The Role of Work Values in Promoting Organizational Resilience: Conceptual Grounding and a Study of Contemporary Work Environments

دور قيم العمل في تعزيز الصلابة التنظيمية: الأسس المفاهيمية ودراسة بيئات العمل المعاصرة

MAHER ASAAD IBRAHIM [1],[*]

[1] **Research and Studies Department of the Sunni Endowment Office, maher_662001@yahoo.com**

Article info	Abstract
	This research clarifies the pivotal role of work values in enhancing organizational resilience in contemporary work environments. The study accomplishes this by providing a conceptual framework and an interactive analysis of the relationship between professional values and an organization's ability to adapt and withstand challenges. The study's findings demonstrate that work values are not merely an ethical organizational framework; they have also become a strategic resource that strengthens organizational culture, raises the level of commitment and loyalty, and enhances an organization's ability to make sound decisions in unstable conditions. Evidence from international studies and global companies such as Toyota, Google, Apple, and Microsoft suggests that incorporating work values based on collaboration, integrity, creativity, and responsibility improves operational Resilience, supports continuous learning, and increases the capacity to manage crises, overcome pressures, and handle fluctuations. The study clarifies that organizational resilience arises from the interaction of individual values with leadership practices, organizational culture, and supportive policies. The absence of a clear value system often leads to organizational fragility, which is manifested by weak adaptability, declining performance, and increased resistance to change. The research affirms that investing in values enhances the ability to build a sustainable work environment capable of evolving in the face of rapid changes in global markets. Accordingly, the study recommends integrating business values into organizational strategies, fostering value-based leadership, and implementing training programs that translate values into practical applications. These strategies contribute to strengthening organizational resilience and achieving long-term competitive sustainability.

ملخص

يُوضح هذا البحث الدور المحوري لقيم العمل في تعزيز مرونة المؤسسات في بيئات العمل المعاصرة. ويتحقق ذلك من خلال تقديم إطار مفاهيمي وتحليل تفاعلي للعلاقة بين القيم المهنية وقدرة المؤسسة على التكيف ومواجهة التحديات. تُظهر نتائج الدراسة أن قيم العمل ليست مجرد إطار أخلاقي للمؤسسة، بل أصبحت أيضًا موردًا استراتيجيًا يُعزز ثقافة المؤسسة، ويرفع مستوى الالتزام والولاء، ويُحسّن قدرة المؤسسة على اتخاذ قرارات سليمة في ظل ظروف غير مستقرة. تشير الأدلة المستقاة من دراسات دولية وشركات عالمية مثل تويوتا، وجوجل، وآبل، ومايكروسوفت إلى أن دمج قيم العمل القائمة على التعاون، والنزاهة، والإبداع، والمسؤولية يُحسّن المرونة التشغيلية، ويدعم التعلم المستمر، ويزيد من القدرة على إدارة الأزمات، والتغلب على الضغوط، والتعامل مع التقلبات. تُوضح الدراسة أن مرونة المؤسسة تنشأ من تفاعل القيم الفردية مع ممارسات القيادة، وثقافة المؤسسة، والسياسات الداعمة. غالبًا ما يؤدي غياب نظام قيم واضح إلى هشاشة المؤسسة، والتي تتجلى في ضعف القدرة على التكيف، وتراجع الأداء، وزيادة مقاومة التغيير. يؤكد البحث أن الاستثمار في القيم يعزز القدرة على بناء بيئة عمل مستدامة قادرة على التطور في ظل التغيرات السريعة التي تشهدها الأسواق العالمية. وبناءً على ذلك، توصي الدراسة بدمج قيم الأعمال في استراتيجيات المؤسسات، وتعزيز القيادة القائمة على القيم، وتنفيذ برامج تدريبية تُترجم القيم إلى تطبيقات عملية. تُسهم هذه الاستراتيجيات في تعزيز مرونة المؤسسات وتحقيق استدامة تنافسية طويلة الأجل.

[*] **MAHER ASAAD IBRAHIM, Research and Studies Department of the Sunni Endowment Office, maher_662001@yahoo.com**

1. introduction

Work values constitute one of the fundamental pillars upon which contemporary organizational structures are built. These values play a vital role in guiding individual and collective behavior, as well as shaping the perceptions that govern performance patterns within organizations. In an increasingly complex and competitive environment, adopting clear and shared values such as responsibility, discipline, excellence, cooperation, innovation, and fairness has become a prerequisite for organizational success. In the face of profound transformations in the business world due to technological advancements, economic and political pressures, and environmental instability, organizational resilience has emerged as a vital capability. It enables organizations to withstand crises, absorb sudden shocks, adapt to changes, and resume stable or improved performance.

