

A research on determining effective factors in agile leadership*

Çevik liderlikte etkili faktörlerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma

Gönderim Tarihi / Received: 01.03.2022

Ülge TAŞ¹

Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 20.06.2022

Doi: [10.31795/baunsobed.1081064](https://doi.org/10.31795/baunsobed.1081064)

ABSTRACT: In the complex business environments are required more research into the impact of agile leadership, managers, and traditional leadership. To develop corporations with the agility requested by the global competition, organizations demand managers who concrete a level of agile. This study focused on agile leadership as a research in the industry using qualitative methods. The originality of this study is the lack of applied studies in the literature on agile leadership. Therefore, the purpose of this paper was to describe the influential factors of agile leadership that were tested in the literature or industry in a series of generally held postulates. As a result of this study, it can be seen a strong relationship between individual responsibility and agile leadership. In addition, a significant relationship was determined between agile leadership and the six codes, and six influential factors. The assumptions related to this are included in the conclusion part.

Keywords: Agile development, Agile leader, Emerging leadership, Management assumptions

ÖZ: Kompleks çalışma ortamındaki değişiklikler, çevik liderliğin, yöneticilerin ve geleneksel liderliğin uygulanmasının etkinliği hakkında daha fazla araştırma yapılmasını gerektirmektedir. Şirketlerin, günümüzün bu çalışma ortamının gerektirdiği çevikliğe sahip organizasyonlar geliştirmek için belirli bir çeviklik düzeyi somutlaştıran liderlere ihtiyacı vardır. Bu çalışmada nitel araştırma yöntemi kullanılarak endüstride çevik liderliğe odaklanılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın özgünlüğü literatürde çevik liderlik üzerine uygulamalı çalışmaların olmamasıdır. Buna bağlı olarak, bu makalenin amacı, alanda yaygın olarak kabul edilen varsayımlarla çevik liderliğin etkili faktörlerini tanımlamaktır. Bu çalışmanın sonucunda, bireysel sorumluluk ile çevik liderlik arasında güçlü bir ilişki olduğu görülmektedir. Ayrıca çevik liderlik tanımlamalarında altı kod ve altı etkili faktör arasında anlamlı bir ilişki tespit edilmiştir. Bu faktörlere bağlı varsayımlar raporlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çevik gelişim, Çevik lider, Yükselen liderlik, Yönetim varsayımları

¹ Öğr.Gör.Dr., Aksaray Üniversitesi, Mühendislik Fakültesi/Endüstri Mühendisliği, ulge.tas@aksaray.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2376-3735>

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Giriş

Küresel rekabet ortamında şirketlerin ayakta kalabilme yeteneği olarak tanımlanan “Çevik” paradigması, ilk olarak 1991 yılında Lehigh Üniversitesi tarafından yayınlanan akademik bir raporda tanıtılmıştır (Nagel ve Dove, 1991). Bu çalışmanın varsayımlarına dayanarak uluslararası arenada liderlik gelişimi geleneksel lidere göre yeniden tanımlandı. Özellikle dijital çağda işletmelerin her yönden çevik ve proaktif bir lidere ihtiyaçları olduğu görülmektedir. Bir yöneticinin çevik lider olabilmesi, işletmenin şirketin çağın ve teknolojinin gelişimini takip etmesini sağlayacak bir strateji üretme iradesine bağlıdır. Bu nedenle, bu karmaşık çevrede organizasyonun ihtiyaçlarına göre işleri koordine edebilecek yöneticilerin, çevik liderlere evrilmesi ihtiyacı doğmaktadır (Fachrunnisa vd., 2020: 66). İşletmeler buna bağlı olarak zamanla daha fazla değer temelli bir yaklaşım benimsemekte ve yöneticilerinin işletmeye olan katma değerine önem vermektedirler.

