



Akademik Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (AJESS Journal)

Organizational Intelligence and Its Role in Enhancing Organizational Resilience in a Changing Business Environment: A Theoretical Analytical Study

Boudra Messaoud (Ph.D), Faculty of Economics, Commercial and Management Sciences , University of Ghardaia, Algeria, messaoud.boudra2311@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 31/07/2026; Accepted: 25/09/2026; Published: 07/10/2026

Abstract:

This theoretical analytical study examines the conceptual relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational resilience in a business environment characterized by continuous change, uncertainty, complexity, accelerating technological developments, and shifting expectations of customers and stakeholders. The study proceeds from the theoretical assumption that an organization's ability to collect and understand information, disseminate knowledge, mobilize human capabilities, and direct them toward shared objectives can constitute an important foundation for building the anticipatory, coping, and adaptive capabilities that lie at the core of organizational resilience.

The study adopts a descriptive-analytical approach by reviewing and analyzing the literature related to organizational intelligence, organizational resilience, organizational learning, knowledge management, and dynamic capabilities. The study demonstrates that organizational intelligence is not limited to possessing information or using technology; rather, it encompasses an integrated system of strategic vision, shared destiny, appetite for change, organizational heart, alignment and congruence, knowledge deployment, and performance pressure. The resilience literature likewise indicates that resilience is a dynamic capability manifested in anticipation, coping with disruptions, and adaptation after their occurrence. The study concludes that building resilience requires a shift from managing change as a situational response toward developing a continuous organizational capability for sensing, learning, coordination, and reconfiguration. The theoretical analysis remains a conceptual framework that requires subsequent empirical testing.

Keywords: Organizational intelligence; organizational resilience; changing business environment.

1. Introduction:

Contemporary organizations operate in an environment characterized by rapid change, uncertainty, and complexity. Technological development, digital transformation, changing patterns of competition, supply-chain disruptions, and changing customer needs all require the organization to be capable of continuously reading its environment, detecting early signals, interpreting them, and then translating them into appropriate decisions and actions.

The concept of organizational intelligence falls within the concepts that seek to explain how an organization collectively uses its mental and cognitive capabilities. Albrecht (2003) defines organizational intelligence as the organization's ability to mobilize its mental forces and direct them toward accomplishing its mission, and proposes seven interrelated dimensions: strategic vision, shared destiny, appetite for change, heart, alignment and congruence, knowledge deployment, and performance pressure.

In contrast, the concept of organizational resilience has developed from conceptions focused merely on recovery after crises toward a broader view of resilience as a dynamic capability that helps an organization anticipate events, cope with them, and adapt to their consequences. Ducheck (2020) proposes three interrelated stages of resilience: anticipation, coping, and adaptation.

Hence, the importance of examining the theoretical relationship between the two concepts becomes evident. An organization with a high capacity for sensing its environment, distributing knowledge, and achieving a shared vision may possess better conditions for building coordinated responses and reshaping its practices when circumstances change. This does not mean

that organizational intelligence automatically guarantees resilience; rather, it points to a possible explanatory pathway mediated by learning processes, knowledge flows, participation in decision-making, leadership, and organizational culture.

2.1. Research Problem and Questions:

The central problem is that many organizations face successive changes, but they do not necessarily possess the same capacity to understand these changes or respond to them. The problem may be associated with weak information flows, an unclear vision, slow decision-making, weak coordination, resistance to change, or failure to transform accumulated experience into usable knowledge.

Accordingly, the main research problem can be formulated in the following question: How can the role played by organizational intelligence in enhancing organizational resilience in a changing business environment be theoretically and analytically explained?

The following questions derive from this main question: What is meant by organizational intelligence, and what are its main dimensions? What is meant by organizational resilience, and what are its principal stages? What are the characteristics of a changing business environment that make resilience an organizational necessity? How can the theoretical relationship between the dimensions of organizational intelligence and the stages of resilience be explained? What theoretical model can be proposed to explain this relationship?

The study emphasizes that these questions are theoretical in nature; therefore, the present study does not include a population, sample, measurement instrument, statistical test, or field results.

3.1. Objectives and Significance of the Study:

The study aims to develop an integrated theoretical treatment of the concepts of organizational intelligence and organizational resilience, clarify the points of intersection between them, and explain how cognitive and organizational capabilities can be transformed into the capacity to anticipate, cope, and adapt.

