

· the results also showed a significant negative

[Technology](#), [Development](#)



· The results also showed a significant negative effect for the Business Continuity Plan Testing, Auditing, and Maintenance ($\beta = -0.14$, N. S), (proving error 3/6).· The data in the table also show a negative effect - not significant - for the Business Continuity Plan Development (name) ($\beta = -0.08$, N.

S) and thus (prove error of (hypothesis 3/5).· The results did not show the effect of the Business Impact Analysis on the efficiency of the performance of the Faculty ($\beta = -0.1$, N. S), and thus (prove error 3/3 hypothesis).· The Project Initiation had a very weak effect, but the effect was not significant ($\beta = 0.$

1, N. S), thus proving the error of (hypothesis 3/1). On the other side· The results also showed a significant effect on the efficiency of the performance of the second stage. However, this effect was negative ($\beta = -0.33$, $p < 0.01$), which may indicate error or failure in the application of the second stage in the Faculty. However, prove hypothesis 3/2),· The phases of the business continuity plan affect 56% of the efficiency of the business continuity plan implementation.

The data in the table that the efficiency of the performance of the Faculty was more affected by stage VII (stage name) ($\beta = 0.79$, $p < 0.01$) and thus (prove hypothesis 3/7).

The performance efficiency of the Faculty was also affected by the fourth stage ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$) and thus (hypothesis 3/4).· The table (5-20) shows the phases of the business continuity plan affect 56% of the efficiency of the business continuity plan implementation.

The data in the table that the efficiency of the performance of the Faculty was more affected by stage VII (stage name) ($\eta^2 = 0.79$, $p < 0.01$) and thus (prove hypothesis 3/7). The performance efficiency of the Faculty was also affected by the fourth stage ($\eta^2 = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$) and thus (hypothesis 3/4)