Çevik eğilimlerin önemine dikkat çeken literatürdeki çalışmalar, hızla değişen koşulları tahmin eden ve karmaşıklığı etkin bir şekilde yönetebilen çevik liderlik konusunun organizasyonları geliştiren bir olgu olduğunu göstermektedir. Çevik araştırmalar üretimde, yalnız organizasyonlarda ya da liderlik konusunda yaygın çalışılan bir konu haline gelmiştir. Çevik liderliğin organizasyonun genel performansını önemli ölçüde arttırdığına dair birçok teorik araştırma bulunmaktadır. Ancak literatürde çevik liderlik ile ilgili uygulamalı çalışmalara rastlanmamıştır. Bu nedenle, bu makalenin amacı, alanda yaygın olarak kabul edilen bir dizi varsayımın geleneksel liderlik farklılıklarını test edecek olan çevik liderliğin etkili faktörlerini tanımlamaktır.

Literatür özeti

Araştırmalar incelendiğinde, çevik liderlik konusunda şu şekilde çalışmaların olduğu görülmektedir. “Çevik” paradigması ilk olarak Lehigh Üniversitesi tarafından bir akademik raporda sunulmuştur (Nagel ve Dove, 1991). Ralston (2008), işletmelerin zayıflığının liderlerden kaynaklanan işletim sürecinin başarısızlığından kaynaklandığını bildirmiştir. Sull, (2009); Schein, (2010b), işletmelerdeki başarının sağlam bir organizasyonel kültür ve çevik liderlik geldiğini iddia etmişlerdir. Doz ve Kosonen (2010), çevik liderlik gibi dinamik yeteneklerin yapısal bir başarı perspektifini benimsediğini bildirmiştir. Savall ve Zardet, (2011) çevik liderliğin örgütsel yapılar ve çalışan davranışları arasında yapılandırılmış bir değişim kültürü olduğundan bahsetmişlerdir. Parker ve ark. (2015), yirmi üç işletmede yaptıkları ampirik çalışmada çevik liderler tarafından yönetilen örgütlerin kendi kendini organize eden ekiplere dönüşebileceklerini raporlamışlardır. Worley ve ark. (2015), çevik liderliği operasyonel işletmelerde geleneksel mükemmellik stratejisi olarak tanımlamışlardır. Bushuyeva et al. (2019), karar verme süreçleri açısından çeşitli metodolojileri uygularken çevik liderlik yaklaşımını modern yönetim olarak tanımlamışlardır. Tarken (2020), çalışanların Covid-19 salgını ve uzaktan çalışma gibi çeşitli zorluklarla karşı karşıya kalması durumunda bu zorluklarda çalışma şartlarını çevik liderin koordine edebileceği varsayımında bulunmuştur.

Yöntem

Sektör yöneticilerinin çevik liderliğe bakış açılarını ve etkili olan faktörleri ortaya çıkarmak için araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada literatüre dayalı olarak ve araştırmanın amacına uygun çevik liderliğin etkili faktörlerini ortaya çıkarmak için yirmi soru hazırlanmıştır. Bu konuyla ilgili sorular araştırmacı tarafından Aksaray'daki bir üretim işletmesinde bulunan 14 uzman departman yöneticisine yöneltilmiştir. Nitel araştırma olarak yürütülen bu çalışma, on dört yönetici ile açık uçlu soru görüşmeleri ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Nitel araştırma yaklaşımında belirli bir olguya odaklanması nedeniyle amaçlı örnekleme kullanılmıştır (Creswell, 2013: 231; Mertens, 2014: 38). Veri toplanırken, katılımcılarla ortak olarak belirlenen yer ve zamanda bir araya gelinerek daha önceden hazırlanan açık uçlu sorular üzerinden her bir katılımcıyla ayrı ayrı zamanlarda görüşme yapılmıştır. Tüm görüşmeler aynı araştırmacı tarafından ele alınmış, toplanan verilerdeki görüşler kodlanmıştır.

Bu çalışmada nitel verileri analiz etme sürecinde yönetici görüşmelerinden elde edilen veriler kodlanmıştır. Bilgi teknolojisinin ilerlemesi göz önüne alındığında, bu araştırma analizi için bilgisayar ortamında MAXQDA'nın nitel veri kodlama programından yararlanılmıştır. Araştırmanın güvenilirliğini

ölçmek için Miles&Hübermanın Kod Güvenirliği formülü ile hesaplama yapılmış ve araştırmanın güvenilirliği %84 olarak belirlenmiştir.

