

The Relationship Between Tenacity and Organizational Agility: Basis for Leadership Development

Wilfred Min C. Velasco, MBA
School of Business and Accountancy, National University Philippines (NU Baliwag)
wilfredmincawili@gmail.com

Cecilia A. Balaoing, Ph.D.
Colegio de San Gabriel Arcangel
ceciliac_albarracin@yahoo.com

Von Karlo G. Gabumpa, CPA, MBA
School of Business and Accountancy, National University Philippines (NU Baliwag)
gabumpavon@gmail.com

Arturo C. Tolentino, MBA
Philippine Christian University, Dasmarias
31actolentino@gmail.com

Richelle C. Toledo, MBA
Philippine Christian University, Dasmarias
richelle.toledo@pcu.edu.ph

Joey S. Suba
Baliwag Polytechnic College
joeysuba96@gmail.com

Date Submitted:
December 23, 2025

Date Accepted:
January 6, 2026

Date Published:
January 7, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.18168950

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility from the perspective of academic supervisors in educational institutions. In today's rapidly evolving educational environment, schools and universities must remain agile to stay relevant and effective. While much research on organizational agility emphasizes structural and strategic factors, this study focuses on the human element specifically, the tenacity of academic supervisors. Tenacity is understood as a multi-dimensional trait encompassing grit, resilience, and persistence. The research is grounded in well-established theories, including Duckworth's Grit Theory, Masten's Resilience Theory, and Teece's Dynamic Capabilities Theory. By

exploring the experiences of supervisors across different academic settings such as colleges, a senior high school, and a university this study seeks to understand how personal qualities can influence an institution's ability to adapt and thrive. The research examines supervisors' self-perceived levels of tenacity and

organizational agility and investigates whether a significant relationship exists between these variables. Ultimately, the study aims to offer practical insights that can inform leadership practices, fostering adaptability and sustainable effectiveness in educational institutions facing continuous change.

Keywords: *tenacity, organizational agility, academic supervisors, grit, resilience, persistence, educational leadership, adaptive*

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly evolving world, educational institutions are under immense pressure to keep up with change. Whether it's adapting to updated government policies, integrating new technologies, or meeting the shifting needs of learners, schools and universities must be agile enough to stay relevant and effective. This agility, however, doesn't just come from systems or digital tools it stems largely from the people within the organization, particularly those in leadership roles.

Organizational agility refers to an institution's ability to quickly respond to changes in its environment while maintaining its core purpose and performance standards (Appelbaum et al., 2020). It involves being flexible, innovative, and proactive in facing challenges. But the ability of an institution to remain agile is deeply influenced by the strength and resolve of its leaders especially those who demonstrate tenacity, or the determination to persist through adversity and maintain focus despite setbacks.

Tenacity is not simply about "not giving up." It is about the capacity to endure difficulties while maintaining purpose and drive. In academic institutions, where challenges like budget limitations, policy changes, and administrative constraints are common, the role of supervisors and academic leaders becomes even more crucial. Their ability to lead with persistence can have a direct impact on how the institution adapts, evolves, and ultimately thrives (Duckworth, 2019).

This study seeks to understand how tenacity among supervisors influences the organizational agility of academic institutions. It explores this relationship by drawing insights from supervisors who have served in various educational environments, including private colleges, senior high schools, and universities. In doing so, the research hopes to offer practical and research-backed insights on how personal attributes such as grit and resilience contribute to building more adaptive and agile learning institutions.

Throughout the researcher's career in the education sector having served in different academic institutions such as a schools in Manila, Bulacan and Pasay - a recurring observation emerged: schools that were able to adapt well to change often had leaders who demonstrated not only intelligence or authority but also tenacity.

At certain colleges, where quality assurance and accreditation requirements are top priorities, supervisors are tasked with ensuring that academic programs align with CHED standards, even amid limited resources and time constraints. This requires relentless effort, patience, and the ability to push forward despite bureaucratic obstacles.

In schools across Pasay, Bulacan, and Manila, leaders faced different challenges that required commitment, adaptability, and persistence. In some schools, structured curricula and disciplined learning environments demanded that supervisors find ways to innovate within their capacities while managing teacher performance and addressing student needs. Their daily efforts highlighted the importance of persistence and creative problem-solving in maintaining an effective learning system.

In other schools, agility involved embracing digital transformation, student-centered learning, and changes in administrative processes. Supervisors needed to demonstrate openness to change, invest in continuous training, and guide teams through transitions especially during periods of disruption, when decisions had to be made quickly and implemented at scale.

Across all schools, leaders were also tasked with maintaining high academic standards while supporting students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Tenacity was evident in how supervisors collaborated with faculty and administration to implement interventions, revise curricula, and respond to student feedback, all while ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements.

These experiences align with the findings of Carmeli and Spreitzer (2019), who emphasized that tenacious leaders foster learning cultures and psychological safety, both of which are essential for organizational agility. Similarly, Chuang et al. (2020) found that tenacity, particularly in the form of “grit,” positively impacts innovation and readiness for change.

Organizational agility, as recent literature suggests, is not just a structural characteristic but a behaviorally rooted outcome shaped by the beliefs, habits, and resilience of its people (Worley, Williams, & Lawler, 2021). Leaders who are committed to their mission despite setbacks tend to create work environments that are adaptable and future-ready (Salem, 2021).

What makes this research unique is its personal grounding. It is not merely built on theories, but on lived experiences working alongside supervisors who had to be agile and resilient in real educational settings. These individuals, while different in personality and approach, shared one thing in common: a determination to make things work. They did not always have the answers, but they had the will to try, adapt, and try again. That kind of leadership is worth studying, especially in today’s context where education continues to face complex and unpredictable challenges.

By exploring the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility, this research hopes to contribute to the development of leadership practices that are not only effective but also sustainable in the ever-changing educational landscape. In doing so, it aims to support institutions in nurturing the kind of leaders who can guide them not just to survive, but to evolve.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in several well-established theories that together explain the underlying relationship between tenacity and organizational agility in educational institutions. At the core of the concept of tenacity is Angela Duckworth’s Grit Theory, which defines grit as the sustained passion and perseverance for long-term goals (Duckworth, 2007; 2016). Grit is especially relevant in the context of academic supervisors who must consistently overcome institutional challenges, policy shifts, and limited resources while staying committed to educational excellence. The presence of grit in leaders, as observed in various school settings, allows institutions to endure and evolve even during turbulent periods.

Complementing grit is Resilience Theory, which explains how individuals adapt positively despite adversity. Rooted in the principles of Positive Psychology, resilience is no longer viewed simply as a fixed trait but as a dynamic process shaped by the interaction of personal strengths, external supports, and the nature of challenges faced. Recent studies highlight that resilience operates across multiple systems biological, psychological, social, and cultural emphasizing that individuals not only bounce back from setbacks but may also achieve post-traumatic growth, performing even better than before adversity (Masten,

2021; *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2021). For supervisors in academic institutions, resilience is not just about coping it's about bouncing forward, transforming setbacks into learning opportunities, and maintaining operational momentum. Resilient leadership directly contributes to a culture of agility, where the organization as a whole becomes more adaptive and solution-oriented.

Persistence, another important construct of tenacity, is supported by Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and Expectancy-Value Theory. SDT, developed by Deci and Ryan (1985), asserts that persistence stems from intrinsic motivation doing something because it is inherently satisfying or meaningful. In academic leadership, this often translates to supervisors remaining committed not because of external rewards, but because of a deep-rooted belief in their role and responsibility. Likewise, the Expectancy-Value Theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002) explains that individuals persist in tasks when they believe success is possible and worthwhile. This belief system fuels the kind of tenacity that drives leaders to take on complex tasks, even in uncertain institutional environments.

On the other hand, the concept of organizational agility is grounded in the Dynamic Capabilities Theory by Teece et al. (1997), which describes an organization's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments. In educational institutions, this may involve adapting teaching modalities, revise curricula, or shifting administrative strategies in response to reforms and innovations. The McKinsey Agile Model further contributes to this understanding by highlighting dimensions such as team empowerment, rapid decision-making, and continuous learning as pillars of agility. Similarly, the Worley and Lawler (2010) Framework emphasizes that organizational agility is not just structural but also behavioral, shaped by leadership flexibility, collaboration, and commitment to change.

Integrating these theories, the current study posits that the tenacity of supervisors comprising grit, resilience, and persistence is a foundational element that supports and enhances organizational agility in educational institutions. Supervisors who demonstrate these traits are more likely to foster environments that are adaptive, innovative, and resilient. As supported by the researcher's experiences in multiple academic institutions, such leaders play a crucial role in ensuring that their organizations remain agile in the face of ongoing educational challenges. Thus, these theoretical lenses collectively provide a robust framework for examining how human attributes influence institutional responsiveness and adaptability.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study illustrates the hypothesized relationship between tenacity and organizational agility within the context of academic institutions. It draws from the lived experiences of supervisors in various educational settings, highlighting how individual leadership traits can contribute to an institution's ability to adapt, respond, and thrive amidst continuous change. Specifically, this framework positions tenacity reflected in the dimensions of grit, resilience, and persistence as a crucial factor influencing organizational agility. These dimensions form the core of the independent variable, tenacity, which is examined through the lens of key psychological and behavioral theories.

Grit, as defined by Duckworth (2007; 2016), refers to the sustained passion and perseverance toward long-term objectives, even when faced with obstacles. Resilience, grounded in the works of Richardson (2002) and Masten (2014), emphasizes an individual's capacity to recover from adversity and grow stronger in the process. Persistence, on the other hand, is anchored in Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and Expectancy-Value Theory (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002), and pertains to the consistent effort individuals invest when they are intrinsically motivated and believe that success is meaningful and achievable.

The dependent variable in this study is organizational agility, conceptualized as an institution's ability to respond effectively to both internal and external changes, innovate in its practices, empower teams, and cultivate a culture of continuous learning. This construct is grounded in the Dynamic Capabilities Theory (Teece et al., 1997), the McKinsey Agile Model, and the Worley & Lawler Framework (2010), which collectively emphasize agility as a combination of strategic adaptability, decision-making speed, and structural flexibility.

In relation to the study titled *"The Relationship Between Tenacity and Organizational Agility: Insights from Supervisors in a Former Workplace,"* this framework suggests that academic supervisors who exhibit high levels of grit, resilience, and persistence are more likely to foster conditions that support organizational agility. These leaders not only persist through institutional challenges but also create adaptive and responsive learning environments. Through this lens, tenacity is seen not merely as a personal trait, but as a leadership quality with the potential to shape how schools and universities adjust to change, sustain innovation, and lead transformation.

Statement of the Problem

In a constantly evolving educational landscape, the ability of institutions to remain agile and responsive relies not only on their systems and strategies but also on the leadership characteristics of their personnel. One of the most crucial yet underexplored leadership traits is tenacity, which includes grit, resilience, and persistence. These behavioral traits allow academic supervisors to navigate challenges, recover from setbacks, and stay committed to institutional goals despite adversity. While organizational agility has often been analyzed from a structural or strategic perspective, this study shifts the focus to the human factor specifically, how the tenacity of academic supervisors may influence their institution's agility.

This study seeks to examine the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility based on the experiences and perceptions of academic supervisors from selected educational institutions. To achieve this, the study will address the following research questions:

1. **What is the demographic profile of the academic supervisors in terms of:**
 - 1.1. Gender
 - 1.2. Years of Service
 - 1.3. Role in the Academic Institution
2. **How do academic supervisors perceive their level of tenacity in terms of:**
 - 2.1. Grit;
 - 2.2. Resilience; and
 - 2.3. Persistence?
3. How do academic supervisors perceive the level of organizational agility in their respective institutions?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the level of tenacity and the perceived organizational agility among the demographic profile of the academic supervisors?
5. Which among the tenacity dimensions (grit, resilience, or persistence) is the strongest predictor of organizational agility in educational institutions?
6. What experiences or insights can supervisors share that illustrate how their tenacity has contributed to fostering or sustaining organizational agility?

Scope and Delimitation

This study focuses on exploring the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility among academic supervisors in selected educational institutions. The primary aim is to assess how supervisors' levels of grit, resilience, and persistence contribute to their institution's ability to adapt to change, innovate, and respond effectively to internal and external challenges.

The scope of this research is limited to educational institutions in Manila, Bulacan, and Pasay. These schools represent diverse academic structures, leadership styles, and organizational cultures, providing a meaningful context for examining the influence of tenacity on agility. Only academic supervisors from these institutions will serve as respondents, as they play key roles in shaping institutional responsiveness and adaptability.

This study deliberately excludes the corporate or private business sector, as the dynamics and performance metrics in those environments differ significantly from educational settings. The focus remains solely within the academic field to ensure relevance to organizational leadership in schools. Furthermore, non-supervisory personnel, such as rank-and-file faculty or administrative staff, are not included, as their roles may not directly involve decision-making or responsibilities related to institutional agility.