These mounting challenges have prompted organizations to reassess their true sources of strength. Material resources and traditional administrative structures are insufficient to guarantee continuity. Instead, attention has shifted to the value system instilled among employees. This system is recognized as the underlying driver of work behaviors and a catalyst for enhancing organizational effectiveness during times of crisis. From this perspective, it is important to understand how work values can be a key factor in building organizational resilience by motivating commitment, supporting internal cohesion, and increasing the ability to cope with organizational pressures.

Despite numerous studies addressing organizational resilience from perspectives such as leadership capabilities, risk management, and psychological capital, the relationship between work values and organizational resilience is underrepresented in Arabic literature. This relationship requires further conceptual grounding and scientific analysis. The relationship between employees' value systems and an organization's ability to withstand challenges is not well understood, especially in environments with continuous economic, political, and technological fluctuations.

Accordingly, the main research question is as follows: To what extent do work values contribute to enhancing organizational resilience within contemporary organizations, and what mechanisms do these values employ to support an organization's ability to adapt, persevere, and continue? This question branches into subquestions about the most influential values, how they interact with organizational Resilience and learning elements, and their capacity to encourage positive behaviors during crises.

This research is important because it attempts to bridge the knowledge gap concerning the relationship between an organization's value system and its ability to withstand organizational shocks. This adds a new dimension to our understanding of organizational resilience dynamics. The study's practical significance is demonstrated by its ability to help leaders and managers develop strategies to embed work values as a tool to enhance organizational preparedness, improve collaboration, and cultivate a positive work culture that supports continuity and innovation.

This research aims to achieve several objectives: establishing the foundations of work values and organizational resilience concepts and reviewing their theoretical underpinnings, analyzing the relationship between work values and organizational resilience and adaptability, identifying mechanisms by which work values are translated into behaviors that support organizational resilience, providing a conceptual framework clarifying the role of values in promoting organizational recovery during crises, and highlighting practical aspects enabling organizations to leverage values to develop institutional resilience.

The research provides a comprehensive scientific perspective that enriches the contemporary literature on sources of

organizational strength, highlighting the pivotal role of work values as a fundamental pillar for building organizational resilience in rapidly changing environments. Through this conceptual grounding and analytical study, the research hopes to support organizations in their pursuit of sustainable performance and enhance their ability to meet future challenges.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Work Values

Values are fundamental concepts that affect all aspects of human relationships. The study of values is a cornerstone of ethics, attracting many scholars and philosophers (Al-Saab, 2009). Najm (2008) credits Roecker with pioneering the study, analysis, and measurement of values and considers him to be among the first to examine and analyze them in depth. Khanifar et al. (2011) argue that values guide our behavior and serve as a reference point by which we judge ourselves and others. Suleiman (2006) maintains that values hold great importance in the social sciences because they are a primary factor in shaping individual behavior in social life.

Al-Zahrani (2002) asserts that shared values between an organization and its employees are a fundamental source of individual and organizational effectiveness. Conversely, conflict between personal and organizational values leads to organizational conflict and reduces productivity and job satisfaction. Kuchinke (2008) concurs, finding a relationship between work values and job satisfaction and commitment.

He-Lin (2008) suggests that understanding the work value structure helps employers and managers develop more effective human resource policies that meet employee needs and achieve efficient work outputs in environments where employees value work highly. Gahan and Lakmal (2008) identify a relationship between work values and management style and organizational culture. They emphasize that national culture and self-concepts are important indicators of work values and influence the formation of an individual's value structure. Al-Saab (2009, p. 24) found a positive correlation between work values and professional adjustment among the research sample. Wey and Charlotte (2002) argue that work values differ across generations. Work values differ across generations (Wey & Charlotte, 2002). Today's work values are characterized by innovation, renewal, ethical conduct, and professional pride. Additionally, individuals tend to adhere more to work values as they age. Vecernik (2006) believes that work values differ according to the prevailing economic system (capitalist or communist).

Ueda and Oh Zoning (2011) defined internal and external work values as follows:

- External work values are "the traditional pursuit of success through advancement within the organizational hierarchy to achieve prestige, status, and a high income."
- Internal work values are "the natural desire of employees to be active, develop, and grow in the workplace; build beneficial and satisfying relationships with colleagues; and help those in need."