Bulgular ve tartışma

Araştırma verileri MAXQDA ile kodlanarak çıkarımlar frekansa dayalı olarak raporlanmıştır. Bu çalışmanın verileri analiz edildiğinde çevik liderliğe etki eden faktör olarak altı anahtar kod ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunlar (1) Bireysel Sorumluluk; (2) Güven; (3) İşbirliği; (4) Kendi Kendini Örgütleyen Ekip, (5) Öncü Ruh, (6) Odak. Çalışmanın sonucunda çevik liderlik için en etkili faktörün ‘bireysel sorumluluk’ olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bireysel sorumluluktaki en önemli gösterge ise çalışan sorunlarının çözülmesi büyük etki oranına sahiptir denilebilmektedir. Analiz sonuçlarına göre, çalışan problemlerini çözme ile çevik liderlik arasında güçlü bir ilişki olduğu görülmektedir. Araştırma kapsamında gerçekleştirilen nitel çalışma sonucunda kazanım, kod boyutları ve etkili faktörlerden altı tanesi ölçekte tutularak altı madde ile yeni varsayımlar önerilmiştir.

Sonuçlar ve öneriler

Nitel araştırma sonuçları çevik liderlik için altı adet etkin faktör olduğunu göstermektedir. Bunlar arasında en önemli değere sahip olan ‘bireysel sorumluluk’ faktörünün alt göstergesi olan ‘çalışan problemlerini çözenin’ çevik liderlik ile arasında güçlü bir ilişki vardır denilebilmektedir. Çalışan sorununun bireysel sorumluluk kodu altında çözülmesi en önemli etken olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca çevik liderlik ile altı kod başka bir deyişle altı etkili faktör arasında anlamlı bir ilişki tespit edilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak işletmelerin çevik olarak değerlendirilen liderlik ile ilgili faaliyetleri gerçekleştirme sıklığını artırdıkça farkındalıklarının da artacağı vurgulanmaktadır. Çalışan problem çözme yeteneklerinin çevik liderlik üzerinde önemli bir etkiye sahip olması, bu yöndeki araştırmaların geliştirilmesi ve sürdürülmesi gerekliliğini gösteren ana argümanlardan biri olarak öne sürülebilmektedir. Literatür ile uyumlu görünen nitel araştırma sonuçları özgün yaklaşımı nedeniyle sektöre ve literatüre katkı niteliğinde olabilir. Bu nedenle, araştırmanın sonuçları üretim işletmelerinde uygulamalarla yaygınlaştırılabilir ve çevik liderliğin farkındalığını artırabilir. Gelecekteki çalışmalarda aynı araştırma nicel varsayımla tekrarlanabilir, farklı sektörlere uygulanabilir.

Introduction

Leaders who have to change and development, they conscious that competitors in a global world incessantly attack companies with change and complicacy. While forthcoming improvements are increasingly hard to prevision with certainty, the pace of change can be sure to continue to expand, and the degree of complicatedness. The achiever of traditional leadership conducted relatively well for most industries until recent years when the global world pioneer in an age of everlasting change and increasing confidence. Therefore, commonly powerful and effective leadership in this complex environment needs mastery of the far seeing, helpful trend found in the level of agility. To develop companies with the agile required by present complex business conditions, companies need managers who concrete a degree of agility. The essence of agile leadership is the capability to manage effectively in an environment of intense competition. Therefore, intense competition impact all managers, and agility is a qualification that's progressively required not just in the management team but all through the organization (Parker et al., 2015: 120).