Given these delimitations, the findings of the study are not intended to be generalized across all sectors or types of organizations. Instead, they are intended to provide insights specifically applicable to leadership and agility within educational institutions.

Review of Related Literature

Tenacity

In today's fast-changing educational environment, the personal qualities of leaders particularly their ability to stay strong, focused, and driven despite difficulties are more important than ever. This is especially true for academic supervisors, who play a key role in ensuring that schools and universities remain agile, responsive, and resilient. One of the core traits that influence effective leadership is tenacity, a quality that encompasses grit, resilience, and persistence. Recent studies, both locally and internationally, highlight how these traits are not only desirable but necessary for leaders navigating the complexities of educational institutions.

Here in the Philippines, a study by Pascual, San Miguel, and Valverde (2025) looked into the grit levels of public school teachers in Laguna. They found that most teachers demonstrated moderate to high levels of grit, suggesting a strong commitment to their roles despite numerous challenges in the public education system. What made this study particularly insightful was how it connected grit with actual leadership practices teachers who scored higher in grit were also more likely to show resilience in handling institutional pressures and changes. The study recommended training programs to further nurture this trait, showing that tenacity can be developed and strengthened, not just observed. This has direct relevance to the present study, which seeks to understand how tenacious supervisors may contribute to organizational agility. If grit can empower public school teachers to stay motivated and effective, it can also drive leaders in private institutions to adapt and lead through transitions.

Another local study by Torres (2024) focused on how school leaders apply transformational leadership in managing change and guiding teachers. While not solely focused on tenacity, the study emphasized that successful leaders consistently demonstrated perseverance and emotional strength qualities deeply connected to grit and resilience. According to Torres, leaders who could remain focused on long-term goals and adapt their strategies during crises were more likely to help their institutions perform better and adjust faster to policy reforms or external disruptions. This adds weight to the idea that supervisors with high tenacity are likely to cultivate a more agile, change-ready school environment.

From an international perspective, Watkins (2023) introduced the idea of "agile tenacity" in a case study conducted through the International Institute for Management Development (IMD). This study highlighted how leaders who combined grit, adaptability, and resilience were able to lead their organizations effectively even during highly uncertain and fast-changing conditions. Watkins emphasized that these leaders not only overcame setbacks but actively fostered agility in their teams encouraging innovation, collaboration, and learning. This directly supports the argument of the current research: that tenacious supervisors are key agents in promoting and sustaining organizational agility.

Finally, Bonilla et al. (2024) conducted a psychometric study validating the Grit-S scale among Spanish university students. The findings supported the two main dimensions of grit: consistency of interest (staying committed to goals over time) and persistence of effort (continuing despite failure or frustration). Though the participants were students, the results are applicable to educators as well, especially those in leadership roles. The study confirms that grit is a measurable, universal trait that plays a vital role in performance whether in completing a degree or managing an academic unit. For this research, it reinforces the idea that grit, as a dimension of tenacity, can help supervisors remain grounded and effective, even when leading through difficult times.

Together, these studies show that tenacity is not just a buzzword it is a real, research-supported characteristic that significantly influences how leaders guide organizations through change. Whether in a classroom, a department, or an entire academic institution, grit, resilience, and persistence can shape the way supervisors handle challenges and foster environments that are both adaptive and forward-looking. By exploring these qualities through the lens of academic supervisors in former and current workplaces, this study seeks to add to the growing conversation on the human side of institutional agility

Grit

Grit, as popularized by psychologist Angela Duckworth (2019), refers to the passion and sustained perseverance toward long-term goals. Unlike intelligence or talent, grit is about staying the course not just during moments of success but, more importantly, during times of failure and frustration. Duckworth emphasized that grit is about having stamina: the ability to persist with effort and interest over years despite failure, adversity, and plateaus in progress.

This quality resonates strongly with the experience of many educators and academic supervisors, particularly in the Philippine context. A study by Pascual, San Miguel, and Valverde (2025) investigated the grit levels of public school teachers in Laguna. They found that most teachers showed moderate to high levels of grit, especially those who had been in the profession for more than a decade. These teachers continued to push through institutional challenges like lack of funding, overcrowded classrooms, and policy changes, all while staying committed to student learning. What this tells us is that grit is more than a motivational buzzword it is a form of strength rooted in consistent dedication.

For academic supervisors, grit is even more essential. These leaders are tasked with sustaining operations, mentoring faculty, resolving internal conflicts, and sometimes absorbing institutional pressures from above. A gritty supervisor doesn't just work hard they commit to institutional goals with long-term focus. According to Watkins (2023), in his case study on "agile tenacity," leaders who exhibit high levels of grit foster greater adaptability in their teams. This is because their unwavering focus creates psychological safety, consistency, and direction in an otherwise turbulent environment. Thus, supervisors who consistently model grit may naturally cultivate organizational agility helping schools remain steady and focused amid rapid change.

Resilience

Resilience has become a foundational trait in cultivating tenacity and enabling organizational agility, particularly in volatile and demanding work environments. In the Philippine context, Garcia (2021) explored the link between psychological resilience and work engagement among Filipino employees. The study concluded that resilient individuals demonstrate stronger tenacity, allowing them to stay committed to their roles and responsibilities despite adversity. This persistent drive contributes to a culture of adaptability, which is essential for fostering agility within organizations. Complementing this, Ramos and Castillo (2020) conducted a study on Filipino team leaders in Metro Manila and found that those who exhibited high levels of resilience were more likely to empower their teams to adapt quickly to organizational changes. The research emphasized that resilient leaders modeled tenacious behaviors such as proactive problem-solving and emotional regulation which significantly influenced their teams' ability to remain agile and productive during operational transitions.

From an international perspective, Williams and Durbin (2020) investigated how resilient teams in UK-based corporations used individual tenacity to enable agile responses in dynamic and uncertain environments. Their study revealed that resilient supervisors who consistently displayed determination and mental toughness became key drivers of organizational agility by promoting rapid decision-making, learning, and adaptability across departments. Additionally, Lee and Golonka (2021) conducted research in South Korea, focusing on resilience among mid-level managers during post-pandemic restructuring. They found that tenacity, strengthened by resilience, was a strong predictor of successful adaptation to agile workflows. Managers who remained steadfast in their goals, even in the face of ambiguity and resource scarcity, were better able to support agile project transitions and manage cross-functional collaboration.

Together, these local and foreign studies affirm that resilience is more than an individual coping mechanism it is a powerful enabler of tenacity that supports agile leadership and adaptive team performance. Supervisors who consistently exhibit resilient and tenacious behaviors act as catalysts for organizational agility, especially in workplaces undergoing structural or strategic change. These insights provide a strong foundation for the present study, which aims to examine how tenacity among supervisors relates to organizational agility in a former workplace setting.

Persistence

Persistence often viewed as the behavioral expression of tenacity plays a critical role in how individuals and organizations sustain performance and respond to change. In the Philippine setting, Santos and de Guzman (2019) examined the role of persistence in enhancing leadership effectiveness among Filipino supervisors in service-oriented businesses. They found that supervisors who demonstrated persistent behavior were more likely to maintain team motivation during difficult times, ultimately

facilitating agile decision-making and proactive workplace adaptation. Their findings suggest that persistence is not only a personal strength but a leadership asset that supports organizational responsiveness. Similarly, Cruz and Austria (2021) explored persistence in the context of workplace goal achievement among employees in Metro Manila. Their study revealed that employees with high levels of persistence were more likely to complete long-term projects and adapt to shifting organizational priorities, making them key contributors to team agility and sustained operational success.

On the international level, Dweck and Yeager (2020) emphasized the importance of persistence within the growth mindset framework in organizational leadership. Their study argued that leaders who adopt a growth mindset and persist despite setbacks are better equipped to lead through complexity and ambiguity key conditions that require organizational agility. Persistent supervisors, they argue, model resilience and adaptability, encouraging their teams to approach change with optimism and determination. In a separate study, Tan and Lim (2022) conducted research in Singaporean tech firms and found that persistent team leaders helped maintain momentum during agile project sprints. These leaders consistently pushed for progress despite roadblocks, which created a culture of accountability and adaptability among team members. This persistence, grounded in tenacity, enabled continuous improvement and responsiveness in high-pressure innovation environments.

Together, these local and international studies provide strong evidence that persistence functions as a behavioral driver of both tenacity and organizational agility. Supervisors who exhibit persistent efforts in meeting goals, navigating uncertainty, and motivating teams are more likely to lead agile transitions and foster adaptability in the workplace. These insights are particularly relevant to the present study's focus on former workplace environments, where supervisory persistence may have played a pivotal role in enabling agility during times of change.

Organizational Agility

Organizational agility refers to an organization's capacity to rapidly adapt to internal and external changes while maintaining productivity and innovation. In the Philippine context, Dela Cruz and Santos (2020) investigated organizational agility among medium-sized enterprises in Metro Manila. They discovered that agile organizations often relied on proactive supervisors who embraced innovation, encouraged cross-functional collaboration, and responded quickly to operational disruptions. These supervisors, through their strategic persistence and adaptability, helped maintain team performance and direction amid market uncertainties. Likewise, a study by Mendoza and Ferrer (2022) explored agility in the public sector, particularly in local government units during the COVID-19 pandemic. The findings highlighted that supervisors who demonstrated initiative and flexibility contributed significantly to agile responses in policy implementation, resource reallocation, and crisis communication underscoring the vital role of supervisory behavior in driving organizational agility even in bureaucratic settings.

Internationally, Denning (2020) emphasized that organizational agility is deeply influenced by leadership behavior and culture. In his research on agile transformations in global enterprises, he asserted that agility thrives in organizations where leaders empower teams, decentralize decision-making, and model adaptive thinking. Persistent and tenacious leaders were shown to act as enablers of agile work environments by consistently advocating for continuous improvement and embracing experimentation. In a complementary study, Sherehiy and Karwowski (2021) analyzed organizational agility frameworks in manufacturing and tech industries in the U.S. and Europe. They concluded that agile organizations succeed when supervisors and mid-level managers are empowered to make quick decisions, adjust priorities, and

maintain team alignment with shifting goals functions often dependent on their individual capacity for persistence, communication, and adaptability.

Together, these local and international studies affirm that organizational agility is not solely a systems-based capacity, but a behaviorally influenced outcome shaped by supervisory tenacity and responsiveness. Supervisors who are quick to adapt, persistent in leading through change, and capable of mobilizing teams during uncertainty play a central role in building and sustaining organizational agility. These insights directly support the purpose of this study, which investigates the connection between tenacity and organizational agility in a former workplace context.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative research design and adopted purposive sampling as its primary method for selecting participants. Purposive sampling, also known as judgmental or selective sampling, enables researchers to choose individuals who are most relevant and informative for the objectives of the study (Etikan & Bala, 2019). Given the focus of this research “The Relationship Between Tenacity and Organizational Agility: Basis for Leadership Development” the researcher selected only one supervisor from each company previously worked on. These supervisors were specifically chosen based on their leadership roles and direct exposure to organizational challenges, employee behavior, and adaptive strategies. This method ensured that the collected responses would provide in-depth perspectives on how tenacity influences agility in workplace settings. As Gentles et al. (2020) noted, purposive sampling is highly suitable when the study seeks to explore detailed experiences from individuals with specific expertise or contextual knowledge.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The population for this study comprises academic supervisors from five selected educational institutions where the researcher has previously and currently served: two colleges in Manila, a senior high school with a maritime curriculum, a university campus in Bulacan, and a private higher education institution in Pasay. These respondents were purposively selected based on their leadership roles, direct involvement in institutional operations, and exposure to organizational change and development.

Purposive sampling was employed to ensure the inclusion of individuals who possess substantial insight into institutional adaptability, leadership challenges, and change management core elements relevant to the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility.

By selecting supervisors who operate within various academic structures and cultures, this approach ensures the collection of rich, contextually grounded data. These participants are uniquely positioned to reflect on how traits such as grit, resilience, and persistence influence their institution’s capacity to navigate internal and external challenges. Their perspectives are vital in capturing the nuanced interplay between tenacity and agility within educational environments.

Instruments of the Study

To effectively address the research questions and examine the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility among academic supervisors, this study utilized quantitative data-gathering instruments. These tools were developed to measure the respondents' demographic characteristics, perceived tenacity, organizational agility, and personal experiences related to institutional adaptability.

The first part of the instrument collected the demographic profile of the respondents. This section included items focused on gender, years of service in the institution, and current role or position held. These variables provided contextual insights into the backgrounds of academic supervisors and served as a basis for analyzing differences in perceptions.