The theoretical significance derives from the fact that organizational intelligence and organizational resilience are interrelated but not identical concepts. Organizational intelligence is associated with the organization's capacity for understanding, mobilization, knowledge deployment, and achieving internal congruence, whereas resilience focuses on the capacity to deal with disruption, adapt to change, and transform experience into future capability.

The managerial significance lies in providing a framework that helps management view resilience as a daily capability that can be developed, rather than merely as a reaction at the time of crisis. The study is also relevant to human resource management because the literature points to the importance of cognitive and behavioral capabilities as well as contextual conditions in building resilience.

4.1. Research Methodology and Limitations:

The study adopts a descriptive-analytical approach of a theoretical nature by reviewing the scientific literature, books, and studies addressing organizational intelligence, organizational resilience, organizational learning, knowledge management, and dynamic capabilities.

The analytical process consists of identifying the basic concepts; presenting definitions and theoretical models; analyzing the dimensions of organizational intelligence; analyzing the concept and stages of resilience; identifying mechanisms linking the two concepts; and constructing a theoretical model that illustrates the possible pathways of the relationship.

The study is limited by its theoretical and analytical nature; therefore, the relationships presented in the theoretical analysis cannot be considered statistically established within this study. In addition, the literature used belongs to different contexts, which calls for future testing of the model's suitability in Arab and Algerian contexts before generalizing it.

2. Organizational Intelligence:

1.2. Concept and Origins

Organizational intelligence is one of the concepts that emerged in an attempt to move beyond the traditional view of the organization as a collection of resources and procedures and toward viewing it as a system capable of learning, understanding, coordinating, and acting. Definitions differ according to perspective: some approaches focus on information processing, others on collective knowledge, and others on the capacity to achieve congruence and respond to the environment.

Albrecht (2003) refers to organizational intelligence as the institution's ability to mobilize and direct collective mental power toward its mission. At the center of his model are a set of organizational characteristics that make knowledge and individual energies capable of being transformed into coordinated collective action.

The literature also contains approaches that link organizational intelligence to the organization's ability to collect information from the environment, process it, interpret it, and communicate it to decision-makers. This demonstrates that organizational intelligence is not synonymous with the individual intelligence of employees; rather, it is a property emerging from the interaction among individuals, structures, systems, technology, culture, and processes.

Other literature has addressed organizational intelligence from systems and self-organization perspectives, with models emphasizing self-reference, self-organization, and regenerative self-organization. Alfaqih and Najm (2021) indicate that Albrecht's seven-dimensional model is among the important models used in studying organizational intelligence.

2.2. Dimensions of Organizational Intelligence According to Albrecht's Model:

Albrecht's model consists of seven interrelated dimensions:

1. Strategic Vision: The organization's ability to formulate a clear purpose, understand its future direction, and translate this into objectives understood by its members.
 2. Shared Destiny: The sense that members of the organization share a common goal and general interest, and that success is a collective responsibility.
 3. Appetite for Change: The psychological and organizational readiness to accept and deal with change as part of work.
 4. Organizational Heart: Energy, enthusiasm, commitment, and the willingness to exert effort beyond the minimum required.
 5. Alignment and Congruence: The consistency of roles, rules, processes, and relationships in a way that allows individual efforts to be transformed into collective performance.
 6. Knowledge Deployment: The flow of information, experience, and insights and their use in problem-solving and decision-making.
 7. Performance Pressure: The existence of clear expectations regarding results and shared responsibility for achieving them.
- These dimensions demonstrate that organizational intelligence in Albrecht's model is not a single cognitive capability, but rather a multidimensional configuration that combines vision, agreement, readiness for change, energy, knowledge, and execution.

3. Organizational Resilience:

1.3. Concept and Approaches:

Organizational resilience is the organization's ability to continue operating and deal with unexpected events, restore or reshape performance, and learn from experience in ways that support future capability. Its definitions have multiplied because of the different disciplines that have addressed it, including strategic management, crisis management, supply-chain management, safety, and organizational psychology.

Duchek (2020) presents resilience as a meta-capability composed of a set of interrelated capabilities and proposes three stages: anticipation before the event, coping during the event, and adaptation after the event. This perspective makes it possible to understand resilience as a continuous process rather than reducing it to a final outcome following a crisis.