The paradigm of "Agile" which is defined as the competence of companies to live in the global world full of threats, was first presented in 1991 by Lehigh University in an academic paper (Nagel and Dove, 1991). Consequently, this advancement has put options into action across the globe, and leadership development has been redefined according to the traditional leader. Especially, facing the digital era, it demands an agile and proactive leader in all ways. The agility leader has to the production of a plan which will make the organization follow the improvement of the technology and era. Thus, the needs a leader as agile who could give influence to the team to do the business based on the necessity of the organization in this changeable technology (Fachrunnisa et al., 2020: 66). Agile leaders know this kind of work is suitable, and it is a tool to give meaning to the strategy achieved by the organization. However, companies are increasingly taking a value-based approach like agile and know to distinguish between what is value-added and what does not matter.

Managers aim in agile by deciding the type of leader they need to become using their activities to practice on this demand, and then applying on stages. The concept of agile leadership suggests that managers also demand basic guiding applications that provide a concept inside which employees, rather than rigid rules (Spreitzer et al., 1999: 347). Applying agile practices, the manager becomes a leader, arrangement the strategy, establishes the plan, and supports a solution, adjustment, and teamwork. Guiding principles of agile leadership are (Parker et al., 2015: 114): (a) intrinsic ability; (b) analytical perspective; (c) provide self-organization management; (d) humanistic; (e) problem-solving mechanism; (f) proactive; (g) decision-making mechanism; (h) managing for outcome products, and (i) removes many difficulties that prevent from achieving the targets. The agile leader who realizes these principles can guide the organization and effect employee behaviour by determining, spreading, and sustaining the mission.

Studies in the literature, intensely aware of the agile tendency, have been shown the need to enhance agile leadership companies that estimate and respond to fastly changing situations in methods that successfully manage complications. Agile research is becoming an increasingly common agile workplace as production, lean, organization, or leaders. Indeed, much theoretical research exists that overall performance increased significantly since agile transformations of leadership began. The originality of this study is the lack of applied studies in the literature on agile leadership. Therefore, the aim of this paper was to describe the influential factors of agile leadership that were tested in the literature or industry in a series of generally held postulates.

The paper is organized as follows: initially section is for the introduction. In the second section, the literature review is presented. Materials and methods are explained in the third section shows. The fourth section presents the qualitative data collected from managers in a production industry are analyzed. In the conclusion part, the results provided from the study were discussed and the next studies were suggested.

Literature review

Conceiving the organization as a live organism rather than a machine lies at the heart of the achievements trend toward agile leaders. The recent research and papers show agile leaders in organizations were that it encourages transformation and this has included the plan they use to reach the aims. Many researchers have been described agile leadership as a systematic management strategy in the company. Researchers have been keen on an interest in agile leadership as the follows: The paradigm of “Agile” was first introduced by Lehigh University in an academic report (Nagel and Dove, 1991). Ralston (2008) has reported weakness of agile leadership is through the defect of the operating process direct out coming from unproductive leadership. Sull, (2009); Schein, (2010b) have claimed that dynamic works continuously build skills that require a robust culture of organizational to agile leadership. Doz and Kosonen, (2010) have reported dynamic capabilities like agile leadership embrace a structural achieving perspective. Savall and Zardet, (2011) have mentioned of agile leadership displays a culture capable of change structured between organizational structures and employee behaviours. Parker et al. (2015) reported describing the improvement of a research journal that was tested in the 23 companies of commonly held esteems around agile leadership of self-organized teams. Worley et al. (2015) described agile leadership as the traditional strategy of excellence in operational functions. Bushuyeva et al. (2019) explored contemporary approaches to agile leadership transformation while implementing various methods in periods of decision-making operations. Tarken (2020) claimed that as agile managers front diverse challenges such as the Covid-19 pandemic and remote working, it is significant to reply to these difficulties.

There are many studies in the literature on agile leadership for theoretical. In addition, this study is due to a lack of literature including qualitative research. Qualitative research questions were applied and analyzed to the management level where the agile leadership occurrences. Based on the analysis findings, the article presents suggestions for agile to encourage managers. With this viewpoint, due to its original approach, this qualitative research is a contribution to the industry and literature.