The second part of the instrument measured the respondents' level of tenacity. This section was divided into three key dimensions: grit, resilience, and persistence. Statements for each dimension were based on existing theoretical concepts and literature. Grit referred to the consistency of effort and long-term commitment to goals, resilience referred to the capacity to recover from challenges and setbacks, and persistence measured the determination to continue pursuing objectives despite obstacles. Respondents indicated their level of agreement using a **5-point Likert scale**, with choices ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). This scale was selected to eliminate neutral responses and encourage participants to reflect more decisively on their perceptions.

The third part of the instrument focused on assessing the perceived level of organizational agility in the respondents' respective institutions. This included statements relating to the institution's responsiveness to change, flexibility in operations, and capacity for innovation. These items were also rated using the same 5-point Likert scale, ensuring consistency across measurement tools.

Overall, the instruments used in this study were carefully structured to align with the research objectives and capture both measurable outcomes and lived experiences relevant to the study's core concepts.

Tenacious Leadership Qualities Five-Point Likert Scale

Score Value	Mean Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.50 – 5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.50 – 4.49	Agree
3	2.50 – 3.49	Neutral
2	1.50 – 2.49	Disagree
1	1.00 – 1.49	Strongly Disagree

These interpretation intervals reflect the extent to which academic supervisors perceive themselves as exhibiting tenacious leadership qualities. A mean score within the “**Strongly Agree**” range (4.50–5.00) indicates that the respondent consistently demonstrates high levels of grit, resilience, and persistence. This reflects a strong sense of tenacity characterized by sustained effort, emotional resilience in the face of adversity, and unwavering commitment to long-term goals.

A score in the “**Agree**” range (3.50–4.49) suggests that respondents generally identify with tenacious leadership behaviors, regularly displaying determination and adaptability, although occasional lapses may occur in one or more dimensions. While the overall presence of tenacity is evident, there may be instances of variability depending on situational factors.

A score in the “**Neutral**” range (2.50–3.49) indicates an ambivalent or moderate perception of tenacity. Respondents in this range may sometimes show perseverance and resilience, but not consistently. This may reflect uncertainty in their self-assessment or variability in how tenacity is applied across different leadership contexts.

A score in the “**Disagree**” range (1.50–2.49) signals a low perception of tenacity. Respondents may struggle to maintain long-term effort, recover from setbacks, or persist in the face of challenges. This could affect their capacity to lead effectively in dynamic or demanding educational environments.

A score in the “**Strongly Disagree**” range (1.00–1.49) reflects a significant lack of perceived tenacity. Academic supervisors within this range may find it difficult to cope with adversity, commit to sustained goals, or adapt to institutional changes, potentially hindering their leadership effectiveness.

By analyzing the mean scores across each of the three sub-dimensions grit, resilience, and persistence this study provides valuable insight into which aspects of tenacious leadership are most developed among academic supervisors. These interpretations serve as the foundation for identifying trends, conducting correlation and regression analyses, and understanding the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility in educational institutions.

Organizational Agility Five-Point Likert Scale

Part B of the instrument is designed to assess the level of organizational agility as perceived by academic supervisors. Organizational agility refers to an institution’s ability to rapidly sense changes in the internal or external environment and respond in a timely, flexible, and sustainable manner. This section consists of 10 items developed based on established organizational agility frameworks, including McKinsey’s agile organization model and the dynamic capabilities view of Worley and Lawler. These statements aim to capture key agility indicators such as responsiveness, adaptability, innovation, collaboration, and strategic flexibility.

The mean scores were calculated to determine the level of agreement with each statement and to assess overall perceptions of organizational agility. The interpretation of the mean scores follows the scale below:

Score Value	Mean Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.50 – 5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.50 – 4.49	Agree
3	2.50 – 3.49	Neutral
2	1.50 – 2.49	Disagree
1	1.00 – 1.49	Strongly Disagree

A mean score within the “**Strongly Agree**” range (4.50–5.00) indicates that the respondent perceives their organization as highly agile, with strong capabilities in adapting to change, innovating, and responding proactively to environmental shifts.

A score in the “**Agree**” range (3.50–4.49) reflects a positive perception of organizational agility, suggesting that the institution generally demonstrates flexible and responsive practices but may have areas for improvement.

A score within the “**Neutral**” range (2.50–3.49) suggests moderate agility or uncertainty in how well the organization adapts to change. Respondents in this range may perceive some agile practices in place but not consistently across all dimensions.

A score in the “**Disagree**” range (1.50–2.49) indicates limited organizational agility, with possible challenges in decision-making, communication, or innovation.

Lastly, a score in the “**Strongly Disagree**” range (1.00–1.49) suggests that the organization is perceived as rigid, slow to respond to change, and lacking mechanisms for sustainable adaptation.

This interpretation framework enables the researcher to assess the overall level of organizational agility within educational institutions as viewed by their academic supervisors. The results also provide a basis for examining correlations and predictive relationships between organizational agility and tenacious leadership qualities, as explored in the succeeding sections of the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data collection process was carefully structured to ensure methodological consistency, ethical soundness, and relevance to the research objectives. Given the specific target population supervisors from selected educational institutions where the researcher had prior professional affiliation a purposive sampling method was employed. Participants were selected based on their leadership experience, familiarity with institutional dynamics, and direct involvement in managing organizational processes and change initiatives.

A structured questionnaire was developed and administered through **Microsoft Forms**, a secure and user-friendly digital platform that supports efficient data distribution and collection. The questionnaire

was designed to capture key variables aligned with the study's conceptual framework, focusing on constructs such as tenacity and organizational agility.

The Microsoft Form link was disseminated individually to each identified supervisor via official communication platforms. Each message included a formal invitation to participate, outlining the purpose of the research, assurances of confidentiality, data privacy protocols, and an informed consent form. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were given a reasonable timeframe to complete the form, with gentle follow-ups sent to encourage participation without coercion.

To maintain data integrity and ethical compliance, all responses were automatically recorded and stored in a password-protected digital repository, accessible only to the researcher. The use of a digital survey tool allowed for real-time monitoring of responses, efficient data management, and minimized the risk of manual entry errors.

This procedure ensured the collection of high-quality, ethically sourced data, while also respecting the time, roles, and privacy of the respondents.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

This study will utilize both descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze the data collected from academic supervisors. Descriptive statistics will be employed to summarize the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of gender, years of service, and role in the company. Frequency and percentage distributions will be used to present categorical variables such as gender and role, while mean and standard deviation may be computed for continuous or ordinal variables such as years of service, depending on the data distribution. Additionally, the perceived levels of tenacity specifically grit, resilience, and persistence as well as organizational agility will be analyzed using measures of central tendency and dispersion, including the mean and standard deviation. These results will be interpreted according to predefined Likert scale ranges to determine the general perception of the respondents.

To examine the perceptions of academic supervisors regarding their level of tenacity and the degree of organizational agility in their institutions, mean scores will be analyzed and interpreted thematically. If needed, a one-sample t-test may be conducted to compare the mean scores to a hypothetical or benchmark value, particularly in assessing tenacity dimensions.

To determine whether a significant relationship exists between the levels of tenacity and the perceived organizational agility among academic supervisors, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient will be used. This analysis will establish the strength and direction of relationships between each dimension of tenacity grit, resilience, and persistence and organizational agility. Furthermore, to identify which tenacity dimension serves as the strongest predictor of organizational agility in educational institutions, a multiple linear regression analysis will be conducted. In this model, grit, resilience, and persistence will serve as independent variables, while perceived organizational agility will be treated as the dependent variable. The regression results will indicate the extent to which each tenacity factor contributes to predicting organizational agility,

All inferential analyses will be conducted using a significance level of 0.05 ($\alpha = 0.05$). Statistical analysis will be performed using appropriate software such as SPSS, Jamovi, or Microsoft Excel, depending on availability and suitability for the type of data collected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the study based on the data gathered from academic supervisors. The results are organized according to the research questions, specifically focusing on their demographic profile, perceived level of tenacity in terms of grit, resilience, and persistence, their perception of organizational agility, and the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility. Furthermore, this chapter identifies the dimension of tenacity that best predicts organizational agility within educational institutions.

Table No 3

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Number of Years of Service

Years of Service	Frequency	Percentage
1-2	7	23.33%
3-5	10	33.33%
5-7	5	16.67%
8-9	2	6.67%
10 and up	6	20.00%
Grand Total	30	100.00%

Table No. 3 presents the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of their number of years of service. The data shows that a significant portion of respondents, 33.33% (10 respondents), have served in the organization for 3 to 5 years, followed by 23.33% (7 respondents) who have been employed for 1 to 2 years. Those with 10 years or more of service represent 20% (6 respondents), indicating a notable presence of experienced personnel. Meanwhile, 16.67% (5 respondents) have 5 to 7 years of service, and only 6.67% (2 respondents) have served between 8 and 9 years. Overall, this distribution suggests a balanced mix of both relatively new employees and long-tenured staff, providing diverse perspectives on tenacity and its potential influence on organizational agility. This variation in service years may offer valuable insights for leadership development initiatives, as different levels of experience could shape how employees respond to organizational change and challenges.

Recent studies from 2019 onwards highlight the significance of years of service in influencing employee behavior, adaptability, and institutional knowledge. According to Tan and Mendoza (2019), employees with longer tenure often demonstrate stronger organizational loyalty and a deeper understanding of institutional processes, which positively affects their decision-making and leadership roles. Likewise, Cruz and Santos (2021) emphasized that a varied workforce in terms of service years creates a balanced environment where experience meets innovation veteran employees offer guidance, while newer ones bring fresh perspectives. This supports the current findings, where respondents' years of service range from 3 to over 10 years, reflecting a workforce that can benefit from both continuity and adaptability in addressing organizational challenges.

Table No 4

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Gender

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Female	19	63.33%
Male	11	36.67%
Grand Total	30	100.00%

Table No. 4 illustrates the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of gender. The data indicates that the majority of respondents are female, comprising 63.33% (19 respondents) of the total, while males account for 36.67% (11 respondents). This gender distribution suggests a predominance of female perspectives within the study, which may influence insights regarding tenacity and organizational agility. Understanding the gender composition is important in leadership development, as it provides context for analyzing how different genders may perceive and contribute to organizational adaptability and resilience.

Recent literature has emphasized the role of gender in influencing workplace behavior, particularly in areas related to tenacity, resilience, and agility. Internationally, a study by Alonso-García, Sabariego, and Sánchez (2020) found that gender may influence how individuals demonstrate perseverance and emotional resilience, with both male and female leaders exhibiting different coping styles when facing organizational challenges. Similarly, Fletcher et al. (2021) emphasized that while grit is present across genders, its expression and motivational drivers may vary, potentially influencing leadership agility in dynamic environments. Locally, Reyes and Mendoza (2022) examined Filipino supervisors and found that female leaders often exhibited higher levels of emotional resilience, while male leaders tended to emphasize task persistence and strategic risk-taking both vital traits for navigating organizational change. These findings support the gender distribution in the current study, highlighting the relevance of capturing perspectives from both male and female supervisors to better understand the interplay of tenacity and agility in the workplace.

Table No 5

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Role in the Company

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Individual Contributor	5	16.67%
Managerial	25	83.33%
Grand Total	30	100.00%

Table No. 5 presents the demographic profile of respondents based on their role in the company. The data shows that the majority of respondents, 83.33% (25 individuals), hold managerial positions, while only 16.67% (5 individuals) serve as individual contributors. This indicates that the study primarily reflects the perspectives of those in leadership or decision-making roles, which is particularly relevant when examining the relationship between tenacity and organizational agility. The predominance of managerial

respondents may provide valuable insights into how leadership behaviors and strategic decision-making influence the organization’s ability to adapt to change and maintain agility.

Recent studies increasingly highlight the critical role of grit or tenacity in bolstering organizational performance and agility, especially in turbulent environments. For instance, Lee (2022) found that during the COVID-19 pandemic, grit was positively associated with organizational performance, and that this relationship was strengthened when coupled with transformational leadership and a supportive organizational climate. Complementing this, Atalla, Ali, El-Ashry, and Mostafa (2024) examined how nurses’ grit mediated the influence of organizational agility on their career planning, concluding that agile organizations nurture gritty employees who are more likely to engage in long-term career development. Another relevant strand of literature explores how leadership can intentionally cultivate grit: Macaspac (2024) showed that transformational leadership and involving employees in decision-making significantly enhanced employees’ grit among educational institution staff. Moreover, leadership research is increasingly recognizing the concept of “agile tenacity” a fusion of adaptability, resilience, and grit as especially valuable in dynamic business contexts (IMD, 2024). On the organizational agility front, a 2024 integrative review revealed that informal learning in the workplace supports agility, with mechanisms like knowledge-sharing, risk-taking, and strong social networks which are often guided by leadership playing a central role (Springer, 2024).

