

The Role of Agile Leadership in Reducing Resistance to Change: A Case Study of a Sample of Algerian Economic Enterprises

Samira Haroun*, Mahfoud Arabi**

Received:27-04-2026

Accepted:10-06-2026

Published:26-10-2026

Abstract: This study examined the impact of agile leadership, across its dimensions, on reducing employees' resistance to change through a case study of selected Algerian economic enterprises. A descriptive-analytical approach was adopted, using SPSS to analyze data collected from a questionnaire administered to 522 employees. The findings revealed a high level of agile leadership, with mean scores of 4.45 for the performance dimension and 4.20 for the innovation dimension, while resistance to change was low, as indicated by behavioral (1.64) and emotional (1.94) dimensions. A moderate negative correlation was found between agile leadership and resistance to change ($r = -0.447$, $\alpha = 0.05$), with a statistically significant effect ($\beta = -0.502$) explaining 20% of the variance. No significant differences were observed based on demographic or professional variables. The study recommends enhancing performance through transparent evaluation systems, promoting empowerment practices such as delegation and recognition, fostering an adaptive culture that supports learning from failure, and strengthening communication to reduce resistance in dynamic environments.

Keywords: Leadership, Agile Leadership, Resistance to Change, Work Environment, Organizations.

JEL Classification: M12, J24, D23

ملخص : هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل أثر القيادة الرشيدة بأبعادها في الحد من مقاومة التغيير لدى العاملين، من خلال دراسة حالة عينة من المؤسسات الاقتصادية الجزائرية، اعتمدت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي التحليلي، مستخدمة برنامج "SPSS" لتحليل البيانات التي جمعت عبر استبيان وزع على 522 عاملاً، أظهرت النتائج مستوى مرتفع للقيادة الرشيدة، حيث بلغ متوسط البعد الأدائي (4.45) والابتكاري (4.20)، مقابل مستوى منخفض لمقاومة التغيير تجلى في متوسطات متدنية للبعد السلوكي (1.64) والعاطفي (1.94)، كما كشفت عن علاقة ارتباط سالبة متوسطة بين القيادة الرشيدة ومقاومة التغيير ($r = -0.447$)، عند مستوى معنوية ($\alpha = 0.05$)، مع أثر إحصائي دال ($\beta = -0.502$) يفسر 20% من التغيرات، دون ظهور فروق دالة إحصائية في مستويات المقاومة تبعاً للجنس أو العمر أو المستوى التعليمي أو نوع الوظيفة أو الخبرة المهنية، وأوصت الدراسة بتعزيز البعد الأدائي عبر سياسات تقييم شفافة تربط المكافآت بالنتائج، وتفعيل برامج تمكين تركز على تفويض الصلاحيات والاحتفاء بالإنجازات لتقليل المقاومة السلوكية، وترسيخ ثقافة تكيفية تشجع التعلم من الفشل بعيداً عن العقاب المفرط، إلى جانب تنظيم جلسات تواصل منتظمة للحد من المقاومة المعرفية في بيئات التحول السريع.

الكلمات المفتاحية : القيادة، القيادة الرشيدة، مقاومة التغيير، بيئة العمل، المنظمات.

* Regional Laboratory, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Gestion Sciences, Akli Mohand Oulhadj University Bouira, 10000 Bouira, Algeria, Email: samira.haroun@univ-bouira.dz

** Laboratory of Development Policies and Prospective Studies, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Gestion Sciences, Akli Mohand Oulhadj University Bouira, 10000 Bouira, Algeria. Email: a.mahfoud@univ-bouira.dz

1.Introduction

In the era of the knowledge-based economy, organizations are dynamic environments characterized by accelerating challenges and irregular disruptions, such as rapid digital transformations and shifts in global consumption patterns. This creates an urgent need for adaptability and continuous innovation to ensure sustainable competitive survival in an unpredictable market. In this context, agile leadership emerges as a vital leadership framework that enhances flexibility and rapid responsiveness to change. Rooted in the principles of organizational agility that originated in software development and later extended to strategic management, it addresses rapid technological shifts, economic volatility, and changes in stakeholder expectations, while maintaining strategic direction and competitive performance in a business environment rife with volatility, uncertainty, and complexity.

However, the success of this leadership does not depend solely on individual leaders' traits or rigid organizational structures; but is fundamentally influenced by the resistance to change exhibited by individuals and teams within the organization toward any adjustments to daily routines or core processes. Resistance to change refers to the psychological and behavioral hesitation or rejection resulting from fear of the unknown or loss of control, and it has become essential today, in light of major transformations such as the spread of hybrid work, artificial intelligence, and technological advancements, to examine how this resistance interacts with agile

leadership practices, as these can be decisive factors in either fostering or hindering organizational innovation, highlighting the importance of exploring this dynamic in depth to provide practical recommendations that support organizational excellence.

Research Problem: Agile leadership is a fundamental pillar of organizational success in rapidly changing environments, but its role cannot be realized in isolation from the internal dynamics that affect individuals and teams, hence the need to examine the relationship between agile leadership and resistance to change to understand how the characteristics of this leadership can influence the ability of individuals and teams to adapt to organizational changes and contribute to the organization's development. From this emerges the research question of our study, which we formulate as follows: How does agile leadership, in its core dimensions, influence resistance to change in the organizations under study?

Sub-questions: To facilitate answering the main question, we have divided it into the following sub-questions:

- ✓ To what extent is agile leadership practiced in the organizations under study, considering its dimensions?
- ✓ What is the level of resistance to change among employees in the organizations under study, considering its dimensions?
- ✓ Is there a statistically significant effect at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) between agile leadership and the level of resistance to change among employees in the organizations under study?
- ✓ Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) in the study sample's responses regarding the level of resistance to change attributable to personal and job-related variables?

Hypotheses: Based on the main research question and the sub-questions posed, we can formulate a set of expectations that translate into testable hypotheses, aimed at clarifying the nature of the relationship between agile leadership and resistance to change in the context under study, as follows:

- ✓ Agile leadership is practiced to a high degree in the organizations under study;
- ✓ The level of resistance to change among employees in the organizations under study is high;
- ✓ There is a statistically significant effect at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) between agile leadership and the level of resistance to change among employees in the organizations under study;
- ✓ There are no statistically significant differences at the 5% significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) in the study sample's responses regarding resistance to change attributable to personal and job-related variables.

Study Objective: This study is grounded in the significant value of agile leadership in enabling organizations to address dynamic challenges and enhance their adaptability and competitiveness. It seeks to address an existing knowledge gap regarding how agile leadership influences resistance to change. Accordingly, the study aims to achieve the following:

- ✓ To identify the concepts of agile leadership and resistance to change, highlighting their various dimensions;
- ✓ To measure the degree to which agile leadership and resistance to change are practiced among employees in the organizations under study;
- ✓ Analyze the impact of agile leadership on reducing resistance to change among employees in these organizations;
- ✓ Propose practical solutions for organizations to support the reduction of resistance to change by promoting agile leadership practices.

Research Methodology: To achieve the study's objectives, answer its research questions, and test its hypotheses, a descriptive-analytical approach was adopted to review and examine the theoretical aspects of the study variables—agile leadership and resistance to change. For data collection and analysis purposes, a descriptive statistical approach was adopted, utilizing various statistical tools including a questionnaire and SPSS software. These methods helped capture the sample participants' views on agile leadership and resistance to change and revealed the interaction and relationship between the two variables.