Materials and Methodology

In order to find out the industry managers’ perspectives and influential factors on agile leadership, a qualitative research method was used as part of the primary research. The research was conducted with a group-wide measurement of key elements of organizational culture represented by leadership principles with 20 questions. Based on the literature analysis, the questions were prepared for measurement of the probability for application of agile leadership. In this context, the research used especially composed questions to reach the aim. Questions and the various personal opinions relating to this topic have been asked to 14 industry managers in production plants in Aksaray by the researcher. This study, which was conducted as qualitative research was conducted with open-ended questions interviews with the fourteen managers. Purposive sampling was used for the reason that it focuses on a certain phenomenon in the qualitative research approach (Creswell, 2013: 231; Mertens, 2014: 38). While collecting the data, the participants were met at a jointly determined place and time, and each participant was interviewed at separate times over the open-ended questions prepared beforehand. All interviews were handled by the same researcher, and the views in the collected data were coded.

Participants have various work experiences in the work field. The managers were asked for their agile leadership level of knowledge before asking the questions. The investigation was face-to-face in order to create clear conclusions in the research and to get a certain response from the managers. In the investigation, the participants were responded to which factors influential would create the ideally agile leadership. The manager's position, experience, and agile leadership information levels are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Managers features

No	Position (Manager/Director)	Experience (year)	Agile Leadership Level of Knowledge
1	Order Management	18	Moderate
2	Human Resources	18	Moderate
3	Supplier Management	12	Moderate
4	Production Planning	19	Basic
5	Maintenance	16	Basic
6	Controlling	7	Little
7	Information Technologies	9	Moderate
8	Finance	14	Basic
9	Process Planning	14	Moderate
10	Quality Management	20	Moderate
11	Research&Development	7	Moderate
12	Project Management	12	Little
13	Sales&Marketing	18	Basic
14	Purchase Management	11	Basic

Table 1 indicates how managers at every themselves while agility degree in three-step (moderate, basic, and little). By data collected from 14 expert managers in a common variety of departments, the guess is that about 50 percent of managers knowledge operates at the moderate, 36 percent of managers knowledge basic, and 14 percent of managers know little levels of agility.

The qualitative approach submits generally unstructured text-based data. In this study, the process of analysing qualitative data primarily involves coding or classifying the data of the manager interviews. Given the advancement of information technology, the program of MAXQDA of qualitative data coding has used for this research analysis. After coding, the findings were interpreted as indicating the most effective with six factors.

Throughout the analysis of the qualitative data, inductive content analyses were carried out by the researcher, and a paper was prepared on the participants' ethics and compliance primarily to raise awareness. To ensure the research reliability, "Code Reliability = Agreement / (Agreement + Disagreement) x 100" (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 64) of the formula was used, and the reliability percentage for this study was determined as 84% [Code Reliability = 410 / (410 + 78) x 100].

Results and discussion

Throughout the coding phase of the study, open codes were used. Open codes mention an advanced vision that a researcher adds to knowledge accepted strategically. These codes were grouped based on equalities and proximity points and became related and practical (Cohen et al., 2011: 238). Research data were then predicted based on frequency then color-coded and exported to make results using MAXQDA. When analyzing the data collected, six key codes arise: Individual Responsibility, Trust, Collaboration, Self-Organized Team, Pioneer Spirit, Focus. There are sub-indicators in the formation of these codes. The frequency shows how often the sub-indicators were asserted per code. Findings on the codes and codes' sub-indicators of agile leadership are as follows:

Individual responsibility: The theme of individual responsibility became that the concept of agile leadership consciousness evokes 10 different influential factors apparent through the data analysis step.

Table 2: Influential factors suggesting in 'individual responsibility'

Influential Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Solving Employee Problem	9	18.51
Employee Conversation	8	15.22
Team Decisions	7	13.69
Team Control	7	13.47
Employee Initiative	7	11.80
Excuse, Justification, and Victimization	5	9.56
Flexible Working	5	5.16
Personnel Empowerment	4	4.47
Employee Presentations	4	4.26
Delegation Game	2	3.86
Total	57	100.00

In Table 2, the frequency and percentage distributions of the influential factors evoked by the individual responsibility consciousness are given. Solving employee problem influential factor was with the highest level (18.51%) often has to be learned again by employees. Managers usually have intervened the solving employee problem in a limited way. The agile leader assumption that the employees should know that their work-related problems will be resolved. In this situation, the employees encourage independent, solution-oriented thinking to agile leaders.