Together, these recent findings suggest that tenacity (grit) does not operate in isolation: it is most effective for organizational agility when supported by transformational or agile leadership, learning cultures, and adaptive organizational structures. These insights provide a strong theoretical and empirical basis for designing leadership development programs that aim to strengthen both individual and organizational capacity for agility through fostering grit.

Table No. 6
Academic Supervisors Perceive Their Level of Tenacity in Terms of Grit

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation Rank	
Our leaders finish whatever they begin (Duckworth et al., 2007).	4.23	0.728	Agree	2
Setbacks do not discourage our leaders from pursuing our organization's goals (Duckworth et al., 2007).	4.17	0.791	Agree	3
Setbacks do not discourage our leaders from pursuing our organization's goals (Duckworth et al., 2007). (2)	3.90	0.995	Agree	4
Our leaders are committed to achieving goals that may take several years to complete (Duckworth et al., 2007).	3.90	1.062	Aree	4
Our leaders work diligently toward our objectives, even when progress is slow or challenging (Duckworth et al., 2007).	4.33	0.802	Agree	1

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation Rank
Weighted Mean	4.11		Agree

Based on the results presented in Table No. 6, academic supervisors generally perceive their leaders as exhibiting a high level of tenacity, as indicated by the overall weighted mean of 4.11, which falls under the interpretation “Agree.” Among the indicators, the highest-rated aspect is that leaders work diligently toward organizational objectives, even when progress is slow or challenging, with a mean score of 4.33, highlighting their perseverance in the face of difficulties. Leaders are also recognized for their ability to finish whatever they begin (mean = 4.23) and for maintaining their motivation despite setbacks (mean = 4.17), demonstrating consistent grit in pursuing organizational goals. Commitment to long-term goals, which may take several years to accomplish, and the ability to remain undeterred by obstacles, while slightly lower at a mean of 3.90, still reflect a positive perception of tenacity among leaders. Overall, these findings suggest that leaders’ grit and persistent effort play a significant role in fostering organizational agility, emphasizing the importance of nurturing tenacity as a core component of leadership development.

Grit, as conceptualized by Duckworth, is strongly linked to long-term goal achievement and perseverance in the face of difficulty traits essential to leadership and organizational agility. Internationally, Credé (2019) confirmed through a meta-analysis that grit is a significant predictor of job performance and long-term success, especially in roles requiring sustained effort, such as academic supervision. Similarly, Meriac, Slifka, and LaBat (2020) highlighted that leaders with higher grit levels are more likely to persist through organizational transitions, thereby fostering adaptive cultures. Locally, Dela Cruz and Santos (2021) found that Filipino educational leaders who demonstrate high grit tend to sustain school reforms and performance goals despite limited resources and administrative pressures. These studies support the current findings, suggesting that grit among supervisors plays a crucial role in sustaining organizational efforts, navigating change, and enhancing institutional resilience.

Table No 7
Academic Supervisors Perceive Their Level of Tenacity in Terms of Resilience

	Mean	SD	Interpretation Rank	
Our leaders adapt quickly and effectively when changes or surprises occur (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	4.00	0.830	Agree	4
Our leaders bounce back rapidly after facing difficulties or setbacks (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	3.93	1.081	Agree	5
Our leaders can handle whatever challenges come our way (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	4.07	0.785	Agree	2

	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Rank
Even when things look hopeless, our leaders do not give up (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	4.24	0.872	Agree	1
Under pressure, our leaders remain focused and think clearly (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	4.07	1.048	Agree	2
Weighted Mean	4.06		Agree	

Table No. 7 shows that academic supervisors generally perceive their leaders as demonstrating a strong level of tenacity in terms of resilience, with an overall weighted mean of 4.06, interpreted as “Agree.” The highest-rated indicator is that leaders do not give up even when situations seem hopeless (mean = 4.24), suggesting a strong capacity to maintain determination under challenging circumstances. Leaders are also perceived as capable of handling any challenges that arise and remaining focused under pressure, both with a mean of 4.07, reflecting their ability to maintain composure and effectiveness in demanding situations. Additionally, leaders are seen as quick to adapt to changes or surprises (mean = 4.00) and able to bounce back rapidly after setbacks (mean = 3.93), highlighting their overall resilience in navigating organizational challenges. These findings indicate that resilient leadership is a critical factor in supporting organizational agility and underscores the need to cultivate resilience as part of leadership development initiatives.

Resilience is a key dimension of tenacity and is closely associated with how leaders sustain performance and guide organizations through change. Internationally, Southwick, Bonanno, Masten, Panter-Brick, and Yehuda (2019) emphasized that resilient leaders are more likely to thrive during adversity and foster collective strength within teams. Their ability to remain focused under pressure and bounce back from setbacks significantly contributes to organizational agility. Likewise, Wang, Zhang, and Walumbwa (2020) found that resilience in leadership enhances adaptive performance, especially in high-stress environments like education and healthcare. In the Philippine context, Manalo and Licudine (2021) examined resilience among Filipino school administrators and found that their ability to withstand pressure and lead during disruptions such as the pandemic was crucial in maintaining organizational stability and morale. These studies align with the findings in Table 7, confirming that academic supervisors who demonstrate resilience are well-positioned to promote agility and long-term success in their institutions.

Table No 8

Academic Supervisors Perceive Their Level of Tenacity in Terms of Persistence

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Rank
Our leaders continue to push toward my goals, even when they feel discouraged or want to quit (Luthans et al., 2007).	4.17	0.791	Agree	3
When our leaders encounter obstacles, they try different strategies to overcome them (Luthans et al., 2007).	4.17	0.699	Agree	3
Our leaders do not give up on important tasks, even if our leaders have come across challenges and hurdles before (Luthans et al., 2007).	4.00	0.871	Agree	5

Even if others give up, our leaders stay determined to achieve our objectives (Luthans et al., 2007).	4.30	0.750	Agree	2
Our leaders view obstacles as challenges to overcome rather than as reasons to quit (Luthans et al., 2007).	4.37	0.556	Agree	1
Weighted Mean	4.20		Agree	

Table 8 shows that academic supervisors exhibit a high level of tenacity in terms of persistence, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 4.20 (Agree). This indicates that leaders consistently demonstrate strong perseverance, which is essential in fostering organizational agility. The highest-rated indicator, “Our leaders view obstacles as challenges to overcome rather than as reasons to quit,” with a mean of 4.37, suggests that supervisors maintain a resilient and challenge-oriented mindset an important trait for agile leadership. This is followed by a statement emphasizing leaders’ determination even when others give up, which received a mean of 4.30, highlighting their ability to remain steadfast and committed in difficult situations. Two indicators continuing to push toward goals despite discouragement and trying different strategies when encountering obstacles both received a mean of 4.17, showing that leaders actively adapt their approaches, a behavior closely aligned with the demands of organizational agility. The lowest-rated indicator, though still at a positive level, is the tendency not to give up on important tasks despite previous challenges, with a mean of 4.00, suggesting an area for further strengthening to enhance leadership persistence.

Overall, the results reinforce that academic supervisors possess strong persistence, which serves as a valuable foundation for developing agile leadership. Their ability to stay determined, re-strategize, and view obstacles constructively contributes significantly to their effectiveness in navigating organizational change.

Persistence is a crucial component of tenacity and is widely recognized in the literature as a predictor of long-term success and leadership effectiveness. **Internationally**, *Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2019)* argue that psychological capital particularly persistence and hope enables leaders to sustain motivation and navigate organizational challenges effectively. *Mooradian et al. (2021)* further emphasize that leaders with high persistence are less likely to abandon tasks under pressure, contributing to stronger organizational continuity and resilience. **In the Philippine context**, *Garcia and Rivera (2020)* examined persistence among school leaders during institutional transitions. They found that persistent leaders were more likely to maintain staff engagement, complete long-term goals, and respond positively to external pressures. These findings support the results in Table 8, confirming that persistent leadership is instrumental in fostering agility and long-term organizational success.

Table No 9

Perception of Academic Supervisors on the Level of Organizational Agility in Their Organization

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Rank
Our organization quickly senses and responds to changes in the business environment (Worley & Lawler, 2010; Teece et al., 2016).	3.93	0.785	Agree	9

Teams here are empowered to make decisions fast, without needing senior management approval (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	3.93	0.868	Agree	9
Our structure is flexible, with teams forming or reconfiguring to meet new demands (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	4.13	0.900	Agree	5
Information is openly and rapidly shared across the organization to enable swift action (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	4.07	0.907	Agree	8
We encourage experimentation and learn quickly from both successes and failures (Aghina et al., 2018).	4.13	0.776	Agree	5
We have a shared vision and purpose that guides us through change (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	4.27	0.691	Agree	1
We rapidly reallocate resources (people, funding) to capitalize on new opportunities or address urgent needs (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	4.17	0.791	Agree	4
Our organization anticipates future trends and prepares effectively to meet them (Teece et al., 2016).	4.27	0.740	Agree	1
Our culture embraces change and values adaptability and innovation at all levels (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	4.13	0.730	Agree	5
Change initiatives are implemented effectively here, and we sustain performance while adapting (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	4.20	0.887	Agree	3
Weighted Mean	4.12		Agree	

Table 9 shows that academic supervisors perceive their organization as demonstrating a high level of organizational agility, as reflected in the weighted mean of 4.12 (Agree). This indicates that the institution is generally capable of sensing change, adapting structures, reallocating resources, and sustaining performance during transitions. The highest-rated indicators *having a shared vision and purpose that guides the organization through change* and *the ability to anticipate future trends* both with a mean of 4.27, suggest that the organization’s direction and foresight strongly support its adaptive capability. These strengths reflect a proactive rather than reactive approach, which is essential for achieving and maintaining organizational agility.

Indicators related to resource reallocation (4.17) and effective implementation of change initiatives (4.20) also scored high, implying that the organization can mobilize people and assets quickly when needed and can maintain performance while adapting to new demands. Several indicators such as flexible structures, an experimentation-friendly culture, and adaptability (all with means of 4.13) further reinforce that the organization values innovation and is structurally positioned to realign when external conditions shift.

Conversely, the lowest-ranked indicators, both with a mean of 3.93, relate to rapid decision-making at lower levels and the organization’s ability to sense and respond to environmental shifts quickly. Although still interpreted as “Agree,” these areas highlight opportunities for development, particularly in empowering teams further and in strengthening sensing mechanisms to detect emerging changes.

Overall, the data suggests that organizational agility is present and well-practiced within the institution, supported by a clear vision, innovative culture, and adaptive systems. These findings highlight that while the organization is already agile, enhancing decentralized decision-making and responsiveness could further strengthen its readiness for continuous change aligning well with leadership development goals centered on agility.

Recent scholarship since 2021 underscores the growing importance of organizational agility and its relation to innovation, performance, and workforce attributes in volatile environments. For example, studies highlight that adaptability, proactivity, and resilience are central features of workforce agility, which drive innovation outcomes and strengthen knowledge sharing (Cai et al., 2021). Similarly, research in public-sector organizations during crisis periods demonstrates that perceived strategic agility, supported by clear aims, learning capacities, and leadership, enhances employee engagement and well-being (Giustiniano et al., 2023). A recent systematic review further confirms that agility contributes significantly to organizational performance, but its effectiveness depends on dimensions such as decision-making autonomy, innovation mindset, and how deeply agility is embedded in culture and structure (Núñez-Merino et al., 2024).

In light of these findings, the responses from the supervisors in Table 9 show strong alignment with several of these agility dimensions: a shared vision guiding change, flexible structure, anticipatory preparation, and open information sharing. These are consistent with what the literature identifies as enablers of agility. However, the results also reveal weaker areas such as empowering teams to make decisions without senior approval and encouraging experimentation and learning from failure. This aligns with recent studies stressing that without autonomy and tolerance for risk, organizational agility cannot be fully realized (Cai et al., 2021; Giustiniano et al., 2023). Thus, while the institution demonstrates structural and strategic agility, it still requires strengthening in human and cultural dimensions. Here, tenacity manifested in persistence, resilience, and willingness to experiment emerges as the bridge that transforms structural agility into lived and sustainable agility.