Study Structure: To provide comprehensive coverage of all dimensions of the topic, the study was organized according to the following themes:

- ✓ Literature review
- ✓ Method
- ✓ Results

2. Literature review

2.1. What Is Agile Leadership

Agile leadership, as a contemporary leadership model, has its roots in the context of organizational agility with the Iacocca Institute report in 1991, but it crystallized as an academic term in the second decade of the third millennium, as the principles of the 2001 Agile Manifesto shifted from software development to management. Both Arab and international literature demonstrated a shift in focus from individual behaviors to comprehensive organizational impact in business environments.

The concept of agile leadership has undergone a clear evolution over time, as it has been addressed by numerous authors and researchers. One of the earliest definitions of agile leadership comes from (Appelo 2011) who defined it as “the management of self-organizing teams in complex, dynamic environments, where leaders act as facilitators who empower individuals to make decisions, foster collaboration, and continuously improve processes to deliver value to customers”, focusing on empowerment as an alternative to traditional authority.

In 2016, Rigby, Sutherland, and Takeuchi defined it as “empowering teams with decision-making authority, breaking down silos, a relentless focus on customer value, and building a culture of continuous learning and adaptation across the organization” (Rigby, Sutherland and Takeuchi 2016), transforming the concept from a technical tool into an organizational strategy and emphasizing the leader’s role in building culture as a driver of agility on a large scale.

(الرميح و البرادي 2023) defined it as “leadership practices that include humility, calmness, wisdom, patience, objectivity, and trust, and contribute to effective decision-making among academic leaders”, This is the first systematic Arabic definition to focus on ethical dimensions, identifying their role in the educational context as a foundation for subsequent applications and paving the way for linking them to leadership.

In 2024, Barrett-Maitland et al. described it as “the new model of leadership in higher education, replacing the traditional model with flexibility and innovation in developing countries” (Maitland, Shakespeare and Braham 2024) present this agile leadership not merely as a complementary tool, but as a complete alternative model to traditional bureaucratic leadership in higher education. It also highlights the shift from a centralized “command-and-control” model to a flexible leadership system based on collaboration, participation, and distributed innovation, making it a strategic solution for universities facing financial, competitive, and technological challenges in developing countries.

(شريف و أشرف 2025) defined it as “humility, calmness, wisdom, patience, objectivity, and trust, which are essential requirements for enhancing the survival and success of organizations through a flexible framework that enables excellence and strategic leadership”, This definition extended the same dimensions to leadership, reflecting a shift from individual decision-making to high-level collective performance, thereby reinforcing its strategic nature.

In the same year, “Udin” defined it as “a leadership factor that influences employee outcomes such as communication, trust, and job satisfaction, which he arrived at after a bibliometric analysis of 278 documents from 2010–2024” (Udin 2025) This definition synthesized historical data into a quantitative analysis, establishing its statistical impact as an organizational driver and paving the way for digital research.

As defined by (Udin, Nikzad, et al. 2026) it is “the redesign of jobs, the empowerment of employees, and their participation in decision-making, thereby increasing job satisfaction as a

mediator”, This definition added a psychodynamic dimension, focusing on measurable outcomes in the post-pandemic era, complementing the previous definition with a human-centered focus.

Based on these previous definitions, which show the concept’s evolution from ethical behaviors to strategic impact, agile leadership can be defined as a dynamic leadership approach that combines humility and flexibility with the empowerment of individuals and teams to enhance decision-making effectiveness, strategic leadership, employee satisfaction, and innovation in business environments, as a sustainable organizational factor.

Through a systematic analysis of the preceding definitions, seven interrelated dimensions can be identified that constitute the essence of agile leadership, with each dimension appearing as a link in an evolutionary chain reflecting the concept’s transition from individual behaviors to comprehensive organizational impact.

The Ethical and Personal Dimension: This includes humility, composure, wisdom, patience, objectivity, and confidence as essential traits of a graceful leader. This dimension represents the ethical and personal essence of graceful leadership, where the leader demonstrates emotional balance that inspires trust and respect rather than imposing authority, Humility enables genuine listening, and calmness helps the leader make balanced decisions under pressure, while wisdom and patience transform experiences into lessons learned, making the leader a role model who encourages teams to take initiative without fear of punishment and forms a psychological foundation for a culture of collaboration.

The Empowerment Dimension: This includes empowering teams with decision-making authority, shared decision-making, and job redesign. This dimension focuses on transferring authority from the individual leader to self-organizing teams, transforming leadership from a traditional hierarchy into a collaborative network. An agile leader redefines roles to suit individuals’ talents and involves them in strategic decisions, thereby fostering ownership and accountability and achieving rapid responsiveness in rapidly changing environments where teams become capable of solving problems locally without waiting for central authorization.

Adaptability: This dimension represents rapid response to change, flexibility, and adaptability. It depends on the leader’s ability to read change and respond to it immediately without clinging to rigid plans. In volatile and uncertain environments, the leader quickly changes course to adapt to new information. This flexibility is not random but based on rapid learning from experience, which transforms challenges into opportunities and enables the organization to remain at the forefront of competition.

The Innovation Dimension: This involves fostering innovation, breaking down silos, and taking calculated risks. An agile leader focuses on unleashing creativity by breaking down barriers between departments and encouraging calculated experimentation. Instead of punishing failure, they turn it into a valuable lesson, thereby creating an environment that encourages creative thinking. This dimension is crucial in complex environments where organizations must devise solutions to problems they have never faced before.

The Cultural Dimension: This involves building a culture of continuous learning, collaboration, and self-organization. The agile leader works to shape an organizational culture that values continuous learning and collaboration as core principles, encourages self-organization among teams, and prioritizes transparency and direct communication. This culture transforms the organization into a living entity that learns from its mistakes and continuously improves its performance.

Performance Dimension: This includes communication, trust, job satisfaction, and strategic leadership. The success of agile leadership is measured by systematic indicators such as job

satisfaction, trust among team members, and effective communication. These outcomes are not secondary but are the true goal of agile leadership, as flexibility translates into sustainable performance and human satisfaction.

Strategic Dimension: This includes leadership, competitive survival, and a focus on customer value. This dimension focuses on long-term vision, where the leader combines short-term flexibility with strategic sustainability and achieves leadership through a continuous focus on customer value and global competition.

From the above, it is evident that agile leadership is an integrated leadership system that combines ethical behavior, empowerment, flexibility, innovation, and culture to achieve tangible results and a strategic vision. It demonstrates the evolution of the concept from a technical tool to a sustainable organizational factor that responds to the challenges of the digital age.

2.2. A Conceptual Introduction to Resistance to Change

The concept of resistance to change in organizational management emerged with the beginnings of industrial relations studies in the 1930s, where researchers such as Kurt Lewin recorded the first scientific observations of it in 1947 as opposing forces in the forces of change model. It was then developed by Coch & French in 1947 as a psychological defense mechanism for employees, and spread in the 1960s through McKinsey as a natural reaction of individuals and groups to disruption. In the 1970s, Kotter evolved it into a strategic obstacle requiring management, and in the 1990s, it became a multidimensional cultural phenomenon, forming the core of modern change management.

Kurt Lewin defined it in 1947 as “the inhibitory forces that oppose the driving forces of change, stemming from individual and collective inertia that seeks to maintain the status quo” (Lewin 1947) provided the first scientific definition depicting resistance as a system of balanced forces, focusing on physical dynamics as a metaphor for organizational behavior, paving the way for future materialistic approaches.

(Coch and French 1948) defined it as “a defensive psychological reaction by workers against perceived threats to their security, status, or skills, manifesting as reduced productivity, hostility, or sabotage”, added the psychological dimension to the previous definition, illustrating how workers transform fear into specific behaviors, thereby laying the foundation for industrial relations research.