Trust: 9 different influential factors are apparent through the data analysis step.

Table 3: Influential factors suggesting in 'trust'

Influential Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Transparency	8	16.55
Loyalty	7	14.31
Exchange Ideas	7	14.14
Team Culture	7	13.21
Speak Positively	7	11.78
Employee Annoyances	6	11.69
Praise Instead of Criticism	6	7.96
Control Rules	5	6.13
Find Solutions	3	4.23
Total	56	100.00

In Table 3, the frequency and percentage distributions of the influential factors evoked by the trust consciousness are given. Transparency influential factor was with the highest level (16.55%), every meeting reported which topics are currently being discussed in the management circle. Accordingly, meeting reports and budgets should be open. Agile leaders create transparency on what basis have made decisions.

Collaboration: 9 different indicators of which is collaboration' influential factors are apparent through the data analysis step.

Table 4: Influential factors suggesting in 'collaboration'

Influential Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Collaborative Work	8	17.82
Help the Employee	8	17.11
Create Workspaces	8	16.32
Freedom	7	14.55
Employee Appreciation	5	10.41
Employee Contribution	5	10.08
New Personnel	5	5.98
Mood	5	5.88
Celebrate the Feasts	2	1.85
Total	53	100.00

In Table 4, the frequency and percentage distributions of the influential factors evoked by the collaboration consciousness are given. Collaborative work influential factor was the highest level (17.82%). Traditional leaders often deal with mistakes and catastrophes and lose sight of the successes. An agile leader looking back at success can strengthen self-confidence.

Self-organized team: 8 different indicators of which is Self-Organized Team' influential factors are apparent through the data analysis step.

Table 5: Influential factors suggesting in 'self-organized team'

Influential Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Personnel Goals	8	17.54
Develop and Support	8	17.21
Employee Map	7	15.66
Change in Perspective	7	15.08
Good Job	5	10.79
Spend Time Your Team	5	8.98
Reference Book	5	8.76
Personnel Mistakes	5	5.98
Total	50	100.00

In Table 5, the frequency and percentage distributions of the influential factors evoked by the self-organized team consciousness are given. The personnel goals influential factor was the highest level (17.54%). By encouraging the employees to learn, agile leaders get to know their motivation, learning fields, and weaknesses better. In this way, it promotes mutual trust and personnel goals.

Pioneer spirit: 8 different indicators of which is Pioneer Spirit influential factors are apparent through the data analysis step.

Table 6: Influential factors suggesting in 'pioneer spirit'

Influential Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Job Rotation	8	16.96
New Techniques	8	16.77
New Ideas and Impulses	8	16.43
Work Direction	7	15.09
Play Team Games	5	9.56
Innovation Laboratory	5	9.45
Integrate Customers	5	8.90
Activity Register	5	6.84
Total	51	100.00

In Table 6, the frequency and percentage distributions of influential factors evoked by the pioneer spirit consciousness are given. The job rotation influential factor was the highest level (16.96%). Job rotation requires planning and courage. Agile leaders have to plan with whom and in which department a job exchange is possible. This rotation is possible and will give the team unexpected impulses, ideas, and self-knowledge.

Focus: 8 different indicators of which is Focus influential factors are apparent through the data analysis step.

Table 7: Influential factors suggesting in 'focus'

Influential Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Nonvalue Added Activities	8	17.77
Customer Satisfaction	8	17.68
Customers and Stakeholders	8	16.96
Impediments	7	14.23
Methods	7	12.52
Organization Vision	7	12.39
Employee Vision	5	5.43
Discuss	2	3.02
Total	52	100.00

In Table 7, the frequency and percentage distributions of the influential factors evoked by the focus consciousness are given. Nonvalue added activities influential factor was the highest level (17.77%). Agile leaders raise the team’s awareness to question, automate and, if possible, eliminate particularly time-consuming and resource-intensive tasks again and again.

