are significant differences. The schools vary in terms of agility demographic variables of gender, education level, years of service and age, there is a significant difference.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

This study employs a descriptive – analytic design and was conducted in public and private schools of Isfahan in 2013. The population of the study

consisted of all 1128 public and private schools administrators who were randomly selected.

2.2. Measurement

Data collection questionnaire noble model-based agility and Zhang (2000) is in two parts. The first section contained questions regarding demographic variables of the participants in the study and the second part contains questions on a five-point Likert scale response packet after answering the 36 questions, In four dimensions (11 items), resilience (9 items), competence (10 items) and speed (6 items) that is used to determine. The maximum achievable score of 168 and a minimum of zero. to determine the level of agility of schools agility scores were divided into five categories, each category would represent a level of agility: Average score below 33 indicates a very low level of dexterity, agility, low level represents the average score of 33-66, the average score of 66-99 indicates moderate levels of agility, Average score of 99-132 indicates upper-middle class and average agility class represents excellent 132-168. To assess face and content validity of the questionnaire based on the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was

used and management experts based on Cronbach's alpha (95%). That is a sign of stability and reliability of the research instrument. Data analysis using SPSS statistical software and using descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation, and percentage) and inferential statistics (independent t-test analysis was one-way ANOVA) was performed.

3. Results

In the first part of the frequency band based on demographic characteristics and the results of independent t-test and analysis of variance are presented. Data show that in this study of 286 managers, 166 (58/3%) women and 120 (41/7%) were male. Terms of age, most of the 214 patients (75%) were in the age group above 40 year. The 217 patients (76%) of the undergraduate degree, and 108 (76/37) were over 25 years of work experience. In response to the first research hypothesis that the average agility public and private schools in the city, there are significant differences using independent t-test is that the results are presented in Table 1.

Table1. Comparing public and private schools, average agility in Isfahan city

School	Mean	SD	t	P	Test results
public-school	93.65	9.96	-2.58	0.01	p< 0.05
private school	100.88	5.66			

As can be seen in Table, t obtained for these variables are significant (0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected with 95% confidence. So there is a significant difference in the agility of public and private schools,

In response to the second research hypothesis that there are significant differences between the mean dimensions of agility in city public schools and non-profit organizations, Independent t-test is used when the results are presented in Table 2.

Table2. Compared to the average size of public schools and non-profit agility in Isfahan city

Dimensions Agility	Type of school	Mean	SD	t	P	Test results
Competence	Public school	45.30	4.35	-2.21	0.03	p<0.05
	private school	48.31	3.68			
Flexibility	public-school	14.75	3.64	-1.71	0.09	p>0.05
	private school	16.44	1.71			
Accountability	Public school	20.15	1.57	-5.69	0.000	P<0.05
	private school	23.25	1.69			
Speed	Public school	13.45	6.75	0.33	0.74	p>0.05
	private school	12.88	1.31			

As can be seen in Table t values obtained in sub variables of accountability and competence are significant at alpha level 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected with 95% confidence. So there is a significant difference public and private schools in the responsiveness and agility of competence. But the flexibility and speed of t values obtained at the alpha level of 0.05. (Two domains) is smaller than the critical t value. The values obtained for these variables are also

significant. Therefore there is no significant difference between public and private schools in the agility, flexibility and speed. In response to the third research hypothesis that there are significant differences between the variable Dexterity schools according to demographic variables, education level, work experience, is test based on analysis of variance was used.

Table3. ANOVA for determining differences between the means of multiple groups with varying years of service agility

Variable	Sources of change	Square	Degrees of freedom	F	Level of significance	Test results
Agility	Between groups	303.03	3	5.05	0.006	P<0.05
	Within groups	59.97	127			
	Total		135			

As can be observed in Table, F is meaningful. So we can say that the null hypothesis is rejected and this means that there is a significant differences exist between agile principals of schools with work experience. So Work experience could be an important factor in agility schools.

4. Discussion

The results showed significant differences between public and private schools out there agility are more agile so agility at public schools, private schools, but a moderate to high average. This results Yarmohammadian et al (2011) but the results are inconsistent and Nasiripoure and Akbari (2011) are consistent .This can be explained as due to the private schools are in competition with other schools and the lack of competition, financial loss incurred should be removed . Thus, in some dimensions, but overall agility of public schools surpassed the public to a desired level of agility city schools are far. This situation can be caused by poor performance of some components such as agility, flexibility, competence and accountability. The results can be significant for the following deserve mention agility out as can be derived out according to the private schools than in public schools is out of eligibility. This can be explained by the fact that private schools are sensitive to changes because they are competing with other schools. We are more sensitive to changes in the school, so generally

capable and competent and knowledgeable people mainly used is very sensitive matters and, if necessary, to better meet the diverse technology school parents, students and teachers can use it at the expense of the public schools have more freedom.