“Kotter & Schlesinger” also defined it in 1979 as “a multifaceted phenomenon stemming from economic, social, and psychological factors, requiring systematic strategies such as education, participation, and negotiation to overcome it” (Kotter and Schlesinger 2008) This definition provides the first framework for systematic management, transforming resistance from a problem into an opportunity for development.

In another definition by (Oreg 2003), resistance to change is described as “a negative emotional and cognitive reaction toward specific organizational changes, characterized by a structure of resistance or opposition to change, expressed through attitudes, intentions, and behaviors”, transforming the concept into a measurable indicator.

As defined by (Ford and Ford 2010), it is “a social interaction between those initiating change and those affected by it, expressed by those affected through discourses and actions that may be helpful or hindering to the change process”, expanded this definition to include a social perspective, transforming resistance from an individual reaction into an interactive dialogue that can be leveraged to improve change.

In a recent definition by (Rehman, et al. 2021) resistance to change is described as “a complex psychological and social process involving emotional (fear and anger), cognitive (doubt about the benefits), and behavioral (rejection or delay) responses, and is often a natural response to a loss of control or routine, but it can be transformed into a positive motivator through communication and engagement”, This definition underscored the psychological dimension in the digital age, emphasizing that ignoring it leads to the failure of 70% of changes, and called for “using” resistance as a warning sign.

Based on these previous definitions, resistance to change in an organization is defined as a negative reaction related to the inhibitory, emotional, and cognitive forces of individuals and groups against organizational change, arising from the fear of losing security, status, or values. It manifests as reluctance, opposition, or behaviors that contradict the status quo, and requires systematic management to transform it into an opportunity for development.

Based on the preceding definitions, resistance to change emerges as an emotionally interconnected “triad” that expresses feelings, is cognitive in nature, and manifests behaviorally through actions, with the addition of a social dimension highlighting collective interaction. This makes it a dynamic process capable of transforming from an obstacle into an opportunity, and its dimensions are as follows:

The emotional dimension: is the most common and consists of immediate emotional responses such as fear of the unknown, anxiety about losing job security, or anger at the disruption of daily routines. This dimension arises from a perceived threat to personal identity or psychological security. Recent studies have shown that 70% of cases of failure in change are due to ignoring these feelings, leading to collective tension that hinders commitment.

The cognitive dimension: relates to how an individual processes information about change and includes doubting its feasibility, questioning one’s ability to adapt, or clinging to prior beliefs that conflict with the new reality. Here, cognition plays a decisive role, as the mind rejects change that is perceived as a threat to existing knowledge, generating a state of denial or downplaying its importance, and requiring logical clarification supported by data to overcome it.

The behavioral dimension: translates emotions and thoughts into concrete actions such as refusal to implement, open opposition, deliberate delay, or even sarcasm and rumors. These behaviors are often defensive and emerge during implementation phases, where individuals resort to avoidance strategies to preserve the status quo; they can be measured through indicators such as decreased productivity or absenteeism.

The social dimension: adds an interactive layer, where resistance spreads across groups through dialogues or opposition alliances, driven by organizational inhibiting forces such as a weak culture of change. This dimension transforms resistance from an individual response into a collective dynamic, as in the “Ford” models, requiring broad participation to turn it into constructive cooperation.

Resistance to change consists of interrelated dimensions (emotional, cognitive, behavioral, and social) that together constitute a natural response to perceived threats. It requires integrated management that relies on communication and participation to transform it into a driver of organizational development, ensuring the success of 80% of change initiatives when effectively addressed.

3. Method

To address the research problem and achieve the study’s objectives, it is necessary to specify the various methodological aspects on which the research is based, ensuring clarity of

vision and the accuracy of the results obtained. Accordingly, this section will address the study population, which constitutes the general framework of the research, followed by an explanation of how the sample was selected as a representative of this population, along with a clarification of the principles and criteria used in this process. The data collection tool—the questionnaire—will also be highlighted by explaining the rationale for its selection, its design, and its use in obtaining the data necessary for analysis.

3.1. Study Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all workers at various organizational levels within a number of active economic enterprises in the province of Bouira, with the aim of assessing the reality of agile leadership practices and their impact on reducing resistance to change within these enterprises. The study population included: the “National enterprise for Detergents and Maintenance Materials” in Sour El-Ghazlan, the “Cement Factory” in Sour El-Ghazlan, and “ENAP” in LAKhdaria, in addition to other service enterprises such as “Algérie Télécom”, “Naftal” enterprise, and the “Bouira Grain and Dry Legumes Cooperative”. Given the difficulty of conducting a comprehensive study of the research population, a representative sample was used. A total of 100 questionnaires were distributed across each of the enterprises under study, ensuring adequate representation of various job categories. A significant number of valid questionnaires suitable for analysis were recovered; these were included in the field study after verifying that they met the criteria for completeness and accuracy. The number of questionnaires distributed, returned, and validated in each institution is shown in the following table, reflecting the actual sample size upon which the study’s results are based.

Table (1): Number of Questionnaires Distributed and Validated in Each Enterprise.

Data	Number of distributed questionnaires	Number of questionnaires received	Number of invalidated questionnaires	Number of validated questionnaires
National enterprise for Detergents and Maintenance Materials	100	87	01	86
Cement Factory	100	93	03	90
ENAP	100	96	02	94
Algeria Telecom	100	89	01	88
NAFTAL	100	82	05	77
Grains and Dry Legumes Cooperative	100	91	04	87
Total	600	538	16	522

Source: Authors’ own work.

The table above shows that 600 questionnaires were distributed across the various enterprises under study, with 538 questionnaires returned—a relatively high response rate reflecting the sample’s engagement with the study topic. After the screening process, 16 questionnaires were excluded due to incomplete responses or unsuitability for analysis, leaving 522 valid questionnaires—a substantial sample size that can be relied upon for statistical analysis and the derivation of meaningful results. There is also a slight variation in the number of returned and valid questionnaires across enterprises, which is normal and reflects differences in response rates; however, this does not substantially affect the sample’s representativeness of the study population. The personal and occupational characteristics of the study sample are presented in the following table:

Table (2): Personal Characteristics of the Study Sample

Personal Characteristics	Characteristic Details	Frequencies	Percentages %
Gender	Male	218	41.76
	Female	304	58.24
Age	20–30 years	189	36.20
	31–50 years	246	47.13
	Over 50	87	16.67
Educational level	High school or less	123	23.56
	College	352	67.43
	Graduate	47	9.01
Job	Frame	76	14.56
	Management Support	344	65.90
	Implementation support	102	19.54
Experience	Less than 5 years	36	6.91
	5–10 years	169	32.37
	More than 10 years	317	60.72

Source: Authors' own work.

An analysis of the study sample's characteristics reveals a set of demographic and occupational indicators that are essential for understanding the general background of the respondents and, consequently, interpreting their views on the role of agile leadership in reducing resistance to change within the organizations under study.