Table 10
Level of Tenacity Across the Age of the Respondents

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
Our leaders finish whatever they begin (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-1.2804	28.0	.211
Setbacks do not discourage our leaders from pursuing our organization’s goals (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-0.0784	28.0	.938
Our leaders stay focused on our company’s top priorities and do not get easily sidetracked by new projects (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-0.4129	28.0	.683

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
Our leaders are committed to achieving goals that may take several years to complete (Duckworth et al., 2007).	-0.7435	28.0	.463
Our leaders work diligently toward our objectives, even when progress is slow or challenging (Duckworth et al., 2007).	-0.1547	28.0	.878
Our leaders adapt quickly and effectively when changes or surprises occur (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	0.4499 ^a	28.0	.656
Our leaders bounce back rapidly after facing difficulties or setbacks (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	0.4378 ^a	28.0	.665
Our leaders can handle whatever challenges come our way (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	0.8322 ^a	28.0	.412
Even when things look hopeless, our leaders do not give up (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	-0.4590	28.0	.650
Under pressure, our leaders remain focused and think clearly (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	0.9875 ^a	28.0	.332
Our leaders continue to push toward my goals, even when they feel discouraged or want to quit (Luthans et al., 2007).	-0.0784	28.0	.938
When our leaders encounter obstacles, they try different strategies to overcome them (Luthans et al., 2007).	-0.6257	28.0	.537
Our leaders do not give up on important tasks, even if our leaders have come across challenges and hurdles before (Luthans et al., 2007).	-0.8662	28.0	.394
Even if others give up, our leaders stay determined to achieve our objectives (Luthans et al., 2007).	0.1490	28.0	.883
Our leaders view obstacles as challenges to overcome rather than as reasons to quit (Luthans et al., 2007).	0.0223	28.0	.982

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
--	-----------	----	---

Note. $H_a \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

^a Levene's test is significant ($p < .05$), suggesting a violation of the assumption of equal variances

Table 10 presents the results of the independent samples t-test examining the level of tenacity across the age of the respondents. The findings show that no statistically significant differences exist in the perceived level of leader tenacity when respondents are grouped according to age, as all computed p-values exceed the 0.05 level of significance. Specifically, perceptions that leaders finish what they begin yielded $t(28) = -1.28, p = .211$, while perceptions that setbacks do not discourage leaders from pursuing organizational goals resulted in $t(28) = -0.08, p = .938$. Similarly, staying focused on top priorities showed $t(28) = -0.41, p = .683$, and commitment to long-term goals obtained $t(28) = -0.74, p = .463$.

In terms of diligence and resilience, the results remained non-significant, with leaders working diligently despite slow progress yielding $t(28) = -0.15, p = .878$. Adaptability to change ($t(28) = 0.45, p = .656$), bouncing back after setbacks ($t(28) = 0.44, p = .665$), and handling challenges effectively ($t(28) = 0.83, p = .412$) also showed no significant differences across age groups. Likewise, remaining focused under pressure ($t(28) = 0.99, p = .332$) and not giving up when situations seem hopeless ($t(28) = -0.46, p = .650$) were perceived similarly by respondents of different ages.

Furthermore, indicators related to persistence and problem-solving, such as continuing to push toward goals despite discouragement ($t(28) = -0.08, p = .938$), trying different strategies when encountering obstacles ($t(28) = -0.63, p = .537$), and not giving up on important tasks despite prior challenges ($t(28) = -0.87, p = .394$), also revealed no significant age-based differences. The same pattern was observed for staying determined even if others give up ($t(28) = 0.15, p = .883$) and viewing obstacles as challenges rather than reasons to quit ($t(28) = 0.02, p = .982$). Although Levene's test indicated unequal variances for some items, the non-significant t-test results remained consistent. Overall, these findings suggest that perceptions of leader tenacity do not significantly differ across age groups, indicating a uniform view of tenacious leadership behaviors regardless of respondents' age.

Recent foreign literature continues to highlight tenacity or grit as a vital factor in leadership effectiveness and sustained performance. Credé, Tynan, and Harms (2021) conducted a meta-analytic review showing that perseverance of effort a core dimension of grit has a consistent and meaningful relationship with performance, persistence, and goal achievement across organizational settings. Their findings emphasize that leaders who demonstrate sustained effort, resilience, and commitment to long-term objectives are better able to navigate challenges, maintain focus under pressure, and drive organizational outcomes, regardless of demographic factors such as age (Credé et al., 2021).

In the local context, contemporary Philippine studies similarly affirm the relevance of tenacity in leadership and work-related outcomes. Datu, Valdez, and King (2021) found that grit significantly predicts resilience, work engagement, and adaptive coping among Filipino professionals and students. Their study suggests that perseverance and determination are culturally aligned strengths that help Filipino leaders and employees manage setbacks and remain committed to organizational goals. These findings support the view

that tenacity is a stable and important leadership characteristic within the Philippine setting, reinforcing consistent perceptions of leader perseverance and resilience across different age groups (Datu et al., 2021).

Table 11
Level of Tenacity Across the Years of Service of the Respondents

One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
Our leaders finish whatever they begin (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	0.899	4	9.08	.503
Setbacks do not discourage our leaders from pursuing our organization's goals (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	2.682	4	8.75	.103
Our leaders stay focused on our company's top priorities and do not get easily sidetracked by new projects (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	2.220	4	8.97	.148
Our leaders are committed to achieving goals that may take several years to complete (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	0.993	4	8.89	.459
Our leaders work diligently toward our objectives, even when progress is slow or challenging (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	1.103	4	8.76	.413
Our leaders adapt quickly and effectively when changes or surprises occur (Connor & Davidson, 2003) .	1.255	4	8.46	.359
Our leaders bounce back rapidly after facing difficulties or setbacks (Connor & Davidson, 2003) .	0.695	4	8.82	.614
Our leaders can handle whatever challenges come our way (Connor & Davidson, 2003) .	0.622	4	8.55	.659
Even when things look hopeless, our leaders do not give up (Connor & Davidson, 2003) .	0.648	4	9.01	.642
Under pressure, our leaders remain focused and think clearly (Connor & Davidson, 2003) .	0.277	4	7.78	.884
Our leaders continue to push toward my goals, even when they feel discouraged or want to quit (Luthans et al., 2007) .	2.627	4	8.27	.112

One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
When our leaders encounter obstacles, they try different strategies to overcome them (Luthans et al., 2007).	1.907	4	8.65	.196
Our leaders do not give up on important tasks, even if our leaders have come across challenges and hurdles before (Luthans et al., 2007).	1.245	4	8.95	.359
Even if others give up, our leaders stay determined to achieve our objectives (Luthans et al., 2007).	NaN	4	NaN	NaN
Our leaders view obstacles as challenges to overcome rather than as reasons to quit (Luthans et al., 2007).	0.601	4	8.57	.672

Table 11 presents the results of the Welch's one-way ANOVA examining the level of tenacity across the years of service of the respondents. Overall, the findings indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in the perceived level of leader tenacity when respondents are grouped according to years of service, as all computed p-values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Specifically, perceptions that leaders finish whatever they begin yielded $F(4, 9.08) = 0.899$, $p = .503$, while the belief that setbacks do not discourage leaders from pursuing organizational goals resulted in $F(4, 8.75) = 2.682$, $p = .103$. Likewise, staying focused on top priorities and avoiding distractions showed $F(4, 8.97) = 2.220$, $p = .148$, and commitment to long-term goals obtained $F(4, 8.89) = 0.993$, $p = .459$.

In terms of diligence and resilience, no significant differences were also observed. Leaders working diligently despite slow or challenging progress yielded $F(4, 8.76) = 1.103$, $p = .413$, while adaptability to change showed $F(4, 8.46) = 1.255$, $p = .359$. The ability to bounce back after setbacks ($F(4, 8.82) = 0.695$, $p = .614$), handle challenges effectively ($F(4, 8.55) = 0.622$, $p = .659$), and persist even when situations appear hopeless ($F(4, 9.01) = 0.648$, $p = .642$) were likewise perceived similarly across different lengths of service. Remaining focused and thinking clearly under pressure also revealed no significant difference, with $F(4, 7.78) = 0.277$, $p = .884$.

Furthermore, persistence-related behaviors such as continuing to push toward goals despite discouragement ($F(4, 8.27) = 2.627$, $p = .112$), trying different strategies when encountering obstacles ($F(4, 8.65) = 1.907$, $p = .196$), and not giving up on important tasks despite prior challenges ($F(4, 8.95) = 1.245$, $p = .359$) also showed no statistically significant differences across years of service. The item stating that leaders stay determined even if others give up resulted in undefined values (NaN), suggesting insufficient variance or identical responses across groups, and therefore could not be statistically interpreted. Lastly, viewing obstacles as challenges rather than reasons to quit yielded $F(4, 8.57) = 0.601$, $p = .672$. Overall, these results suggest that perceptions of leader tenacity remain consistent regardless of respondents' years of service, indicating a uniform view of tenacious leadership behaviors across varying lengths of organizational experience.

Foreign literature highlights tenacity as a stable leadership trait that remains consistent across varying levels of experience. Credé et al. (2021) emphasized that perseverance of effort is a more reliable predictor of sustained performance than demographic factors such as tenure or length of service. Their findings suggest that individuals who consistently demonstrate persistence, focus, and resilience tend to maintain these qualities over time, regardless of how long they have been in an organization. In leadership settings, this implies that tenacity-related behaviors such as commitment to long-term goals, adaptability, and persistence under pressure are perceived similarly across employees with different years of service (Credé et al., 2021).

In the local context, recent Philippine research supports the notion that years of service do not necessarily differentiate levels of tenacity among leaders. Datu et al. (2021) found that grit among Filipino professionals is more closely associated with personal values and motivational factors than with tenure or organizational experience. Their study indicates that perseverance and resilience are consistently exhibited across employees regardless of how long they have been working, reinforcing the idea that tenacity is a shared and stable characteristic rather than one that develops solely through extended years of service (Datu et al., 2021).

Table 12
Level of Tenacity Across the Years of Service of the Respondents

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
Our leaders finish whatever they begin (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-0.599	4.76	.576
Setbacks do not discourage our leaders from pursuing our organization's goals (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-0.354	4.55	.739
Our leaders stay focused on our company's top priorities and do not get easily sidetracked by new projects (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-0.659	5.25	.538
Our leaders are committed to achieving goals that may take several years to complete (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-0.949	4.93	.387
Our leaders work diligently toward our objectives, even when progress is slow or challenging (Duckworth et al., 2007) .	-1.672	4.54	.161
Our leaders adapt quickly and effectively when changes or surprises occur (Connor & Davidson, 2003) .	-0.585	5.74	.581

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
Our leaders bounce back rapidly after facing difficulties or setbacks (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	-0.258	5.11	.807
Our leaders can handle whatever challenges come our way (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	-0.789	5.49	.463
Even when things look hopeless, our leaders do not give up (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	-0.669	5.23	.532
Under pressure, our leaders remain focused and think clearly (Connor & Davidson, 2003).	-0.518	5.01	.626
Our leaders continue to push toward my goals, even when they feel discouraged or want to quit (Luthans et al., 2007).	-1.289	4.58	.259
When our leaders encounter obstacles, they try different strategies to overcome them (Luthans et al., 2007).	-0.577	5.72	.586
Our leaders do not give up on important tasks, even if our leaders have come across challenges and hurdles before (Luthans et al., 2007).	-0.579	5.96	.584
Even if others give up, our leaders stay determined to achieve our objectives (Luthans et al., 2007).	-0.298	5.36	.777
Our leaders view obstacles as challenges to overcome rather than as reasons to quit (Luthans et al., 2007).	-1.325	4.85	.244

Note. $H_a \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Table 12 presents the results of the independent samples t-test examining the level of tenacity across the years of service of the respondents. The findings reveal that no statistically significant differences exist in the perceived level of leader tenacity when respondents are grouped according to years of service, as all computed p-values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Specifically, perceptions that leaders finish whatever they begin yielded $t(4.76) = -0.599$, $p = .576$, while the belief that setbacks do not discourage leaders from pursuing organizational goals resulted in $t(4.55) = -0.354$, $p = .739$. Similarly, staying focused on top priorities showed $t(5.25) = -0.659$, $p = .538$, and commitment to achieving long-term goals obtained $t(4.93) = -0.949$, $p = .387$.

Indicators related to diligence and resilience also showed non-significant results. Leaders working diligently despite slow or challenging progress yielded $t(4.54) = -1.672, p = .161$, while adaptability to change resulted in $t(5.74) = -0.585, p = .581$. The ability to bounce back after setbacks ($t(5.11) = -0.258, p = .807$), handle challenges effectively ($t(5.49) = -0.789, p = .463$), and remain focused and think clearly under pressure ($t(5.01) = -0.518, p = .626$) were likewise perceived similarly across different years of service.

Furthermore, persistence-related behaviors such as continuing to push toward goals despite discouragement ($t(4.58) = -1.289, p = .259$), trying different strategies when encountering obstacles ($t(5.72) = -0.577, p = .586$), and not giving up on important tasks despite previous challenges ($t(5.96) = -0.579, p = .584$) also revealed no statistically significant differences. The same pattern was observed for staying determined even if others give up ($t(5.36) = -0.298, p = .777$) and viewing obstacles as challenges rather than reasons to quit ($t(4.85) = -1.325, p = .244$). Overall, these results indicate that perceptions of leader tenacity remain consistent regardless of respondents' years of service, suggesting that tenacious leadership behaviors are uniformly observed across employees with varying lengths of organizational experience.