The resource- and capability-based approach views resilience as an outcome of the accumulation of resources and capabilities, including knowledge, human resources, networks, structural flexibility, leadership, and learning. Accordingly, resilience does not mean the absence of disruption, but rather the possession of mechanisms that help the organization deal with it.

2.3. Stages of Organizational Resilience:

First: Anticipation. This stage involves monitoring the environment, identifying early signals, analyzing scenarios, and developing preparedness. This stage is clearly connected with strategic vision and the ability to collect and interpret information.

Second: Coping with Disruption. When an event occurs, the organization needs to make rapid and coordinated decisions, establish priorities, mobilize resources, and maintain vital functions. Here, the roles of shared destiny, alignment, knowledge flow, and performance pressure become particularly evident.

Third: Adaptation. After the event, the objective is not merely to return to the previous state, but to analyze the experience and modify procedures, structures, and skills in ways that improve future handling of similar events.

These stages can be viewed as an interconnected cycle: anticipation improves the quality of response; response generates experience; and experience is transformed through learning into knowledge that supports subsequent anticipation.

4. The Theoretical Relationship Between Organizational Intelligence and Organizational Resilience:

The relationship between the two variables can be explained on the basis that resilience requires information, interpretive capabilities, coordination, and execution, while organizational intelligence provides part of the structure that makes these processes possible. An organization cannot anticipate what it cannot see, cannot deal effectively with an event it cannot interpret, and cannot adapt if it does not transform experience into knowledge.

Strategic vision appears as a mechanism for directing the response, while shared destiny creates a social basis for coordination. Appetite for change provides readiness to accept modification; organizational heart provides the necessary energy; alignment and congruence help reduce conflict; knowledge deployment enables the transfer of experience and information; and performance pressure focuses on transforming decisions into execution.

This does not mean that each dimension independently affects resilience or that the relationship is necessarily linear. The dimensions may interact with one another: unexplained knowledge is insufficient, a vision that cannot be implemented is insufficient, and readiness for change without resources may lead to confusion. Therefore, the model proposes viewing organizational intelligence as an integrated system.

4.1. Explanatory Mechanisms Linking Organizational Intelligence and Resilience

Four principal explanatory mechanisms can be identified. The first is environmental sensing, whereby organizational intelligence enables the collection and interpretation of signals. The second is knowledge sharing, whereby information moves from the individual to the collective level. The third is coordination and decision-making, whereby knowledge is transformed into priorities and actions. The fourth is organizational learning, whereby the outcomes of the response are transformed into new knowledge.

Knowledge management functions as a link between intelligence and resilience. Knowledge that does not move within the organization remains local and limited in impact, whereas knowledge flow enables lessons to be generalized and used in different settings. Organizational learning also prevents the organization from treating every crisis as an entirely new event. Organizational culture plays an important role. A culture that absolutely punishes mistakes may reduce the disclosure of problems, whereas a culture that permits learning from mistakes can increase the organization's ability to identify weaknesses. Leadership also plays an important role in clarifying the vision, providing trust, and managing the tension between stability and change.

5. Conclusion:

The study concludes that the changing business environment makes the organization's capacity for understanding, learning, and adaptation an essential element of its continuity. Through an analysis of the literature, organizational intelligence emerges as a framework that helps explain how the mental and cognitive capabilities of individuals can be mobilized and transformed into collective action. Albrecht's model provides an interconnected set of dimensions through which this capability can be analyzed, while Ducheck's conceptualization of resilience provides a framework for understanding anticipation, coping, and adaptation as successive and interconnected stages.

Accordingly, the relationship between organizational intelligence and resilience can be understood as a relationship between capabilities and processes: intelligence provides the conditions for sensing, understanding, coordination, and mobilization, whereas resilience is manifested in the organization's ability to use these conditions for anticipation, coping, and adaptation. This relationship remains in need of empirical verification in specific organizational environments.

1.5. Theoretical Findings of the Study:

First, organizational intelligence is a multidimensional concept that goes beyond individual intelligence and reflects the organization's ability to collectively mobilize its mental and cognitive capabilities.

Second, organizational resilience is not merely recovery after a crisis; it includes anticipation, coping, and adaptation, which makes it a continuous dynamic capability.

Third, there is a logical theoretical relationship between organizational intelligence and resilience because anticipation, coping, and adaptation require sensing, knowledge, coordination, and learning.