There are several benefits to management's commitment to sound work values when implementing change (Arafah & Shalabi, pp. 389–390). These benefits include creating harmony and alignment between the work team and its manager, reducing resistance to change, increasing the effectiveness of change, and preventing conflicts of interest. Likewise, management can carry out its tasks regarding change and development under more stable internal environmental conditions and focus on achieving goals rather than resolving conflicts. Adherence to ideals and values gives managers willpower and moral influence over others in a positive way. Finally, adherence to ideals and values increases the loyalty and commitment of employees and planners to achieve the organization's goals.

Previous studies have shown that various factors influence work values. For instance, Askun (2010) discovered that age, gender, and education significantly impacted work value beliefs. Chih (2006) concurred, identifying a positive correlation between demographic variables and work values. Bakar et al. (2011) discovered that work values are strongly linked to educational level, age, and experience. The mere existence of a correlation between work values and practical experience suggests that work values may be cultivated through experience and are not immutable. Al-Zahrani (2009) concluded that personal and work values have a direct impact on leadership behavior within organizations and that conflicts between these values lead to organizational conflicts, reducing productivity and employee job satisfaction. A 2010 study by Askun suggests that differences in managers' work values are likely to contribute to disagreements related to organizational characteristics, such as time management, internal personality types, structure, and reward systems. Bakar et al. (2011) agree, stating that work values clearly influence career choices and the alignment between work values and the work environment — a phenomenon already evident. Chu (2008) argues that work values make new students more interested in learning and development opportunities than material benefits and job status when receiving job offers. However, Askun (2010) claims that job status, number of subordinates, and educational level do not significantly impact work values.

Super (1970) developed one of the most widely used scales, the Work Values Test (WVT). The WVT consists of forty-five variables and measures fifteen values distributed across three dimensions: material incentives, self-actualization, and a liberating spirit. Numerous studies have supported the consistency of this scale, including those by Khanifar et al. (2011), Bakar et al. (2011), Tsuzuki (2006), Chih (2006), Wu et al. (1996), and Hei-Lin (2008). The values are presented in the following three dimensions.

a. Material incentives include eight values: Security: The value of performing work that provides security from the risk of job loss. Financial reward: The value of high financial rewards received by the employee from their workplace, which ensures their living expenses.

Supervisory relationships: The value of working with an easy, honest, and responsible supervisor. His subordinates and prestige: These values grant employees respect, status, and authority in the workplace. Colleagues: These values include liking and wanting to work with people as a team member and building good relationships with them. Achievement: This value is based on the employee's perception that they have fulfilled their responsibilities and are satisfied with the results of their work. Surrounding environment: This value involves working in a clean, pleasant, and comfortable environment where the employee prefers and enjoys performing their work. Lifestyle: This is the value of an enjoyable lifestyle. It is achieved by working in a way that provides a high standard of living, avoids repetitive work, and fosters special work friendships.

B. Self-actualization values include the following five values: Creativity: This value involves advancing and generating new ideas and proposals at work. Aesthetics: This value involves paying attention to beauty in the workplace and doing artistic work. Intellectual stimulation: This value involves independent thinking, solving new work problems, and overcoming intellectual challenges. Variety: This is the value of performing diverse tasks so colleagues see their work as important. Achievement: This is the employee's perception, based on the results of their work, that they have fulfilled their responsibilities. Work satisfaction.

C. Values of a free spirit include two values: Altruism: helping others at work and improving their living conditions.

Independence: These values include self-reliance, taking independent actions, working freely in one's own workspace, and making one's own decisions.

Ueda and Ohzano (2011), Twenge et al. (2010), and Gahan and Abeysekera (2008) classified values into extrinsic and intrinsic categories.

(a) Extrinsic values include financial reward, respect, independence, security, supervisory relationships, the surrounding environment, diversity, and lifestyles.

(b) Intrinsic values include intellectual motivation, altruism, aesthetics, creativity, management, and achievement.