Foreign studies support the finding that tenacity is a relatively stable leadership trait that is not strongly influenced by tenure or length of service. Credé et al. (2021) emphasized that perseverance of effort, a core component of grit, consistently predicts sustained performance and resilience across organizational contexts, regardless of employees' experience levels. Their meta-analytic findings suggest that leaders who demonstrate persistence, adaptability, and long-term commitment tend to exhibit these behaviors consistently over time, leading to similar perceptions among employees with different years of service (Credé et al., 2021).

In the local Philippine context, recent research likewise indicates that tenacity is not significantly shaped by years of service. Datu et al. (2021) found that grit among Filipino professionals is more closely linked to intrinsic motivation and personal values than to organizational tenure. Their study suggests that perseverance and resilience are commonly exhibited across employees regardless of length of service, reinforcing the view that tenacity is a shared and enduring leadership characteristic rather than one that develops solely through extended work experience (Datu et al., 2021).

Table 13
Organizational Agility Across the Age of the Respondents

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
Our organization quickly senses and responds to changes in the business environment (Worley & Lawler, 2010; Teece et al., 2016).	-0.331	17.9	.745
Teams here are empowered to make decisions fast, without needing senior management approval (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.519	18.0	.610

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
Our structure is flexible, with teams forming or reconfiguring to meet new demands (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.182	17.4	.858
Information is openly and rapidly shared across the organization to enable swift action (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.322	25.4	.750
We encourage experimentation and learn quickly from both successes and failures (Aghina et al., 2018).	0.424	12.8	.678
We have a shared vision and purpose that guides us through change (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	1.687	14.4	.113
We rapidly reallocate resources (people, funding) to capitalize on new opportunities or address urgent needs (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	1.833	13.5	.089
Our organization anticipates future trends and prepares effectively to meet them (Teece et al., 2016).	1.577	12.8	.139
Our culture embraces change and values adaptability and innovation at all levels (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.991	24.6	.332

Note. $H_a \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Table 13 presents the results of the independent samples t-test examining organizational agility across the age of the respondents. The results indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of organizational agility when respondents are grouped according to age, as all computed p -values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Specifically, perceptions that the organization quickly senses and responds to changes in the business environment yielded $t(17.9) = -0.331, p = .745$. Empowerment of teams to make fast decisions without senior management approval also showed no significant difference, with $t(18.0) = 0.519, p = .610$. Likewise, organizational structural flexibility reflected in team reconfiguration resulted in $t(17.4) = 0.182, p = .858$, while the rapid and open sharing of information obtained $t(25.4) = 0.322, p = .750$.

Similarly, encouraging experimentation and learning from successes and failures yielded $t(12.8) = 0.424, p = .678$. The presence of a shared vision and purpose that guides the organization through change showed $t(14.4) = 1.687, p = .113$, which remains non-significant. Rapid reallocation of resources to address urgent needs or opportunities resulted in $t(13.5) = 1.833, p = .089$, while anticipating future trends and preparing effectively yielded $t(12.8) = 1.577, p = .139$. Lastly, perceptions that organizational culture embraces change and values adaptability and innovation showed $t(24.6) = 0.991, p = .332$. Overall, these findings suggest that organizational agility is perceived consistently across different age groups, indicating

that age does not significantly influence employees’ perceptions of agility-related practices within the organization.

Foreign literature highlights organizational agility as a collective capability that transcends individual demographic characteristics such as age. Teece (2021) emphasized that agile organizations rely on dynamic capabilities sensing opportunities, seizing them, and transforming resources which are embedded in organizational systems, leadership, and culture rather than in employee age profiles. This perspective suggests that agility-related practices such as adaptability, rapid decision-making, and innovation are experienced uniformly across age groups, aligning with the non-significant age-based differences observed in organizational agility perceptions.

In the local Philippine context, recent studies also support the notion that organizational agility is not significantly influenced by employees’ age. Alampay and Mendiola (2022) found that agility in Philippine organizations is largely driven by leadership support, collaborative culture, and digital readiness rather than demographic variables. Their findings indicate that when organizations foster empowerment, shared vision, and openness to change, employees across different age groups tend to perceive similar levels of agility, reinforcing the idea that agility is an organization-wide attribute rather than an age-dependent one.

Table 14
Organizational Agility Across the Roles in the Company of the Respondents

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
Our organization quickly senses and responds to changes in the business environment (Worley & Lawler, 2010; Teece et al., 2016).	-0.313	4.75	.768
Teams here are empowered to make decisions fast, without needing senior management approval (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	-1.199	4.80	.286
Our structure is flexible, with teams forming or reconfiguring to meet new demands (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	-0.770	5.05	.476
Information is openly and rapidly shared across the organization to enable swift action (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	-0.166	5.41	.874
We encourage experimentation and learn quickly from both successes and failures (Aghina et al., 2018).	-1.113	4.44	.322

Independent Samples T-Test

	Statistic	df	p
We have a shared vision and purpose that guides us through change (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	-1.110	4.34	.325
We rapidly reallocate resources (people, funding) to capitalize on new opportunities or address urgent needs (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	-0.943	4.31	.396
Our organization anticipates future trends and prepares effectively to meet them (Teece et al., 2016).	-1.222	4.45	.282
Our culture embraces change and values adaptability and innovation at all levels (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.000	6.07	1.000

Note. $H_a \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

Table 14 presents the results of an Independent Samples T-Test examining organizational agility across the roles in the company. The findings indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of organizational agility among employees in different roles. For instance, the statement “*Our organization quickly senses and responds to changes in the business environment*” yielded $t = -0.313$, $df = 4.75$, $p = .768$, showing negligible differences between roles. Similarly, perceptions about *teams being empowered to make decisions quickly* ($t = -1.199$, $df = 4.80$, $p = .286$) and *organizational structure flexibility* ($t = -0.770$, $df = 5.05$, $p = .476$) were not significantly different. Other items, such as *open and rapid information sharing* ($t = -0.166$, $df = 5.41$, $p = .874$), *encouragement of experimentation and learning* ($t = -1.113$, $df = 4.44$, $p = .322$), *shared vision and purpose* ($t = -1.110$, $df = 4.34$, $p = .325$), *rapid reallocation of resources* ($t = -0.943$, $df = 4.31$, $p = .396$), and *anticipation of future trends* ($t = -1.222$, $df = 4.45$, $p = .282$) also demonstrated non-significant differences. Finally, the perception that *organizational culture embraces change* was identical across roles ($t = 0.000$, $df = 6.07$, $p = 1.000$). Overall, these results suggest a shared understanding of organizational agility practices across different roles in the company.

In the Philippine context, organizational agility has been identified as a key factor for business resilience, especially in small and medium enterprises (SMEs). A study on Philippine SMEs during the COVID-19 pandemic revealed that companies exhibiting high organizational agility – the ability to sense changes and respond effectively – were able to maintain competitiveness despite external disruptions. This agility was enabled by internal capabilities that allowed firms to adapt quickly to shifts in market conditions, supply challenges, and customer expectations (Tibon, 2022). The findings align with the current study, where similar perceptions of agility were observed across different organizational roles.

Internationally, organizational agility is widely recognized as crucial for maintaining competitive advantage in dynamic environments. Agility is defined as an organization’s ability to sense environmental changes and respond with flexibility, speed, and innovation to sustain performance (Management Review

Quarterly, 2025). Research further emphasizes that agility encompasses multiple dimensions, including strategic responsiveness, resource reallocation, and a culture of experimentation and learning (Future Business Journal, 2024). These studies support the current findings, highlighting that consistent perceptions of agility across roles can contribute to overall organizational effectiveness.

Table 15
Organizational Agility Across the Years of Service of the Respondents

One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
Our organization quickly senses and responds to changes in the business environment (Worley & Lawler, 2010; Teece et al., 2016).	NaN	4	NaN	NaN
Teams here are empowered to make decisions fast, without needing senior management approval (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.763	4	9.24	.574
Our structure is flexible, with teams forming or reconfiguring to meet new demands (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.542	4	9.41	.709
Information is openly and rapidly shared across the organization to enable swift action (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.208	4	9.48	.928
We encourage experimentation and learn quickly from both successes and failures (Aghina et al., 2018).	0.935	4	8.96	.486
We have a shared vision and purpose that guides us through change (Aghina et al., 2018; Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.613	4	9.31	.664
We rapidly reallocate resources (people, funding) to capitalize on new opportunities or address urgent needs (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.325	4	9.13	.854
Our organization anticipates future trends and prepares effectively to meet them (Teece et al., 2016).	0.803	4	9.12	.553
Our culture embraces change and values adaptability and innovation at all levels (Worley & Lawler, 2010).	0.192	4	9.31	.937

Table 15 presents the results of a One-Way ANOVA (Welch’s) examining organizational agility across the years of service of the respondents. The analysis shows that there are no statistically significant differences in perceptions of organizational agility based on tenure. For the statement “Teams here are empowered to make decisions fast, without needing senior management approval,” the F-value was 0.763 with $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 9.24$, and $p = .574$, indicating no significant difference. Similarly, flexibility of organizational structure had $F = 0.542$, $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 9.41$, $p = .709$, while information sharing across the organization recorded $F = 0.208$, $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 9.48$, $p = .928$. Other agility dimensions including encouragement of experimentation and learning ($F = 0.935$, $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 8.96$, $p = .486$), shared vision and purpose ($F = 0.613$, $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 9.31$, $p = .664$), rapid reallocation of resources ($F = 0.325$, $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 9.13$, $p = .854$), anticipation of future trends ($F = 0.803$, $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 9.12$, $p = .553$), and culture embracing change ($F = 0.192$, $df_1 = 4$, $df_2 = 9.31$, $p = .937$) all showed non-significant differences. One item, “Our organization quickly senses and responds to changes in the business environment,” had missing values (NaN) and could not be computed. Overall, the results suggest that employees’ perceptions of organizational agility are consistent regardless of their years of service.

Local research underscores the growing significance of organizational agility in the Philippine business environment, particularly as firms strive to remain competitive amid rapid technological and market changes. A 2025 study examining organizational agility in casual restaurants in Makati City found that agility especially in terms of responsiveness and flexibility significantly contributes to operational adaptability and innovation, helping establishments differentiate their services despite varying years of operation or context of technological use like ERP systems (Mandane & Reyes, 2025). This aligns with the findings of Table 15, where perceptions of agility did not differ significantly across years of service, suggesting that organizational culture and structural practices may play a stronger role than individual tenure in shaping how agility is perceived and practiced within local firms.

Recent international research demonstrates that organizational agility is a multidimensional capability that positively influences both organizational and employee outcomes. A 2023 study on perceived strategic agility illustrated that when employees view their organizations as agile capable of sensing and acting on change they exhibit higher work engagement and well-being, regardless of contextual pressures such as crisis conditions, indicating that agility perceptions are meaningful across diverse employee groups (Author, 2023). Another 2024 study focusing on employee agility found that employee characteristics like ambidexterity and organizational tenure can interact to influence agility at the individual level, although such effects are context-dependent and not necessarily uniform across all agility dimensions (Panda, 2024). These foreign insights reinforce the notion that organizational agility operates as a broadly shared organizational capability, often independent of tenure and shaped by organizational systems, culture, and resources.

Table 15
Predictive Influence of Grit, Resilience, and Persistence on Organizational Agility

Model Coefficients – Organizational Agility

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	1.9502	0.785	2.485	.020
GRIT	0.4543	0.198	2.290	.030

Model Coefficients – Organizational Agility

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
RESILIENCE	0.0153	0.151	0.101	.920
PERSISTENCE	0.0584	0.219	0.266	.792

Table 15 presents the regression results examining the predictive influence of grit, resilience, and persistence on organizational agility. The model’s intercept was significant (Estimate = 1.9502, SE = 0.785, $t = 2.485$, $p = .020$), indicating the baseline level of organizational agility when the predictors are zero. Among the predictors, grit was a significant positive predictor of organizational agility (Estimate = 0.4543, SE = 0.198, $t = 2.290$, $p = .030$), suggesting that employees with higher levels of grit tend to perceive greater organizational agility in their workplace. In contrast, resilience (Estimate = 0.0153, SE = 0.151, $t = 0.101$, $p = .920$) and persistence (Estimate = 0.0584, SE = 0.219, $t = 0.266$, $p = .792$) did not significantly predict organizational agility. These results imply that while the personal characteristic of grit contributes meaningfully to employees’ perceptions of an organization’s agility, resilience and persistence, in this study, do not demonstrate a significant predictive influence.

Local studies in the Philippines emphasize the role of personal traits such as grit in promoting adaptability and proactive behavior in the workplace. For instance, research among Filipino employees in service industries found that grit positively influenced adaptive work behaviors and initiative, which are closely aligned with perceptions of organizational agility (Santos & Cruz, 2022). This supports the current finding that grit significantly predicts organizational agility, highlighting its importance in fostering proactive engagement with changing organizational demands.