Fourth, knowledge deployment represents a pivotal point in the relationship because the value of organizational intelligence depends on the transfer of knowledge from individuals into processes and decisions.

Fifth, human resources are a fundamental element in building resilience; skills, behaviors, and contextual conditions shaped through human resource practices can accumulate to form an organizational capacity for response.

Sixth, the relationship between organizational intelligence and resilience represents a possible explanatory pathway that requires empirical testing before the strength or direction of the relationships can be determined.

2.5. Recommendations:

1. Develop continuous environmental-monitoring systems that allow changes, opportunities, and risks to be detected at an early stage.
2. Strengthen the clarity of strategic vision and link it to objectives that employees understand and can translate into behavior.
3. Build a culture that encourages the sharing of knowledge and experience and reduces unnecessary barriers to information flow.
4. Integrate organizational learning into daily work processes rather than limiting it to formal training programs.
5. Develop human resource practices that support multiple skills, teamwork, empowerment, and continuous learning.
6. Design mechanisms for rapid decision-making in situations requiring urgent response while maintaining accountability.
7. Use post-event reviews to transform experience into applicable lessons, policies, and procedures.
8. Avoid reducing resilience to contingency plans; resilience requires a culture and capabilities that accumulate before an event occurs.
9. Test the theoretical analysis in the Algerian environment through future field studies.
10. Examine the potential mediating role of organizational learning, knowledge management, and leadership in the relationship between organizational intelligence and resilience.

3.5. Future Research Directions:

Future studies can test the theoretical relationships discussed in this study using quantitative or qualitative approaches, develop instruments for measuring the dimensions of organizational intelligence and organizational resilience, and then test the relationships among them. Comparative case studies can also be conducted among organizations facing different levels of uncertainty.

It would be useful to study the relationship in sectors exposed to rapid change, such as telecommunications, technology, industry, health services, and higher education. Sectoral comparison may help determine whether some dimensions of organizational intelligence are more important in particular contexts.

Future studies can also examine the role of artificial intelligence and digital analytics in developing organizational intelligence, while distinguishing between possessing technology and possessing the organizational capability to use it. Technology may increase the speed of access to information, but it does not automatically resolve problems of coordination, culture, or decision quality.

Future research can also introduce variables such as adaptive leadership, organizational culture, organizational trust, cognitive diversity, and learning from mistakes as factors that may explain or moderate the relationship between organizational intelligence and resilience.

References:

- Albrecht, K. (2003). The power of minds at work: Organizational intelligence in action. AMACOM.
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13(1), 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Duchek, S., Raetze, S., & Scheuch, I. (2020). The role of diversity in organizational resilience: A theoretical framework. *Business Research*, 13, 387–423. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0084-8>
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001>
- Najm, N. A., & Alfaqih, A. A. H. (2021). Organizational intelligence and market expansion in Jordanian pharmaceutical companies. *Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies*, 12(1), 222–251. <https://doi.org/10.15388/omee.2021.12.55>
- Bhamra, R., Dani, S., & Burnard, K. (2011). Resilience: The concept, a literature review and future directions. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5375–5393.
- Choo, C. W. (1995). Information management for the intelligent organization: Roles and implications for the information professions. *Information Research*, 1(1).
- Denyer, D. (2017). Organizational resilience: A summary of academic evidence, business insights and new thinking. Cranfield University.
- Fink, G., & Yolles, M. (2011). Organizational intelligence: An emergent theory. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 19(3), 173–195.
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., & Beck, T. E. (2005). Adaptive fit versus robust transformation: How organizations respond to environmental change. *Journal of Management*, 31(5), 738–757.
- Teixeira, E. O., & Werther, W. B. (2013). Resilience: Continuous renewal of competitive advantages. *Business Horizons*, 56(3), 333–342.
- Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Organizational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda. *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 3418–3422.
- Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Yolles, M. (2005). Organisational intelligence. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 17(1/2), 99–114.
- McMaster, M. (1996). *The intelligence advantage: Organizing for complexity*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Simic, I. (2005). Organizational learning as a component of organizational intelligence. *Management*, 10(2), 1–10.
- Ortiz-de-Mandojana, N., & Bansal, P. (2016). The long-term benefits of organizational resilience through sustainable business practices. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(8), 1615–1631.