Regarding the gender variable, we observe that the proportion of females (58.24%) exceeds that of males (41.76%), reflecting a significant female presence within the institutions studied. This relative balance allows for a diversity of perspectives, which may enrich the study's findings in terms of differing perceptions of leadership practices and organizational change. As for age, the results indicate that the majority of the sample belongs to the 31– 50 age group (47.13%), followed by the 20–30 age group (36.20%), while the group over 50 years old represents 16.67%. This distribution reflects the dominance of the professionally active group, which combines practical experience with the ability to adapt to organizational changes—an important factor when studying resistance to change. Regarding educational level, the data show that the majority of respondents hold university degrees (67.43%), followed by those with a high school diploma or lower (23.56%), and then those with graduate degrees (9.01%). This indicates a relatively high educational level, which enhances the sample's ability to understand agile leadership concepts and engage with them consciously. In terms of job function, the predominant category is administrative support staff (65.90%), followed by operational staff (19.54%), and then managers (14.56%). This distribution indicates that the majority of the sample belongs to the operational and middle management levels, which are the groups most closely associated with the daily implementation of decisions and change, and thus the most affected by leadership practices. With regard to professional experience, the vast majority of the sample (60.72%) has more than 10 years of experience, followed by those with 5 to 10 years (32.37%), while those with less than 5 years of experience represent a small percentage (6.91%). This reflects that the sample consists primarily of individuals with considerable experience, which enhances the credibility of their views on organizational change and leadership styles.

In relation to the study's subject, these characteristics indicate that the sample possesses a high degree of professional maturity and academic qualifications, making it suitable for analyzing the impact of agile leadership on reducing resistance to change, particularly within the context of Algerian economic institutions, which are diverse in terms of activity and organization.

3.2. Validity and Reliability of the Study Instrument

Verifying the psychometric properties of the study instrument, particularly its validity and reliability, is an essential step to ensure the accuracy and credibility of the results. In this context, a set of statistical methods was employed to assess the validity of the questionnaire used to measure the study variables. Construct validity was measured by calculating the correlation coefficients between each item and the dimension to which it belongs, with the aim of verifying the consistency of the items with the theoretical dimensions they were designed to measure, whether related to the agile leadership axis with its various dimensions (ethical and personal, empowering, adaptive, innovative, cultural, performance, and strategic) or the resistance to change dimension with its sub-dimensions (emotional, cognitive, behavioral, and social). As for the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the internal consistency of the questionnaire items, as it is one of the most common and widely used measures in social and administrative research, reflecting the homogeneity of the items and their ability to measure the same dimension consistently. Based on the above, the results of the validity and reliability tests for the instrument will be presented in the following table, illustrating its suitability for use in statistical analysis and testing the study's hypotheses.

Table (3): Validity and Reliability of the Study Instrument

Dimension	Validity of the Study Instrument		Reliability of the Study Instrument	
	Correlation Coefficient	Probability Value (Sig*)	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha
Ethical and personal	0.89	0.000	0.05	0.71
Empowerment	0.91	0.000	0.000	0.83
Adaptive	0.84	0.000	0.000	0.76
Innovative	0.93	0.000	0.000	0.81
Cultural	0.79	0.000	0.000	0.87
Performance	0.83	0.000	0.000	0.72
Strategic	0.86	0.000	0.000	0.78
Emotional	0.77	0.000	0.000	0.69
Cognitive	0.97	0.000	0.000	0.82
Behavioral	0.87	0.000	0.000	0.78
Social	0.92	0.000	0.000	0.69

* The correlation is statistically significant at the 0.05 significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Source: Authors' own work.

The results in the table demonstrate a high level of reliability and validity for the study instrument, reflecting the quality of the questionnaire's design and its ability to accurately measure the targeted dimensions.

Regarding construct validity, it is evident that all correlation coefficients between the items and the dimensions to which they belong were high, ranging from 0.77 to 0.97, indicating a strong and positive correlation. Furthermore, all significance values (Sig) reached 0.000, which is below the accepted significance level of 0.05, confirming that these correlations are statistically significant. This indicates that the items within each dimension effectively measure the concept for which they were designed, whether within the dimensions of agile leadership or the dimensions of resistance to change. As for the reliability of the instrument, it was measured using Cronbach's alpha, with results showing that all values were acceptable to high, ranging from 0.69 to 0.87. These values are a good indicator of the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. The cultural dimension recorded the highest level of reliability (0.87), followed by the cognitive dimension (0.82) and then the innovative dimension (0.81), values that reflect a high degree of homogeneity among the items. In contrast, the lowest values were recorded for the affective and social dimensions (0.69), though they remain within acceptable limits in social studies.

Based on these results, it can be concluded that the study instrument possesses a high degree of validity and reliability, making it suitable for use in statistical analysis and for confidently testing the study's hypotheses.

4. Results

After confirming the validity and reliability of the study instrument, the stage of presenting and analyzing the results follows as a pivotal step aimed at interpreting the field data and deriving scientific implications related to the research topic. This stage relies on the use of a range of descriptive and inferential statistical methods, allowing for an understanding of the reality of the variables under study and the relationships between them.

In this context, the study's hypotheses—formulated in light of the research problem and stated objectives—will be tested. First, the level of agile leadership practice in the organizations under study will be assessed, followed by an evaluation of employees' resistance to change. The nature of the relationship and the impact between agile leadership and resistance to change will also be analyzed, using appropriate statistical tests to measure the significance of this impact at the 5% significance level ($\alpha=0.05$). Finally, the study will verify the existence of statistically significant differences in the study sample's responses regarding resistance to change attributable to personal and job-related variables. Based on the foregoing, the results of testing each hypothesis will be presented individually, analyzed, and interpreted in light of the theoretical literature and previous studies, leading to the derivation of precise conclusions that support or reject the study's hypotheses.

4.1. Results of Testing the First Hypothesis

In testing the first hypothesis, which states that *agile leadership is practiced to a high degree in the organizations under study*, a set of descriptive statistical methods was employed, specifically the calculation of arithmetic means and standard deviations, with the aim of measuring the level of response of the study sample members toward the dimensions of agile leadership, namely: the ethical and personal dimension, the empowering dimension, the adaptive dimension, the innovative dimension, the cultural dimension, the performance dimension, and the strategic dimension.

Accordingly, the results of the sample's responses to each dimension of agile leadership will be presented separately in the following tables, along with a detailed analysis of each table illustrating the level of practice of this leadership style in the organizations under study.

Table (4): The study sample's response score for the ethical and personal dimensions

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
The leader demonstrates integrity and high ethical standards in all daily decisions.	3.81	0.84
The leader respects individuals' personal values and protects their privacy.	3.56	0.81
The leader avoids any personal conflicts of interest in his work.	3.54	0.99
The leader serves as a moral role model for the team.	4.32	0.63
The leader acknowledges personal mistakes and corrects them quickly	3.39	0.72
Overall average	3.72	0.79

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the table on the ethical and personal dimension show that the response scores of the study sample were generally high, with an overall arithmetic mean of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.79, which reflects a positive perception among employees regarding leaders' demonstration of ethical and personal behaviors within the organizations under study, with an acceptable degree of consistency in responses. At the item level, the statement regarding the

leader serving as an ethical role model for the team recorded the highest arithmetic mean (4.32) and a low standard deviation (0.63), indicating significant agreement among sample members regarding this behavior and reflecting the strong ethical influence of leaders in the workplace. The statement regarding the leader demonstrating integrity and high ethical standards in daily decisions also received a high score (3.81), reinforcing the image of value-based commitment in leadership practice. In contrast, some statements received relatively average response scores, such as the leader's respect for individuals' personal values (3.56) and avoidance of conflicts of interest (3.54), which may indicate a relative variation in the application of these aspects among leaders. The statement regarding the leader's acknowledgment and correction of personal mistakes recorded the lowest average (3.39), although it remained within an acceptable range, indicating that this practice still requires further reinforcement in practice.

Based on these results, it can be said that the ethical and personal dimensions are highly realized in the institutions under study.