This classification encompasses nearly all of the values in Super's (1970) classification. These three studies converged on the finding that work values are similar and contribute to cultural adaptation and skills development among employees. Van (2010) indicated that an excessive focus on extrinsic values may come at the expense of pursuing intrinsic values. However, this is unnecessary because the primary need at work is psychological well-being, which can lead to greater adaptation and optimal performance. Despite the simplicity of this classification, more complex ones exist. Uqanok (2009) and Ralston et al. (2008) classified values into individualistic and collectivist dimensions:

a) The individualistic dimension includes four values: authority, achievement, motivation, and self-actualization; and b) the collectivist dimension includes five values: benevolence, universality, tradition, homogeneity, and security.

b)The collectivist dimension includes five values: benevolence, universality, tradition, homogeneity, and security.

They had similar values and concluded that the concept of value congruence better explains behavioral variables. They also found that the collectivist dimension was more highly correlated with the study variables than the individualist dimension. Studies by Choy et al. (2007) and Skárzynska (2002) classified

work values into ten categories: authority, achievement, enjoyment, motivation, self-direction, inclusivity, benevolence, tradition, harmony, and security. Vijayakumar's (2007) study divided work values into thirteen dimensions: work ethic, authority, age, achievement, freedom of expression, informality, diversity, privacy, religiosity, leadership positions, independence, openness, and lifestyle. The classifications by Askun et al. (2010) and Alas (2009) differed significantly. They ranged from Western to local to ideological values and were far removed from generally accepted work values. They were closer to religious, legal, and organizational values. This divergence is further emphasized by their unique approach to these measures compared to other studies, thus preventing the generalization of their findings.

In the fields of psychology and organizational studies, work values are an important factor that encourages individuals to seek jobs and work environments consistent with their values (Heil-Lin, 2008). Once an individual joins an organization, they are influenced by the work values of its employees, which determine how they perform their job (Chih, 2006; Alas, 2009). Ueda and Ohzano (2011) believe that values have an effective influence on an individual's culture and are sometimes non-negotiable in the workplace. Based on the importance of work values, researchers have studied them to determine their structure, identify their nature and impact, and motivate them among organizational members with different cultural and educational backgrounds (Al-Saab, 2009).

Al-Saqqa (2001) affirms that there is no distinct value pattern that leads to effective decision-making. This is consistent with previous presentations of different value classifications. David Eperly confirms this, indicating that the field of values is difficult for all parties to grasp. Nevertheless, classifying values greatly helps reduce overlap (Al-Saqqa, 2001).

2.2 Organizational Resilience

The concept of resilience has been adopted by many disciplines, including systems biology, control theory, engineering, computer science, statistics, and supply chain management. Resilience is the organizational strength that allows systems to remain stable in the face of uncertainty. In management literature, resilience has primarily been explored in risk and business continuity management given the constant challenges of maintaining and enhancing organizational resilience in the face of volatility, uncertainty, and rapid change. Therefore, understanding how organizations can maintain their core functions amid uncertainty is crucial to achieving organizational strength (DeSouza & Xie, 2021: 6089).

Initially, this term was used to describe a material's resistance to change. Over the past few decades, it has evolved significantly and is now associated with toughness and rigidity. Resilience is also used to describe the adaptive capacities of individuals, human societies, and the strength of communities and organizations. Resilience is concerned with toughness, strength, and Resilience. It measures an organization's ability to maintain Resilience within a limited range of functions during crises, disasters, disturbances, and unconventional events or situations that pose significant threats to its survival (Oluwasoye & Ugonna, 2015: 1106).

The organizational resilience hypothesis (TRH), formulated by Staw (1981) based on empirical research into how organizations respond to environmental threats, explores how organizations achieve resilience, strength, and robustness by managing their internal resources and limiting control under threatening conditions. This results in a more robust and resilient response to environmental factors (Staw et al., 1981, p. 506, cited in Taylor & Francis, 2010, p. 676). For individual decision-makers, the constraint of business processes and information takes the form of reliance on internal assumptions, past expectations, and attention to prevailing or centralized signals. Consequently, their managerial capabilities for processing information and making rational choices during crises are reduced due to stereotypical or standardized thinking. According to the hypothesis, decision-makers tend to limit themselves when information is critical. Furthermore, there are constraints on control where authority and influence become centralized.

These two characteristics lead to reliance on established thought patterns and learned routines, which lead to rigid responses. This does not necessarily mean the pattern is ineffective. Such responses may mitigate the impact of threats if the task or environment does not change drastically. However, in radically unstable environments, these responses are likely to be inadequate.