The results show that 'individual responsibility' has the greatest value for agile leadership. Therefore, the fulfilment of solving employee problems has the biggest impact on individual responsibility. According to the analysis results, it can be seen a strong correlation between solving employee problems and agile leadership. The influential factors given in Table 8 are shown with assumptions to create awareness of whole agile leadership.

Table 8: Influential factors of agile leadership

No	Codes	Influential Factors	Assumption
1	Individual Responsibility	Solving Employee Problem	Managers usually have intervened the solving employee problem in a limited way. The agile leader assumption that the employees should know that their work-related problems will be resolved.
2	Trust	Transparency	Agile leaders create transparency on what basis have made decisions.
3	Collaboration	Collaborative Work	An agile leader looking back at success can strengthen self-confidence.
4	Self-Organized Team	Personnel Goals	By encouraging the employees to learn, agile leaders get to know team motivation, learning fields, and weaknesses better. In this way, it promotes mutual trust and personnel goals.
5	Pioneer Spirit	Job Rotation	Agile leaders have to plan with whom and in which department a job exchange is possible. This rotation is possible and will give the team unexpected impulses, ideas, and self-knowledge.
6	Focus	Nonvalue Added Activities	Agile leaders raise the team's awareness to question, automate and, if possible, eliminate particularly time-consuming and resource-intensive tasks again and again.

In Table 8, the codes, influential factors, and assumptions evoked by the agile leadership consciousness are given. As an outcome of the qualitative study implement within the field of the study, new assumptions are proposed by six items from the acquisition, codes dimensions, and keeping six of the influential factors on the scale. The study purpose was that "agile leadership" and the six codes to achieve this goal were concerned the individual responsibility, trust, collaboration, self-organized team, pioneer spirit, and focus of the studies included in the manager. According to the analysis results, there is a strong relationship between individual responsibility and agile leadership. The solving employee problem under the individual responsibility code emerged as the most important influential factor. Another reason may be the interviews used when finding the other codes might have revealed the company's influential factors. In addition, a significant relationship was determined between agile leadership and the six codes, and six influential factors.

This paper that although agile leadership methods are new as a whole, this topic has strong research in the literature. First example to discuss this study result is that agile leadership approaches are Gregory and Taylor (2019) developed an assessment methodology that is an agile leadership matrix to provide a management culture evaluation. This matrix is included of five levels that are surviving, stabilizing, secure, thriving, and transformational. This study was that "agile leadership" and the six codes to achieve the study goal were concerned the individual responsibility, trust, collaboration, self-organized team, pioneer spirit, and focus of the studies included in the manager. Additionally, Brand et al. (2019) reported the agile matrix includes seven elements as agile leadership, well-being and fulfilment, collaborative communities, trust and transparency, adaptability to change, innovation, and learning. Denning (2019) has been keen on interest managers are responsible for mapping the agile transformation that considers the new organizational culture, resilience and stability, creativity and innovation, maturity, talent management, leadership, and management. Other studies in the literature indicated that the buy-in of the top management is a key driver or a force multiplier because it is essential to have the agile alignment with organizational management (Ivory & Brooks, 2018; Wyman, 2018).

Conclusion

This paper reports the findings of a qualitative study of the agile leadership and practices of a 'purposive sample' of fourteen managers. To find out the managers' perspectives and influential factors on agile leadership, a qualitative research method was used research. The research was conducted with a group-wide measurement of key elements of organizational culture represented by leadership principles with 20 questions. The program of MAXQDA of qualitative data coding has been used for this research analysis. To ensure the research reliability percentage for this study was determined as 84%.

The purpose of the article was to describe the influential factors of agile leadership that were tested in the literature or industry in a series of generally held postulates. The purpose was that "agile leadership" and the six codes to achieve this goal were concerned the individual responsibility, trust, collaboration, self-organized team, pioneer spirit, and focus of the studies included in the manager. The solving of employee problems, transparency, collaborative work, personnel goals, job rotation, and nonvalue added activities were pointed out by participants as the agile leadership what could give the best influential factors in the management process in the company. The qualitative research results show that solving employee problem from the sub-indicator of individual responsibility has the most important for agile leadership. According to the analysis results, there is a strong relationship between individual responsibility and agile leadership. The solving employee problem under the individual responsibility code emerged as the most important influential factor. Another reason may be the interviews used when finding the other codes might have revealed the company's influential factors. In addition, a significant relationship was determined between agile leadership and the six codes, and six influential factors.