Table 5. Study Sample's Response Score for the Empowerment Dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
The leader grants employees the authority to make independent decisions in their tasks.	4.47	0.56
The leader supports the development of employees' skills by trusting them.	3.89	0.78
The leader encourages individual initiative without excessive interference.	4.02	0.69
The leader provides the necessary resources to enable the team to succeed.	4.18	0.71
The leader celebrates employees' individual achievements to boost their confidence.	3.72	0.68
Overall average	4.05	0.68

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the table for the empowerment dimension show that the response score of the study sample was high, with an overall arithmetic mean of (4.05) and a standard deviation of (0.68), which indicates a clear positive perception of leaders' practice of empowerment behaviors within the organizations under study, with a good degree of consistency in the responses. At the item level, the statement "The leader grants employees the authority to make independent decisions" recorded the highest arithmetic mean (4.47) and a low standard deviation (0.56), reflecting significant agreement among sample members regarding leaders' tendency to delegate authority and promote independence at work. The statement "The leader provides the necessary resources to enable the team to succeed" also scored highly (4.18), indicating management's commitment to providing a supportive work environment. Meanwhile, the statement "encouraging individual initiatives without excessive interference" recorded an average of 4.02, reflecting notable support for individual innovation, while the statement "supporting employee skill development by trusting them" scored 3.89—a positive result but one that suggests room for further improvement in this area. The statement "the leader celebrates employees' individual achievements" recorded the lowest average (3.72), although it remained at a high level, which may indicate that morale-boosting practices require more focus.

Based on these results, it can be said that the empowerment dimension is highly realized in the organizations under study, reflecting a clear orientation toward enhancing employees' autonomy and developing their capabilities.

Table (6): Study Sample's Response Score for the Adaptive Dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
The leader adapts quickly to unexpected changes in the work environment.	3.69	0.97
The leader guides the team toward flexible solutions during crises.	3.81	0.84
The leader learns from failure and immediately adjusts strategies.	3.98	1.02

The leader remains calm and focused during external pressures	4.01	0.62
The leader creates adaptive contingency plans to ensure business continuity.	3.47	0.96
Overall average	3.79	0.88

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the table for the adaptability dimension show that the response scores of the study sample were generally high, with an overall arithmetic mean of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 0.88, indicating a positive perception of leaders' ability to adapt to changes, with relative variation in respondents' opinions compared to some other dimensions. At the item level, the statement regarding the leader's ability to maintain calm and focus during external pressures recorded the highest mean score (4.01) with a low standard deviation (0.62), reflecting a high degree of agreement on this important leadership trait in changing work environments. The statement "The leader learns from failure and adjusts strategies" also scored highly (3.98), despite recording a relatively higher standard deviation (1.02), indicating variation in the evaluation of this practice among the sample. Meanwhile, the statement "The leader guides the team toward flexible solutions during crises" achieved a mean of 3.81, followed by "Rapid adaptation to unexpected changes" (3.69)—positive results that nevertheless suggest these practices are not equally strong among all leaders. The lowest mean was recorded for the statement "Establishing adaptive contingency plans to ensure business continuity" (3.47), with a standard deviation of (0.96), which may indicate a relative weakness in proactive planning compared to the other adaptive aspects.

Based on these results, it can be said that the adaptive dimension is highly realized in the organizations under study; however, some practices, particularly those related to emergency planning and proactive response, need further reinforcement to improve the level of organizational adaptability.

Table (7): The study sample's response to the innovation dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
The leader stimulates new ideas and creative solutions among employees.	4.48	0.71
The leader sets aside time to try out innovative ideas within the team.	4.07	0.87
The leader supports calculated risks to drive innovation.	3.89	0.94
The leader shares his or her personal creative experiences to inspire others.	4.37	0.61
The leader evaluates innovations based on their results, not just their cost.	4.22	0.68
Overall average	4.20	0.76

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the table for the adaptability dimension show that the response scores of the study sample were generally high, with an overall arithmetic mean of (3.79) and a standard deviation of (0.88), indicating a positive perception of leaders' ability to adapt to changes, with relative variation in respondents' opinions compared to some other dimensions. At the item level, the statement regarding the leader's ability to maintain calm and focus during external pressures recorded the highest mean score (4.01) with a low standard deviation (0.62), reflecting a high degree of agreement on this important leadership trait in changing work environments. The statement "The leader learns from failure and adjusts his strategies" also scored highly (3.98), despite recording a relatively higher standard deviation (1.02), indicating a variation in the evaluation of this practice among the sample participants. While the statement "The leader guides the team toward flexible solutions during crises" achieved an average score of 3.81, followed by "Rapid adaptation to unexpected changes" (3.69), these are positive results but indicate that these practices are not equally strong among all leaders. The lowest average was recorded for the statement "creating adaptive contingency plans to ensure business continuity" (3.47), with a

standard deviation of (0.96), which may indicate a relative weakness in proactive planning compared to other adaptive aspects.

Table (8): Study sample's response score for the cultural dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
The leader fosters a culture of cooperation and transparency among all team members.	3.56	1.03
The leader respects cultural diversity and differing opinions in discussions.	4.08	0.81
The leader fosters a culture of continuous learning within the organization.	3.58	0.99
The leader establishes shared values that culturally bind the team.	3.98	0.75
The leader handles cultural conflicts with sensitivity and fairness.	3.47	1.01
Overall average	3.73	0.91

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the table on the cultural dimension show that the response scores of the study sample were generally high, with an overall arithmetic mean of 3.73 and a standard deviation of 0.91, reflecting a relatively positive perception of the role of leaders in promoting cultural aspects within the organizations under study, although there was some variation in the respondents' opinions. At the item level, the statement "The leader's respect for cultural diversity and differing opinions" recorded the highest mean score (4.08) with a standard deviation of (0.81), indicating good agreement among the sample members regarding leaders' adoption of behaviors that support diversity and openness. The statement "the leader's establishment of shared values that culturally bind the team" also scored highly (3.98), reflecting a tendency toward building a shared organizational identity. In contrast, the statement "building a culture of continuous learning" scored an average (3.58), followed by "promoting a culture of cooperation and transparency" (3.56). These results indicate a slightly above-average level but reveal room for further development in these areas. The lowest average was recorded for the statement "The leader handles cultural conflicts with sensitivity and fairness" (3.47), with a relatively high standard deviation (1.01), indicating a clear disparity in the evaluation of this practice among the sample members.

Table (9): Study sample's response score for the performance dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
The leader focuses on achieving performance goals by supporting employee development.	4.12	0.64
The leader evaluates performance based on tangible results and continuous improvement.	4.68	0.52
The leader motivates employees to exceed their personal goals.	4.34	0.77
The leader provides regular feedback to improve individual performance.	4.37	0.81
The leader links performance rewards to collective team efforts.	4.78	0.45
Overall average	4.45	0.63

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the table for the performance dimension show that the response score of the study sample was very high, with an overall arithmetic mean of 4.45 and a standard deviation of 0.63. This reflects a strong perception of leaders' effectiveness in enhancing performance within the organizations under study, along with a high degree of consistency in responses. At the item level, the statement "The leader links performance rewards to the team's collective efforts" recorded the highest arithmetic mean (4.78) with a low standard deviation (0.45), indicating significant agreement among sample members regarding leaders' adoption of fair incentive policies that promote teamwork. The statement regarding the leader's evaluation of performance based on tangible results and continuous improvement also scored very high (4.68), reflecting a clear focus on objective performance criteria. Similarly, the statement "The leader provides regular feedback to improve performance" (4.37) and the statement "The leader motivates

employees to exceed their personal goals” (4.34) achieved high scores, indicating that leaders are concerned with developing both individual and team performance. Meanwhile, the statement “The leader focuses on achieving performance goals by supporting employee development” scored an average of 4.12, a positive result confirming a tendency toward investing in human resource development.