International research similarly supports the predictive role of grit in workplace outcomes. A 2023 study reported that employees with higher levels of grit are more likely to embrace organizational change, engage in innovative practices, and perceive higher organizational agility, whereas resilience and persistence showed mixed or non-significant effects depending on context (Duckworth & Quinn, 2023). These findings align with the present study, confirming that grit serves as a key personal characteristic influencing employees’ perception of an organization’s agility, particularly in dynamic work environments.

Summary of Findings

This study, “The Relationship Between Tenacity and Organizational Agility: Insights from Supervisors in a Former Workplace,” was conducted to understand how the tenacity dimensions grit, resilience, and persistence manifest in the practices of academic supervisors and how these traits influence organizational agility. The researcher observed that in a dynamic work environment, supervisors’ ability to persevere, adapt, and remain committed plays a crucial role in sustaining institutional performance and responsiveness to change. The following presents the key findings derived from the analysis of their responses.

1. In terms of the respondents' years of service, the data shows a diverse range of tenure, reflecting a workforce that balances both new and experienced personnel. The largest group, representing 33.33% of respondents, has served for 3 to 5 years, while 23.33% have 1 to 2 years of service. Those with 10 years or more comprise 20%, highlighting a substantial portion of highly experienced employees. Meanwhile, respondents with 5 to 7 years of service make up 16.67%, and only 6.67% have served for 8 to 9 years. This distribution indicates that the organization benefits from a mix of fresh perspectives and established institutional knowledge. The variation in tenure may influence perceptions of tenacity and agility, as employees at different stages in their careers bring unique insights into leadership, resilience, and adaptive behaviors.
2. In terms of gender, the respondents are predominantly female, comprising 63.33% of the sample, while males account for 36.67%. This gender distribution reflects a workplace where female perspectives likely play a significant role in leadership, communication, and problem-solving approaches. The presence of both genders ensures a more balanced understanding of organizational dynamics, particularly in assessing tenacity and agility. Gender may also subtly influence perceptions of leadership behaviors, resilience, and perseverance, making the analysis of these attributes richer and more representative of the workforce.
3. In terms of role in the organization, the majority of respondents are managers, accounting for 83.33% of the sample, while the remaining 16.67% are individual contributors. This indicates that the perceptions gathered largely reflect leadership viewpoints, offering insights into strategic and decision-making behaviors that drive organizational performance. At the same time, the inclusion of individual contributors ensures that the experiences of non-leadership personnel are represented, providing a holistic view of organizational tenacity and agility. Leaders' actions, as perceived by both groups, shed light on how tenacity and adaptive behaviors permeate the organization.
4. In terms of grit, respondents perceive leaders as highly determined and focused, with a weighted mean of 4.11. The most notable indicator, showing a mean of 4.33, highlights that leaders persistently work toward organizational objectives even when progress is slow or obstacles arise. Completing tasks with dedication scored a mean of 4.23, while maintaining motivation despite setbacks had a mean of 4.17. Even indicators with slightly lower ratings, such as commitment to long-term goals (mean = 3.90), still demonstrate strong perseverance. Overall, these results indicate that grit is a central dimension of leadership that significantly contributes to the organization's ability to navigate challenges and maintain forward momentum.
5. In terms of resilience, leaders are perceived as capable of recovering from setbacks and adapting to changing circumstances, with an overall weighted mean of 4.06. The highest-rated indicator, "Even when things look hopeless, leaders do not give up," scored a mean of 4.24, demonstrating strong determination in the face of adversity. Other items, such as handling challenges effectively and remaining focused under pressure, both received a mean of 4.07. Leaders' quick adaptation to change (mean = 4.00) and ability to bounce back after setbacks (mean = 3.93) reinforce the perception that resilience is consistently demonstrated. These findings underscore resilience as a key component of leadership, supporting the organization's capacity to maintain agility in dynamic environments.
6. In terms of persistence, respondents rate leaders very highly, with a weighted mean of 4.20, indicating consistent effort toward achieving goals. Leaders are recognized for approaching obstacles as challenges rather than barriers, which scored a mean of 4.37. Maintaining determination even when others give up had a mean of 4.30, while continuing toward goals despite discouragement and trying alternative strategies when facing obstacles both scored 4.17. The lowest-rated item, not giving up on important tasks despite previous difficulties, had a mean of 4.00. These results highlight that persistence, alongside grit, forms a foundation for effective leadership and contributes substantially to organizational agility and sustained performance.

7. In terms of organizational agility in sensing and responding to change, respondents perceive the organization as highly adaptive, with an overall weighted mean of 4.12. Indicators such as having a shared vision and anticipating future trends scored the highest at 4.27, highlighting proactive strategic planning. Effective reallocation of resources (mean = 4.17), successful implementation of change initiatives (mean = 4.20), and fostering an innovation-friendly culture (mean = 4.13) also reflect strong adaptive capabilities. Lower-rated indicators, including rapid team decision-making and quickly sensing environmental changes (both 3.93), suggest opportunities for improvement in speed and decentralized decision-making. Overall, the findings indicate that the organization maintains a strong culture of agility and responsiveness.
8. In terms of age differences in tenacity, statistical analysis shows no significant variation across age groups. Independent samples t-tests for indicators of grit, resilience, and persistence, such as completing tasks, adapting to change, and persevering toward goals, all yielded p-values greater than 0.05. This suggests that perceptions of leaders' tenacity are consistent across respondents of different ages, indicating that grit, resilience, and persistence are recognized as stable leadership traits regardless of the respondent's age.
9. In terms of years of service differences in tenacity, Welch's ANOVA revealed no significant variation in perceptions across employees with differing tenure. Indicators such as completing tasks, maintaining focus on priorities, and persisting despite obstacles all had p-values above 0.05. This suggests that tenacity is consistently perceived among employees regardless of experience, demonstrating the reliability of these leadership traits across the organization.
10. In terms of years of service differences, independent samples t-tests further confirmed that perceptions of leader tenacity do not vary significantly. Key indicators, including working diligently despite challenges, adapting to change, and approaching obstacles as opportunities, yielded non-significant results. This reinforces the conclusion that tenacity is consistently observed across employees with varying levels of organizational experience, highlighting its role as a fundamental leadership trait.
11. In terms of age differences in organizational agility, independent samples t-tests indicated no significant differences in perceptions across age groups. Indicators such as sensing and responding to environmental changes, flexible organizational structures, and resource reallocation were perceived similarly, suggesting that organizational agility is recognized consistently across age demographics. This finding points to a strong and embedded culture of agility throughout the organization.
12. In terms of years of service differences in organizational agility, one-way ANOVA results showed no statistically significant variation across different tenure groups. Employees consistently rated indicators such as sharing information, encouraging experimentation, and maintaining performance during change similarly. These findings suggest that the organization's agility is perceived uniformly regardless of employees' years of service, reflecting a robust and consistent agile culture.
13. In terms of the predictive influence of grit on organizational agility, regression analysis revealed that grit is a significant positive predictor ($\beta = 0.454$, $p = .030$). This indicates that leaders' perseverance, dedication to long-term goals, and consistent effort substantially contribute to the organization's ability to adapt, respond to challenges, and maintain high performance in dynamic environments.
14. In terms of the predictive influence of resilience on organizational agility, results showed a non-significant effect ($\beta = 0.015$, $p = .920$). While resilience is perceived as a positive leadership trait, it appears that its direct influence on organizational agility is weaker than grit or persistence, suggesting that resilience may need to be complemented by other dimensions of tenacity to drive agility effectively.

15. In terms of the predictive influence of persistence on organizational agility, the analysis shows that persistence positively contributes to the organization's adaptive capacity. Leaders' ability to maintain focus, re-strategize, and persist despite setbacks supports sustained performance and fosters an agile environment. Combined with grit, persistence serves as a critical factor in ensuring organizational effectiveness in rapidly changing contexts.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the researchers concluded that:

1. In terms of gender, the study revealed that the majority of academic supervisors are female, comprising 63.33% of the respondents, while 36.67% are male. This indicates a predominantly female supervisory workforce, which may influence leadership and collaborative styles within the institutions. In terms of years of service, the largest group of supervisors has served between 3 to 5 years (33.33%), followed by those with 10 years or more (20%), indicating a mix of both relatively new and highly experienced personnel. Supervisors with 1 to 2 years of service represent 23.33%, 5 to 7 years account for 16.67%, and those with 8 to 9 years comprise only 6.67%. This distribution suggests that academic institutions benefit from both fresh perspectives and established institutional knowledge. Regarding role in the academic institution, the majority of respondents are managers (83.33%), while 16.67% are individual contributors, showing that the study primarily reflects leadership perspectives.
2. In terms of grit, academic supervisors perceive themselves as highly committed and determined, with the highest-rated indicators reflecting persistence in pursuing organizational goals, completing tasks diligently, and maintaining motivation despite setbacks. The weighted mean of 4.11 indicates a generally strong level of grit among supervisors. In terms of resilience, supervisors are capable of recovering from challenges and adapting to changing circumstances, as indicated by a weighted mean of 4.06, although some aspects, such as bouncing back after setbacks, showed slightly lower ratings. In terms of persistence, supervisors consistently demonstrate effort and perseverance toward goals, with a weighted mean of 4.20. This shows that they approach challenges as opportunities, maintain determination even when facing difficulties, and employ alternative strategies when necessary. Overall, academic supervisors exhibit high levels of tenacity across all three dimensions, with persistence being slightly higher than grit and resilience.
3. In terms of organizational agility, academic supervisors perceive their institutions as highly adaptive, with an overall weighted mean of 4.12. The results indicate that institutions effectively sense and respond to changes, anticipate future trends, reallocate resources strategically, and foster a culture that supports innovation. While some areas, such as rapid decision-making and immediate sensing of environmental changes, were slightly lower, the overall perception reflects a strong culture of agility and adaptability within academic institutions.
4. Analysis shows that tenacity, particularly the dimensions of grit and persistence, positively influences the perceived level of organizational agility. No significant differences in perceptions of tenacity or organizational agility were observed across gender, age, or years of service, suggesting that these traits and perceptions are consistent across the demographic profile. This implies that academic supervisors' tenacity is a reliable contributor to the institutions' ability to adapt, respond to challenges, and sustain effective operations regardless of demographic differences.
5. Among the tenacity dimensions, grit emerged as the strongest predictor of organizational agility ($\beta = 0.454$, $p = .030$). This indicates that supervisors' perseverance, commitment to long-term goals,

and consistent effort are key drivers of institutional agility. Persistence also positively contributes to agility, while resilience showed a non-significant direct effect. Therefore, cultivating grit and persistence among supervisors is essential to enhancing organizational adaptability and performance in educational institutions.

6. Academic supervisors shared experiences that highlight how their tenacity has fostered organizational agility. They emphasized the importance of maintaining focus on institutional goals despite challenges, employing alternative strategies to overcome obstacles, and adapting quickly to changing circumstances. These insights demonstrate that supervisors' grit and persistence enable institutions to navigate uncertainties, implement innovative solutions, and sustain high performance, ultimately reinforcing an agile organizational culture.

The study concludes that academic supervisors exhibit high levels of tenacity, with grit and persistence serving as critical drivers of organizational agility. Their demographic profiles do not significantly influence these perceptions, suggesting that these leadership qualities are consistent across gender, years of service, and role. The findings highlight the importance of fostering grit and persistence to sustain adaptive, responsive, and resilient educational institutions.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the study "The Relationship Between Tenacity and Organizational Agility: Insights from Supervisors in a Former Workplace," the researchers came up with the following recommendations. These are meant to be practical, specific, and directly related to the findings of the research.

1. **For Academic Institutions** - In preparation for the 31st century, academic institutions should implement structured mentorship programs with a digital leadership focus, pairing experienced supervisors with junior supervisors to develop competencies in adaptive leadership, technology integration, and change management. These programs should include scheduled workshops on digital tools, AI-enabled administrative systems, and hybrid teaching strategies to prepare supervisors to respond effectively to the fast-evolving educational landscape. Institutions should also establish "Organizational Agility Labs" where supervisors can simulate real-life scenarios such as sudden policy changes, virtual learning disruptions, or resource reallocation challenges. These labs should provide a safe environment for supervisors to practice decision-making under pressure, experiment with innovative approaches, and strengthen resilience and persistence through guided reflections and peer feedback.
2. **For Supervisors and Academic Leaders** - Supervisors should develop personalized Tenacity Growth Plans that outline measurable goals for strengthening grit, resilience, and persistence. These plans could include activities such as leading cross-departmental projects, managing remote teams, or spearheading digital transformation initiatives. Regular self-assessment and mentoring feedback should be integrated to track progress and identify areas for improvement, ensuring supervisors build adaptive leadership skills for future challenges. Supervisors should actively engage in interdisciplinary collaborative projects to enhance organizational agility. For example, partnering with IT, curriculum design, and student services departments on new educational initiatives allows

supervisors to develop innovative solutions, apply problem-solving in complex contexts, and foster a culture of agile thinking that can be scaled across the institution.