Consequently, it is highlighted that companies will increase their awareness as they increase the frequency of performing the activities related to leadership, which is evaluated as agile. The fact solving employee problem capabilities have a significant effect on agile leadership supports one of the main arguments of the research, showing that the research in this direction should be developed and continued. This study's findings were appropriate with the related literature. Because of its originality, the present qualitative research is an assist to the sector and other papers. Therefore, the results of the research can foster dissemination and increase awareness of agile leadership for industries management. Future work can be suggested to quantitative research in which agile leadership other studies.

Concerning the limitations of the research is regarded, due to the practical impossibilities of data collection from the company, purposive sampling methods were used. Besides, it was achieved within one company only, one industry, and fourteen managers'.

References

- Brand, M., Tiberius, V., Bican, P. M., and Brem, A. (2021). Agility as an innovation driver: Towards an agile front end of innovation framework. *Review of Managerial Science*, 15(1), 157-187.
- Bushuyeva, N., Bushuiev, D. and Bushuieva, V. (2019). Agile leadership of managing innovation projects. *Innovative Technologies and Scientific Solutions for Industries*, 4 (10), 77-84.
- Cohen, L., Lawrence M. and Keith M (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Denning, S. (2019). The ten stages of the agile transformation journey. *Strategy & Leadership*, 48(1), 3-10.
- Doz, Y. L. and Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 370-382.
- Fachrunnisa, O., Adhiatma, A., Lukman, N. and Ab Majid, M. N. (2020). Towards SMEs' digital transformation: The role of agile leadership and strategic flexibility. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 30(3), 65-85.

- Gregory, P., and Taylor, K. (2019). Defining agile culture: a collaborative and practitioner-led approach. 2019 IEEE/ACM 12th International Workshop on Cooperative and Human Aspects of Software Engineering (CHASE).
- Ivory, S. B., and Brooks, S. B. (2018). Managing corporate sustainability with a paradoxical lens: lessons from strategic agility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(2), 347–361.
- Mertens, D. M. (2014). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed). Sage Publications.
- Nagel, R. N. and Dove, R. (1991). *21st century manufacturing enterprise strategy: An industry-led view*. Diane Publishing.
- Parker, D. W., Holesgrove, M. and Pathak, R. (2015). Improving productivity with self-organised teams and agile leadership. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 64 (1), 112-128.
- Savall, H. and Zardet, V. (2011). *The qualimetrics approach: Observing the complex object*. Information Age Publishing.
- Schein, E. H. (2010b). *Organizational culture and leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Spreitzer, G.M., Cohen, S.G. and Ledford, J.R. (1999). Developing effective self-managing work teams in service organisations. *Group & Organization Management*, 24 (3), 340-366.
- Sull, D. N. (2009). *The upside of turbulence: Seizing opportunity in an uncertain world*. HarperCollins.
- Tarken W. (2020). *Agile leadership in action during a crisis – top 7 practices to build organizational resilience and develop HR leaders* (3rd ed). Workforce Solutions Review.
- Worley, C. G., Zardet, V., Bonnet, M. and Savall, A. (2015). *Becoming agile: How the SEAM approach to management builds adaptability*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wyman, O., (2018). Organizational Agility. Retrieved June 16, 2022, <https://www.oliverwyman.com/our-expertise/insights/2018/apr/organizational-agility.html?bsrc=oliverwyman>

Ethical approval

This study has been approved by the ethics committee of Aksaray University with 2022/01-14 number and date.

Contribution rate of researchers

The author contributed: Wrote the manuscript, collected data, and analyse/reported the results.

Conflict of interest

There is no potential conflict of interest in this study.