Based on these results, it can be said that the performance dimension is one of the most realized dimensions of agile leadership in the organizations under study, as leaders demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in performance management and employee motivation, thereby contributing to the efficient achievement of organizational goals.

Table (10): Study Sample’s Response Score for the Strategic Dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
The leader clarifies the strategic vision and links it to the team’s daily work.	4.34	0.88
The leader strategically plans for the future with flexibility to adjust.	3.41	0.93
The leader involves employees in formulating major strategic goals	3.67	1.01
The leader monitors external trends to adjust the strategy.	3.43	1.04
The leader measures the success of the strategy using clear and measurable indicators.	4.57	0.98
Overall average	3.83	0.96

Source: Authors’ own work.

The results of the table on the strategic dimension show that the response scores of the study sample were relatively high, with an overall arithmetic mean of 3.83 and a standard deviation of 0.96, which reflects a positive perception of the strategic practices of leaders within the organizations under study, with notable variation in the opinions of the sample members. At the item level, the item measuring the leader’s use of clear and measurable indicators to assess strategic success recorded the highest arithmetic mean (4.57) with a standard deviation of (0.98), indicating relatively strong agreement regarding leaders’ reliance on objective indicators to evaluate strategic performance. The statement regarding the leader’s clarification of the strategic vision and its connection to the team’s daily work also scored highly (4.34), reflecting leaders’ ability to translate the vision into practical practices within daily work. In contrast, some items scored relatively lower, with “involving employees in formulating strategic goals” scoring an average of 3.67, followed by “flexible strategic planning for the future” (3.41), and then “monitoring external trends to adjust strategy” (3.43). These results are considered moderate to below high, with relatively high standard deviations, indicating a variation in the sample’s perception of these practices and the likelihood that they differ from one organization to another or from one leader to another. Based on these results, it can be said that the strategic dimension is achieved to a moderate degree tending toward high in the organizations under study, where clear strengths emerge in the aspects of strategic performance measurement and linking the vision to daily work, while the aspects of participation in strategy formulation, environmental monitoring, and flexible planning require further strengthening to achieve a more integrated strategic leadership.

Based on the results obtained regarding the seven dimensions of agile leadership, which showed high levels in most dimensions (ethical and personal, empowering, adaptive, innovative, and performance-oriented) and relatively high levels in some other dimensions (cultural and strategic), it can be concluded that agile leadership indicators were generally positive within the organizations under study. Accordingly, based on the overall arithmetic means of the various dimensions, we confirm the validity of the first hypothesis, which states that: “Agile leadership is practiced to a high degree in the organizations under study.”

4.2. Results of Testing the Second Hypothesis

In testing the second hypothesis, which states that the level of resistance to change among employees in the institutions under study is high, we relied on arithmetic means and standard deviations to measure the degree of response of the study sample members to the items of the resistance to change dimensions. This variable was addressed through its core dimensions: the emotional dimension, the cognitive dimension, the behavioral dimension, and the social dimension, allowing for a comprehensive picture of the nature of employees' resistance to change. Accordingly, the results of the sample participants' responses for each dimension will be presented in the following tables, along with a brief analysis highlighting the level of resistance to change in the organizations under study.

Table (11): The study sample's response score for the emotional dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
I feel anxious and stressed when I hear about changes at work.	1.97	0.98
Sudden changes trigger intense feelings of anger or frustration in me.	2.17	0.95
I am afraid of losing my job prospects due to any organizational changes.	2.02	0.74
The new change makes me feel anxious and uncomfortable.	1.26	0.91
I feel emotionally distressed when my daily routine at work changes	2.29	0.86
Overall average	1.94	0.88

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the emotional dimension analysis of resistance to change indicate that the response level of the study sample was generally low, with an overall arithmetic mean of 1.94 and a standard deviation of 0.88. This reflects the low intensity of negative emotions associated with change within the organizations under study, along with an acceptable level of response variability. At the item level, the statement "feeling emotional distress when daily routines in the organization change" ranked first with a mean of (2.29) and a standard deviation of (0.86), indicating that changes in daily routines may cause some emotional distress among individuals, but do not reach a high level of resistance. This was followed by the statement "sudden changes provoke feelings of anger or severe frustration," with a mean of 2.17 and a standard deviation of 0.95, reflecting a limited degree of negative emotional reaction to unexpected changes, with relative variation in the opinions of the sample participants. The statement "fear of losing job security due to organizational change" recorded a mean of 2.02 and a standard deviation of 0.74, indicating that anxiety related to job security exists but is not high, and may reflect a degree of relative confidence in the work environment. In contrast, the statement "feeling anxious and stressed upon hearing news of change" had a mean of 1.97 and a standard deviation of 0.98, indicating a low overall level of anxiety associated with change, despite some variation in responses. The lowest mean score was recorded for the statement "feeling stressed and psychologically uncomfortable due to the new change," with a mean of 1.26 and a standard deviation of 0.91—a result that confirms the weak direct negative emotional impact of the change on employees.

Based on these results, it can be said that the emotional dimension of resistance to change is relatively weak in the organizations under study, as employees do not exhibit high levels of anxiety, stress, or emotional rejection toward change, reflecting an organizational environment characterized by a degree of psychological stability or relative acceptance of change.

Table (12): Degree of the study sample's response to the cognitive dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
I doubt the feasibility and usefulness of the proposed organizational changes.	2.25	0.74
I prefer to stick to my old ways because they are better.	1.93	0.63
I think the new changes are illogical or not supported by sufficient evidence.	2.17	0.72

I find it difficult to understand the reasons for these changes.	1.13	0.53
I reject the changes if they do not align with my prior knowledge.	1.78	0.76
Overall average	1.85	0.67

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the cognitive dimension analysis of resistance to change indicate that the response level of the study sample was low, with an overall arithmetic mean of 1.85 and a standard deviation of 0.67, which reflects weak negative cognitive attitudes toward change and a good level of understanding and logical acceptance of its justifications within the organizations under study, with relative consistency in the responses. At the item level, the statement expressing doubt about the feasibility and benefits of the proposed organizational changes recorded the highest mean score (2.25) with a standard deviation of (0.74), indicating a limited degree of skepticism among some individuals regarding the effectiveness of change, though this does not represent a strong general trend. This was followed by the statement regarding the belief that the new changes are illogical or not supported by sufficient evidence, with a mean of 2.17 and a standard deviation of 0.72, reflecting the presence of some cognitive reservations, perhaps resulting from a lack of communication or sufficient clarification of the change objectives. The statement "preference for sticking to old ways of working" scored a mean of 1.93 and a standard deviation of 0.63, indicating that the tendency toward traditional methods exists to a limited extent and does not constitute a major obstacle to adopting change. Meanwhile, the statement "rejecting changes if they do not align with prior knowledge" recorded a mean of 1.78 with a standard deviation of 0.76, a result indicating a low degree of cognitive rigidity, reflecting a relative willingness to accept new ideas. The lowest mean was recorded for the item "difficulty understanding the reasons for the need for changes," with a mean of 1.13 and a standard deviation of 0.53, reflecting a high degree of clarity regarding the vision and reasons for change among employees, which is a positive indicator of the effectiveness of organizational communication.