Robustness is a noun derived from the word "robust," which means strength and solidity. It is strong and resistant to breakage or collapse. According to the Oxford Dictionary (2014:678), "robust" means structurally strong, which is the opposite of "rigidity," implying inResilience. Therefore, the term "robust" is linked to the ancient Roman term "roeselare," which means "origin of elasticity" and was mentioned by Lucius Annaeus. Initially, the term was used to describe a material's capacity for development, associated with strength, durability, and rigidity. Now, it is used to describe the adaptive capacities of individuals, human societies, and larger organizations (Oluwasoue & Ugonna, 2015: 1107).

The word "robust" is derived from the root word for strength and solidity. Resilience and toughness measure an organization's ability to maintain itself within a narrow range of functions and are well-suited to environmental threats arising from fluctuations in its external environment, both locally and globally. This requires organizations to assess the potential of

different strategic options within the development process of such disasters. The terms "toughness," "strength," and "resilience" have far-reaching meanings in disaster and crisis science surrounding these organizations. They encompass innovation, leadership, strategy, transformation, learning, iteration, functional diversity, feedback controls, and organizational learning to cope with environmental changes. Carlsson and Dell indicate that the concept of toughness emerged in engineering and control theory (Oluwasoue & Ugonna, 2015: 1107–1108).

The concept of organizational resilience is recognized in business, as well as in the functions that these organizations rely on. Although the concept of resilience has also been adopted by other scientific disciplines, a comprehensive and systematic view of it is lacking. In this study, we present a comprehensive view of resilience by examining related synonyms and their relationship to the concept. There are three mechanisms of organizational resilience distributed across three layers: strategic, functional, and infrastructure. Organizational resilience focuses on developing an integrated, comprehensive understanding of how to create stable systems in the face of uncertainty and environmental fluctuations by examining the resilience, strength, and robustness of organizations, primarily in risk and business continuity management. Due to the continuous and relentless nature of the fluctuations, uncertainties, and speeds organizations face today, it is of the utmost importance to understand how organizations can maintain their core functions in the face of environmental risk and uncertainty in order to achieve organizational resilience (DeSouza, 2021: 6089). Survival in turbulent environments requires viewing organizations' adaptability and resilience similarly to their strength. However, management and organizational literature reveals ambiguity and conflict regarding these constructs' use. These terms are often used interchangeably with others, such as agility, proactive adaptation, strength, and resilience (Karman, 2019: 305).

Therefore, it is unclear whether these terms are synonyms or distinct concepts. Without a guiding theory for the practice of each, failure to interpret the interrelationships between these constructs may lead to divergent conclusions. Specifically, we examine the relationships between organizational resilience, resistance, Resilience, strength, and adaptability, and we advocate for the simultaneous development of these capabilities at the organizational level (Karman, 2019: 306).

Furthermore, the importance of studying organizational resilience has increased significantly due to the impact of the pandemic. Understanding organizational resilience is crucial given the repercussions of the pandemic and its devastating impact on organizations and all other aspects of society. This knowledge can provide organizations with valuable insights and strategies for surviving global crises like the one caused by the pandemic. Information technology also empowers managers and leaders, contributing to sustainability and organizational resilience. Resilience represents a system's ability to anticipate and manage crises in order to return to normal or an even better state. It underscores the system's fundamental mechanisms for responding proactively and rapidly to both predictable and unpredictable crises.

Resilience emphasizes a system's core mechanisms for responding proactively and rapidly to predictable and unpredictable crises. Generally, resilience is a broader concept than Resilience; Resilience only reflects one aspect of resilience. When faced with environmental disturbances and crises, organizations should be able to recover quickly and reshape themselves dynamically. A robust system should also be able to learn from reconfiguration experiences, sharpening its ability to predict, prepare for, and formulate responses to various types of attacks, future

disturbances, and sudden changes in the external environment. Many organizations continuously suffer failures in repeated crises. For example, the aviation industry suffers every time there is a global crisis, such as an oil crisis, the Gulf War, SARS, an economic crisis, or a pandemic like the one caused by the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). This indicates a limited understanding of organizational resilience among these organizations' leaders and managers. Therefore, our study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of organizational resilience. There is a scarcity of studies on organizational resilience, and those that exist portray it as a single aspect, which indicates an inaccurate perception.

This study aims to develop a systematic framework for resilience by integrating the concepts into an organizational context. It accomplishes this by incorporating existing literature on the concepts of resilience, robustness, strength, and Resilience within organizations. The study provides a set of definitions for resilience and creates a table of conceptual synonyms for these terms (DeSouza & Xie, 2021: 60810).