Hence, they can be held accountable operating instructions are the same for both types of schools, and almost simultaneously a fundamental change takes place in schools .experienced managers increases, trial and error in terms of the environment variable is less than change programs , are more responsive . Given that we have a long distance to reach the desired level of public schools agility is proposed to achieve the desired level of agility, better matching the environment to increase the quality of service and education, the reduction of costs satisfaction of the employees students Owle productivity and resilience should be considered in the face of rapid changes in education system and training time associated with fundamental changes in the education system more.

References

Algama, K. (2011). Organizational agility: Speed, accountability and organizational flexibility. *Journal of human development police*, 8 (39), 13-34.

- Ambrose, C., & Morello, D. (2004). Designing the Agile Organization. *International Journal of production economics*, 62(3), 33-43.
- Arteta, B., & Giachetti, C. (2004). A Measure of Agility as the complexity of The Enterprise System. *Journal of Robotics and computer Integrated Manufacturing*, 20(2), 495-503.
- Daolat Modeli, M. (2006). *Article strategies to achieve organization agility*. Web Journal, Issue 72.
- Dove, R. (1994). The meaning of life and meaning of agile. *Production*, 106(11), 14-15.
- Goldman, S., Nagel, R., & Preiss, K. (1995). *Agile competitors and virtual organization*. Kenneth: van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Heydari, M., Siadat, S., Hoveida, R., & Shahin, A. (2013). The relationship between organizational excellence enablers and organizational agility capabilities in public universities of Isfahan. *Journal of New approach in Educational Administration*, 3, 24-36.
- Hornby, A. S. (2000). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English, Sixth Edition*. Oxford university press.
- Lahhafi, I. (2011). *Examine the relationship between organizational agility and team work (case study of public and private banks in the city of Sanandaj)*. Unpublished thesis, Islamic Azad University of Sanandaj. [In Persian]
- Lau, H. C. W., Wong, C. W. Y., Pun, K. F., & Chin, K. S. (2003). Virtual agent modeling of an agile supply chain infrastructure. *Management Decision*, 41(7), 625-634.
- Lee, D. (2005). *In Pursuit of Marketplace Agility: Applying Precepts of Self-Organizing Systems to Optimize Human Resource Scalability*. In D. Ulrich, S. Meisinger and M. Losey (eds.). *The Future of HR: 50 Thought Leaders Call for Change*. New York: Wiley.
- Maskell, B. (2001). The Age of Agile Manufacturing Supply chain Management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 6(1), 5-11.
- Nasiripoure, A., & Akbari, J. (2011). Agility of disaster management and emergency medical center in Kermanshah city. *Journal Concept*, 6(3), 78-94 [In Persian].
- Nicpoor, A., & Salajegheh, S. (2010). The relationship between organizational agility and Job satisfaction in Kerman. *General Management Researches*, 3(7), 184-169. [In Persian]
- Osoli, H. (2007). *Agile organizations, database administrators*, available at URL <http://www.modiriran.ir/modules/article/view.article.php/117>. [In Persian]
- Shahin, A., & Lellahgany, Z. (2011). *Studying the concept and agility application in services*. International Conference on Industrial Engineering Amirkabir University, Tehran.
- Sharifi, H., & Zhang, Z. (2001). Agile Manufacturing in Practice; Application of a Methodology. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 21(5), 772-794.
- Sharifi, H., & Zhange, Z. (1999). A Methodology for achieving Agility in manufacturing organizations. *International journal of production economics*, 62(1), 7-22.
- Sharifi, H., & Zhange, Z. (2000). Agile Manufacturing in practice: Application of a Methodology. *International Journal of Operation s& Production Management*, 21(51), 772-496.
- Striukova, L. (2008). The role of social capital in virtual teams and organizations: Corporate value creation. *International journal of networking and virtual organizations*, 5(1), 503-516.
- Yarmohammadian, M. H., Samouei, R., KhodayariZrnq, R., & Bagherian, A. (2011). The agility of Isfahan hospitals. *Health Information Management Journal*, 12(8), 1122-1128. [In Persian]
- Yusuf, Y., Sarhadi, M., & Gunasekaran, A. (1999). Agile manufacturing: the drivers, concepts and attributes. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 62(2), 33-43.