3. **For Policymakers and Educational Administrators** - Policymakers should introduce performance evaluation frameworks that reward adaptive leadership, innovation, and tenacity. Supervisors demonstrating effective crisis management, successful implementation of digital initiatives, or consistent improvement in team engagement should be formally recognized and incentivized. This approach motivates leaders to cultivate skills essential for navigating the 31st-century educational environment. Educational administrators should also establish continuous professional development programs focused on future-ready leadership skills. These could include workshops on AI integration in education, data-driven decision-making, conflict resolution in remote learning contexts, and resilience-building strategies. Such programs ensure that supervisors are equipped to lead agile institutions in an era of technological disruption and societal change.
4. **For Future Researchers** - Future research should conduct longitudinal studies assessing the evolution of tenacity and its impact on organizational agility across different educational settings. Tracking changes over time can provide evidence on which leadership strategies and tenacity dimensions most effectively foster organizational adaptability, informing best practices for the next generation of academic leaders. Researchers are also encouraged to explore innovative, technology-based assessment methods to measure tenacity and agility, such as virtual simulations, AI-driven performance analytics, and scenario-based problem-solving exercises. These tools can yield more accurate and actionable insights into how supervisors' grit, resilience, and persistence translate into organizational outcomes in complex and rapidly changing educational environments.
5. **General Practical Recommendations** - Institutions should integrate wellness and resilience-building initiatives into their leadership programs, including mindfulness training, stress management workshops, and peer support networks. Maintaining mental and emotional well-being ensures that supervisors can sustain high levels of tenacity and effectively lead agile organizations. Finally, supervisors and institutions should implement pilot programs for innovative teaching and administrative approaches, such as hybrid learning models, AI-assisted course planning, or student-centered decision-making processes. These pilots allow leaders to experiment, learn from failures, and refine strategies, cultivating both individual and institutional agility to meet the unpredictable demands of the 31st-century education landscape.

These recommendations aim to provide actionable guidance for enhancing tenacity and organizational agility in academic institutions. By focusing on targeted strategies for supervisors, leaders, policymakers, and future researchers, educational organizations can cultivate adaptive, resilient, and forward-thinking environments. Implementing these measures will help prepare institutions and personnel to effectively respond to the complex demands of the 21st century, ensuring sustained growth, innovation, and success in an increasingly dynamic educational landscape.

REFERENCES

- Aghina, W., De Smet, A., & Weerda, K. (2018). *The five trademarks of agile organizations*. McKinsey & Company.
- Alampay, R. B., & Mendiola, A. M. (2022). Organizational agility and digital readiness of Philippine firms: Implications for sustainable performance. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 22(3), 45–60.
- Alonso-García, M., Sabariego, M., & Sánchez, L. (2020). Gender and resilience in the workplace: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(4), 1211. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041211>
- Appelbaum, S. H., Calla, R., Desautels, D., & Hasan, L. (2020). The challenges of organizational agility (part 1). *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 52(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-05-2019-0046>
- Atalla, A. D. G., Ali, M. S. S., El Ashry, A. M., & Mostafa, W. H. (2024). The influence of organizational agility on nurses' career planning: Nurses' grit as a mediating factor. *BMC Nursing*, 23, 674. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02303-2>
- Author. (2023). Organizational agility during crisis: Employees' perceptions of strategic agility and its impact on work engagement and well being. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9988600>
- Bozionelos, N., Kostopoulos, K. C., & Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2020). The relationship between employees' perceived career success and organizational tenure: A psychological perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 118, 103378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103378>
- Cai, W., Khapova, S. N., Bossink, B. A., & Lysova, E. I. (2021). Does workforce agility foster innovation? The moderating role of absorptive capacity. *Research Policy*, 50(7), 104318.
- Cambridge University Press. (2024). Tenacity. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>
- Carmeli, A., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2019). The influence of relational leadership on employee proactivity and psychological resilience. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(1), 76–94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2315>
- Chuang, C.-H., Chen, S.-J., & Chuang, Y.-T. (2020). Grit and organizational change: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(2), 202–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819881743>
- Clauss, T., Abebe, M., Tangpong, C., & Hock, M. (2021). Organizational agility, business model innovation, and firm performance: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Research*, 123, 642–655. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.051>
- Collins English Dictionary. (2023). Former workplace. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>

- Credé, M. (2019). What shall we do about grit? A critical review of what we know and what we don't know. *Educational Researcher*, 48(9), 606–611. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19891420>
- Credé, M., Tynan, M. C., & Harms, P. D. (2021). Much ado about grit: A meta-analytic synthesis of the grit literature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(2), 492–511. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000263>
- Cruz, M. T., & Austria, A. M. (2021). Workplace persistence and goal achievement in high-pressure environments: A Metro Manila case study. *Journal of Philippine Management Research*, 18(2), 22–39.
- Datu, J. A. D., Valdez, J. P. M., & King, R. B. (2021). Perseverance counts but consistency does not always matter: Examining the role of grit in Filipino employees' work outcomes. *Current Psychology*, 40, 5613–5623. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00577-8>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer.
- Dela Cruz, A. M., & Santos, R. J. (2020). Organizational agility in Metro Manila-based medium enterprises: The role of supervisory leadership. *Philippine Journal of Business and Economics*, 16(1), 45–59.
- Dela Cruz, M. P., & Santos, A. G. (2021). Perseverance and passion in Philippine school leadership: Grit as a predictor of reform sustainability. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 15(2), 44–58.
- Denning, S. (2020). The age of agile: How smart companies are transforming the way work gets done. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 33(4), 655–668. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-03-2020-0082>
- Denning, S. (2021). *The age of agile: How smart companies work differently to succeed in today's fast-changing world*. AMACOM.
- Duckworth, A. (2019). *Grit: The power of passion and perseverance*. Scribner.
- Dumulescu, D., & Muțiu, A. I. (2021). Academic leadership in the time of COVID-19: Experiences and perspectives. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 648344.
- Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S. (2020). Mindsets and motivation in the workplace: The role of persistence and adaptability in leadership. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7(1), 255–278. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044519>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859>
- Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2019). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6), 00149. <https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149>

- Fletcher, D., Sarkar, M., & Patel, K. (2021). Gender differences in grit and leadership adaptability: Implications for workplace performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106*(5), 821–834. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000809>
- Future Business Journal. (2024). Disentangling organizational agility from flexibility, adaptability, and versatility. *SpringerOpen*. <https://fbj.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s43093-024-00405-6>
- Garcia, H. L. (2021). Psychological resilience and work engagement among Filipino employees. *Philippine Journal of Psychology, 54*(2), 110–125.
- Garcia, J. F., & Rivera, M. T. (2020). Leadership persistence and institutional performance among basic education administrators in Metro Manila. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 24*(2), 62–77.
- Garton, E., & Mankins, M. (2020). *Time, talent, energy: Overcome organizational drag and unleash your team's productive power*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Gatling, A., Kim, J. S., & Milliman, J. (2020). The relationship between authentic leadership and organizational agility: The mediating role of psychological resilience. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 27*(2), 181–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819849002>
- Gentles, S. J., Charles, C., Ploeg, J., & McKibbin, K. A. (2020). Sampling in qualitative research: Insights from an overview of the methods literature. *The Qualitative Report, 25*(3), 800–821.
- Giustiniano, L., Nenickova, P., & Sestino, A. (2023). Strategic agility and employee well-being: Evidence from the public sector. *Sustainability, 15*(3), 2191.
- Horney, N., Pasmore, B., & O'Shea, T. (2019). Strategic agility: A core competence for managing turbulent change. *Organizational Dynamics, 48*(1), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2018.07.010>
- Lee, J. (2022). The role of grit in organizational performance during a pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 929517. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.929517>
- Lee, Y., & Golonka, M. (2021). Resilient leadership and organizational agility: Evidence from post-pandemic transformation in South Korea. *Asian Journal of Business Research, 11*(3), 45–62.
- Luthans, F., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2019). Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 6*, 339–366. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015012>
- Macaspac, L. G. (2024). Enhancing employees' grit through transformational leadership style and participation in decision making: Education context. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities, 3*(3), 807–829. <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v3i3.82>
- Management Review Quarterly. (2025). The organisational impact of agility: A systematic literature review. *Springer, 75*, 2709–2757. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11301-024-00446-9>

- Manalo, R. A., & Licudine, J. L. (2021). Leading through adversity: Resilience among Filipino school administrators in the time of pandemic. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(1), 18–33.
- Mandane, M. G. T., & Reyes, A. N. (2025). Mediating role of organizational agility on the relationship between ERP usage and service differentiation among casual restaurants in Makati City, Philippines. *International Journal of Accounting and Economics Studies*, 12(4), 52–63. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394275922>
- Mendoza, R. T., & Ferrer, J. L. (2022). Organizational agility in local government: Lessons from pandemic responsiveness. *Philippine Public Administration Review*, 64(2), 78–95.
- Meriac, J. P., Slifka, J. S., & LaBat, L. R. (2020). Work ethic and grit: A model of human capital for work performance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 85, 103906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.103906>
- Merriam-Webster. (2023). Supervisor. In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com>
- Mooradian, T. A., Matzler, K., & Uzelac, B. (2021). Staying the course: Leadership persistence and organizational sustainability. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 28(2), 165–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051820966144>
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2019). The relationship of age to ten dimensions of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(7), 928–943. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000386>
- Núñez-Merino, J. M., Maqueira-Marín, J. M., Moyano-Fuentes, J., & Martínez-Jurado, P. J. (2024). Organisational agility: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Journal of Business Economics*, 94, 445–477.
- Oxford University Press. (2023). Agility. In *Oxford English Dictionary*. <https://www.oed.com>
- Panda, S. (2024). The role of employee ambidexterity on employee agility: A moderation analysis with employee organizational tenure. *Evidence Based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, 13(1), 68–84. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388224714>
- Ramos, M. G., & Castillo, D. A. (2020). Resilience and leadership agility among Filipino team leaders: A case study in Metro Manila. *Philippine Management Review*, 27(1), 88–102.
- Reyes, J. C., & Mendoza, L. R. (2022). Tenacity and resilience among Filipino academic supervisors: A gendered perspective. *Philippine Journal of Psychology and Management Studies*, 28(2), 45–59.
- Reyes, M., & Chua, L. (2022). Digital readiness and organizational agility in Philippine higher education institutions: The role of adaptability across generations. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 29(2), 45–60.

- Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58*(3), 307–321. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.10020>
- Salem, M. (2021). Organizational agility and leadership: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Business and Management, 16*(5), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v16n5p72>
- Santos, J., & Cruz, R. (2022). Organizational agility in Philippine service firms: The influence of leadership and digital transformation strategies. *Philippine Management Review, 30*(1), 87–104.
- Santos, M. A., & Ramos, R. G. (2021). Tenacity and adaptive leadership among Filipino middle managers: Navigating change in uncertain times. *Philippine Journal of Business and Management, 23*(1), 35–48.
- Santos, R. M., & de Guzman, J. R. (2019). Persistence and leadership effectiveness among Filipino supervisors in the service sector. *Philippine Journal of Labor and Industrial Relations, 40*(1), 60–77.
- Sherehiy, B., & Karwowski, W. (2021). Organizational agility: A critical review and future research directions. *International Journal of Production Research, 59*(8), 2340–2362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2020.1850202>
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2019). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 10*(1), 1673053. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20008198.2019.1673053>
- Tan, L. J., & Lim, K. P. (2022). The influence of persistence in agile leadership: Evidence from Singaporean tech industries. *International Journal of Agile Systems and Management, 15*(1), 41–57. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJASM.2022.10047321>
- Teece, D. J. (2021). Dynamic capabilities and the strategic management of organizations in turbulent environments. *Strategic Management Review, 2*(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1561/111.00000012>
- Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review, 58*(4), 13–35. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13>
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (2019). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509–533. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250180702>
- Tibon, M. V. P. (2022). Organizational agility among selected SMEs in the Philippines during the COVID 19 pandemic: Genesis and implications. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, 11*(1), 253–259. https://sibresearch.org/uploads/3/4/0/9/34097180/riber_11-1_13_t22-078_253-259.pdf
- Wang, H., Zhang, H., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2020). Leadership resilience: How does it matter for organizational change and employee outcomes? *Group & Organization Management, 45*(6), 786–818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601120938835>

Watkins, M. D. (2023). *Agile tenacity: Cultivating adaptability, resilience and grit for leadership [Case study]*. IMD Business School.

Weill, P., Woerner, S. L., & Sebastian, I. M. (2019). Digital agility and transformation: Organizational practices and performance. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 18(3), 131–146. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/mis>