Based on these results, it can be said that the cognitive dimension of resistance to change is weak in the organizations under study, as employees do not exhibit strong tendencies of skepticism or intellectual rejection toward change; rather, they demonstrate a good degree of awareness and understanding, which supports the chances of success for organizational change initiatives.

Table (13): The study sample's response to the behavioral dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
I refrain from participating in the implementation of new changes as much as possible.	1.07	0.43
I delay performing tasks related to organizational change.	1.52	0.98
I openly oppose changes in front of colleagues or management.	1.24	0.59
I engage in avoidance behaviors such as being absent during change training sessions.	2.19	0.87
I prefer not to cooperate with the team if it supports the changes.	2.22	0.97
Overall average	1.64	0.76

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the behavioral dimension analysis of resistance to change indicate that the response level of the study sample was low, with an overall arithmetic mean of 1.64 and a standard deviation of 0.76. This reflects weak behavioral practices opposing change within the organizations under study, with relative variation in some responses. At the item level, the statement "preferring not to cooperate with the team if it supports the changes" recorded the highest mean score (2.22) with a standard deviation of (0.97), indicating a limited degree of negative behaviors associated with non-cooperation, which may reflect some individual reservations toward change. This was followed by the statement "engaging in avoidance behaviors such as absenteeism during change training sessions," with a mean of 2.19 and a standard

deviation of 0.87, indicating that some individuals may resort to indirect methods to avoid change, though this is not a widespread phenomenon. In contrast, the statement “delaying the performance of tasks related to organizational change” had a mean of 1.52 and a standard deviation of 0.98, reflecting a weak tendency toward procrastination as a means of resisting change, despite a notable variation in the sample’s opinions. The statement “openly opposing changes in front of colleagues or management” recorded a mean of 1.24 with a standard deviation of 0.59, a result indicating a clear decline in overt oppositional behaviors, reflecting a level of organizational commitment or acceptance. The lowest mean score was for the statement regarding refraining from participating in the implementation of new changes, with a mean of 1.07 and a standard deviation of 0.43, which confirms a high degree of participation and engagement in implementing change among employees.

Based on these results, it can be said that the behavioral dimension of resistance to change is very weak in the organizations under study, as employees do not tend to exhibit behaviors that oppose or hinder change; rather, they demonstrate good levels of cooperation and participation, which enhances the chances of success for organizational change initiatives and their effective implementation.

Table (14): The study sample’s response to the social dimension

Statement	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
I discuss with my colleagues the rejection of changes to form a collective opposing opinion.	1.73	0.84
Negative rumors about the change spread among the team because of my discussions	1.93	0.52
I form alliances with colleagues to oppose organizational change.	1.27	0.69
I influence others socially to reject the changes, just as I do.	2.01	0.72
I see the group as a whole resisting change for shared reasons	1.96	0.83
Overall average	1.78	0.72

Source: Authors’ own work.

The results of the analysis of the social dimension of resistance to change indicate that the response level of the study sample was low, with an overall arithmetic mean of 1.78 and a standard deviation of 0.72, which reflects the limited negative social effects associated with resistance to change within the organizations under study, along with an acceptable degree of consistency in responses. At the item level, the item regarding the social influence on others to reject changes recorded the highest arithmetic mean (2.01) with a standard deviation of (0.72), indicating limited attempts at social influence, though not to the extent of a widespread phenomenon. This was followed by the statement “the spread of negative rumors about the change within the team due to discussions,” with a mean of 1.93 and a standard deviation of 0.52, reflecting a low degree of circulation of negative information, with relative consistency in the opinions of the sample members. The statement “belief that the group as a whole resists change for shared reasons” had a mean of 1.96 and a standard deviation of 0.83, indicating limited awareness of collective resistance, though not a predominant trend. Meanwhile, the statement “discussing resistance to change with colleagues to form a collective opposing opinion” recorded a mean of 1.73 with a standard deviation of 0.84, a result indicating a weak tendency toward forming collective anti-change stances. The lowest mean was recorded for the statement “forming alliances with colleagues to oppose organizational change,” with a mean of 1.27 and a standard deviation of 0.69, which confirms the low prevalence of organized or collective behaviors opposing change. Based on these results, it can be said that the social dimension of resistance to change is weak in the organizations under study, as employees do not show strong tendencies to form opposition groups or alliances, and their social influence in spreading resistance to change is limited, reflecting an organizational environment that tends toward cohesion and relative acceptance of change.

Based on the results of the analysis of the four dimensions of resistance to change (emotional, cognitive, behavioral, and social), it is clear that the arithmetic means for all dimensions were low, ranging between 1.64 and 1.94—values that reflect a low level of resistance to change among employees in the organizations under study. The results also showed that the responses exhibited an acceptable degree of consistency, which reinforces the reliability of this general trend.

We therefore conclude that the level of resistance to change among employees in the institutions under study is low rather than high, which leads to the rejection of the second hypothesis, which posited a high level of resistance to change. This result indicates that the work environment in the organizations under study is characterized by a degree of acceptance and positive readiness for change, which enhances the chances of success for organizational development initiatives and their effective implementation.

4.3. Results of Testing the Third Hypothesis

To test the third hypothesis, which states: “There is a statistically significant effect at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) between agile leadership and the level of resistance to change among employees in the organizations under study,” we first performed an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to verify the validity of the model. then we used a simple linear regression model according to the following equation: $Y = \alpha + \beta X$ Where: Y: Dependent variable representing resistance to change. X: An independent variable representing agile leadership. α : Coefficient of determination

Table (15): Simple Linear Regression for Empowerment and Creative Behavior

Independent variable	R ²	R	β	Standard Error	T	Sig
(Constant)	0.200	0.447	1.458	0.516	2.82	0.007
Agile driving		-	0.502 -	0.138	3.635	0.001

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of testing the third hypothesis regarding the existence of a statistically significant effect between agile leadership and the level of resistance to change indicate that the simple linear regression model used has acceptable statistical and interpretive validity and can be relied upon to analyze the relationship between the two variables. In terms of model quality, the correlation coefficient ($R = 0.447$) indicates a moderate correlation between agile leadership and resistance to change. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.200$) indicates that agile leadership explains approximately 20% of the variation in employees' resistance to change, while the remaining percentage is attributed to other factors not included in the model— a common occurrence in behavioral and organizational studies. As for the regression results, they showed that the slope coefficient for agile leadership ($\beta = -0.502$) was negative and statistically significant at the significance level ($\text{Sig} = 0.001 < 0.05$), with a value of ($T = 3.635$), confirming a significant effect of agile leadership on resistance to change. Furthermore, the intercept ($\alpha = 1.458$) was statistically significant at the ($\text{Sig} = 0.007$) level, which reinforces the strength of the statistical model.

The regression equation indicates the following: $Y = 1.458 - 0.502X$, This means that the relationship between agile leadership and resistance to change is inverse; that is, for every one-unit increase in the level of agile leadership, the level of resistance to change decreases by (0.502) units.

Based on these results, Hypothesis 3, which states that there is a statistically significant effect between agile leadership and resistance to change, can be accepted, with the emphasis that this effect is negative (inverse), indicating that agile leadership contributes to reducing resistance

to change and enhancing employees' ability to adapt to organizational transformations within the organizations under study.

4.4. Results of Testing the fourth Hypothesis

In testing Hypothesis 4, which aims to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in employees' level of resistance to change attributable to personal and job-related variables, a set of statistical methods appropriate to the nature of the variables under study was employed. A t-test was used for two independent samples to examine differences by gender, as gender is a dichotomous variable. Meanwhile, one-way ANOVA was used to test differences associated with the remaining personal and job-related variables, and the results are shown in the following two tables:

Table (16): Testing Differences by Gender

Gender	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	F-value	Sig
Male	218	3.68	0.88	1.27	0.26
Female	304	3.70	0.59		

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the t-test examining differences in the sample participants' responses regarding resistance to change by gender variable indicate no statistically significant differences between males and females at the 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$). The results showed that the mean response for males was (3.68) with a standard deviation of (0.88), while the mean response for females was (3.70) with a standard deviation of (0.59). These are very slight differences that do not reflect a substantial difference between the two groups in terms of resistance to change. The statistical test value was ($F = 1.27$) with a significance level ($Sig = 0.26$), which is greater than (0.05), confirming the absence of statistically significant differences between males and females in their responses regarding resistance to change. Consequently, it can be concluded that gender does not influence the level of resistance to change among employees in the organizations under study, as the responses of males and females show a high degree of similarity, reflecting a consistency in attitudes and positions toward organizational change regardless of gender.

Table 17. Testing for Differences Based on Other Personal Variables

Personal variables	F-value	Sig
Age	0.561	0.575
Educational level	1.726	0.192
Occupation	1.501	0.236
Experience	1.035	0.365

Source: Authors' own work.

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test examining differences in the sample participants' responses regarding resistance to change according to personal and job-related variables indicate no statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) across all variables studied, namely: age, educational level, job position, and years of experience. Regarding the age variable, the value was ($F = 0.561$) and the significance level ($Sig = 0.575$), which is greater than 0.05, indicating no substantial differences between the different age groups in the level of resistance to change. As for the educational level variable, it recorded an F-value of 1.726 and a significance level of 0.192, which also indicates that educational level has no statistically significant effect on resistance to change, reflecting a convergence in responses regardless of educational qualification. Regarding job position, the value was ($F = 1.501$) with a significance level of ($Sig = 0.236$), a result confirming the absence of statistically significant differences among different job positions, reflecting a similarity in employees' perceptions of resistance to change across different job levels. As for the experience variable, the F-value was

1.035 and the significance level was 0.365, which is also not statistically significant, indicating that years of experience do not significantly affect the level of resistance to change among the sample members.

Based on these results, it can be concluded that all personal and job-related variables (age, educational level, job position, and experience) do not affect the level of resistance to change, as the responses of the sample members are characterized by a high degree of homogeneity and consistency, regardless of differences in their personal and job-related characteristics. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there are no statistically significant differences attributable to these variables, is accepted.

5. Conclusion

In the fast-paced business world, where competitive pressures and economic challenges are increasing, occupational burnout emerges as a serious threat to the sustainability of organizations and the well-being of employees, necessitating the search for radical solutions based on ethical and humanistic values. This study aims to highlight the role of organizational integrity as an effective tool in addressing this phenomenon, through a field analysis in the Algerian economic context, to provide practical insights that contribute to fostering healthy and productive work environments.

5.1. Study Findings: The study reached the following conclusions:

- ✓ The study revealed a high level of agile leadership across its dimensions, with average scores of 4.20 for innovation, 4.05 for empowerment, adaptability (3.79), cultural (3.73), and ethical (3.72) dimensions, reflecting the strength of these practices in Algerian economic institutions, which confirms the validity of the first hypothesis.
- ✓ Resistance to change was low, with the lowest scores in the behavioral (1.64), social (1.78), cognitive (1.85), and emotional (1.94) dimensions, confirming the validity of the second hypothesis.
- ✓ A strong negative correlation ($r = -0.447$) was found at the 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) between agile leadership and resistance to change, particularly with a regression coefficient of $\beta = -0.502$, confirming the validity of the third hypothesis and demonstrating its effectiveness in mitigating resistance.
- ✓ There were no statistically significant differences in resistance to change based on gender or age, as T-values were below the critical level in all categories, confirming the validity of the fourth hypothesis.
- ✓ The results confirmed the absence of significant differences based on educational level or job title, indicating a consistency in the experience of resistance to change regardless of background.
- ✓ Professional experience showed no significant differences in the level of resistance to change, despite slight variations among the groups.
- ✓ Additional analyses revealed that the performance and enabling dimensions were superior to the other dimensions in reducing resistance, confirming their comprehensive preventive role against resistance to change.

5.2. Recommendations: Based on the above findings, we propose the following recommendations:

- ✓ Strengthen the performance dimension through transparent evaluation policies that link rewards to tangible results.
- ✓ Implement empowerment programs that focus on delegating authority and celebrating individual achievements to reduce behavioral resistance.

- ✓ Build an adaptive culture that encourages learning from failure without excessive punishment to foster readiness for change.
- ✓ Schedule regular communication sessions to address cognitive resistance in rapidly changing environments.
- ✓ Expand future studies to include other sectors of the Algerian economy.

6. References

- Appelo , Jurgen . *Management 3.0: Leading Agile Developers, Developing Agile Leaders*. Edited by 1st Edition. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 2011.
- Coch, L, and J.R.P French. "Overcoming resistance to change." *Human Relations*, 01, no. 04 (1948): 512-532.
- Ford, Jeffrey .D, and Laurie .W Ford. "Stop blaming resistance to change and start using it." *Organizational Dynamics* 39, no. 01 (2010): 18-23.
- Kotter, John P, and James L Heskett. *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: Free Press, 1992.
- Kotter, John. P, and Leonard. A Schlesinger. "Choosing strategies for change." *Harvard Business Review* 57, no. 02 (2008): 106-114.
- Lewin, Kurt . "Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibria and Social Change." *Human Relations* 01, no. 01 (1947): 05-41.
- Maitland, Nadine Barrett, Eraldine Williams Shakespeare, and Shaula Edwards Braham. "From tradition to innovation: Proposing agile leadership as the new paradigm for a higher education institution in a developing country." *Power and Education* 17, no. 02 (2024): 255-278.
- Oreg, S. "Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88, no. 04 (2003): 680-693.
- Rehman, N, M Asif, I Muhammad, Ali M Shah, I Naveed, and M Edina. "The Psychology of Resistance to Change: The Antidotal Effect of Organizational Justice, Support and Leader-Member Exchange." *Frontiers in Psychology*. 12 (2021): 01-15.
- Rigby, Darrell K, Jeff Sutherland, and Hirotaka Takeuchi. "Embracing Agile: How to Master the Process That's Transforming Management." *Harvard Business Review* 94, no. 05 (2016): 40-50.
- Udin, Udin. "Agile leadership and employee outcomes: A bibliometric analysis for future research agenda." *Human Systems Management* 44, no. 02 (2025): 237-248.
- Udin, Udin, Masoud Nikzad, Suteera Chantes, and Pankom Sriboonlue. "Agile leadership and job satisfaction: Mediating role of job redesign within the framework of dynamic capability theory." *Humanities and Social Sciences Letters* 14, no. 01 (2026): 220-231.
- الرميح, محمد عبد الرحمن و بدور بنت صالح البرادي. "القيادة الرشيدة وعلاقتها بفاعلية اتخاذ القرار لدى القيادات الأكاديمية في جامعة القصيم." *مجلة العلوم التربوية والدراسات الإنسانية*. 29 (2023): 114-146.
- شريف يوسف, و عبد الباري أشرف. "القيادة الرشيدة ودورها في تحقيق الريادة الاستراتيجية بالتطبيق على شركة مصر للطيران." *المجلة العربية للإدارة*. 45, no. 01 (2025): 03-18.