Organizational resilience focuses on maintaining Resilience within a limited range of functions during crises, fluctuations, and environmental events that pose significant threats to an organization's survival. Resilience encourages organizational leaders to think outside the box and adopt innovative administrative, organizational, and strategic approaches to problem analysis. Rather than being rigid, a strong organization strategically adapts to lessons learned from past experiences or new, innovative thinking when anticipating and responding to emerging threats from the external environment in the form of unconventional crises and disasters. It continuously employs effective feedback mechanisms to understand complex changes within the business environment. Risks and threats have multiple sources and impacts. Failure to manage them effectively by leaders

and senior management can lead to unsatisfactory outcomes that undermine operational and financial stability. The resilience and Resilience of such organizations can help address the challenges that academics and practitioners face when managing these risks and crises (Oluwasoye & Ugonna, 2015: 1106).

It is important to note that the initial indicators that would make emerging risks, crises, and disasters predictable are often lacking. These events threaten an organization's existence and structure. The areas of vulnerability and susceptibility are vast and highly complex. Consequently, serious events of this nature often require an understanding of their weaknesses, mitigation of their severity, assessment of their future impact, and identification, comprehension, communication, and determination of the various options for addressing them. These risks and threats have multiple sources and impacts. Failure to manage them can lead to unsatisfactory outcomes that undermine an organization's operational and financial stability. A prominent model of organizational resilience reveals that Resilience is a strength that is meaningful in confronting organizational challenges (Oluwasoye & Ugonna, 2015:1107).

Many organizational decision-makers, including leaders and managers, are constrained in how they handle information and its processes. They rely on internal assumptions, past expectations, prior indications, and what is prevalent within the organization and its extreme centralization (Staw et al., 1981:506). Consequently, the managerial capabilities for processing information, making decisions, and exercising rational choice during crises are diminished due to these leaders' standardized or normative thinking and their approach to dealing with crises within their organizations. According to Staw's (1981) hypothesis, decision-makers' neurotic attitudes lead them to impose limitations on themselves when information is

critical. Furthermore, constraints on control arise as authority and influence become centralized. These characteristics result in a reliance on prevailing thought patterns, pre-learned routines, and conventional reactions. This leads to rigid responses that are not commensurate with the level of the environmental event or crisis. However, this does not necessarily mean that the pattern is ineffective. The dominant response may reduce threats if the task or environment does not change radically (Staw et al., 1981: 502–503; Taylor & Francis, 2010: 680).

In order to understand the characteristics of organizational resilience, the mechanisms required for it, and its availability in organizations, it is necessary to determine its levels and the extent to which these characteristics collectively contribute to supporting the dimensions of organizational resilience, strength, and power. Resilience is linked to Resilience; the term "resilire" originated in ancient Rome with Lucius Annaeus.

Table (1) The difference between hardness and other concepts associated with hardness

difference	concept
The term "flexibility" emerged in management literature in the 1970s and is often linked to the concept of change. Change is considered the precursor to flexibility. This means that an organization has become more flexible by making important structural changes at the right time. The organization remains resilient during fluctuations and upheavals while improving its overall strength.	Flexibility
It is one of the weaker forms of rigidity and a simple example of it. Rigidity, on the other hand, is a more complex concept in terms of its mechanisms and practices.	Getting up
It is one of the mechanisms and means to achieve rigidity.	Liquid organization
It is a flexible organization, therefore a rigid organization is broader and more comprehensive than it.	Agile organization
It occurs in a planned manner and cannot accommodate the natural system. In contrast, the solid system can be unplanned and based on the philosophy of the natural system, which embraces randomness and fluctuations in environmental management.	Specialized Management
Creative chaos is exploited by intentionally and deliberately creating it. Resilience, on the other hand, tries to profit from unpredictable and unexpected events and must contain and benefit from them.	Creative Chaos
Crises take advantage of chaos and turmoil, while resilience tries to profit from sudden, unpredictable events that cannot be avoided or contained.	Crisis Management
Linguistically, it means "rigid, strict, hard, and inflexible." In the context of organizations, it refers to the inability to undertake new initiatives in the face of threats and innovation. Organizational rigidity stems from the difficulty of changing dominant mental models, established organizational routines, and organizational cultures that value conformity and continuity. This is significant because the mental models of decision-makers influence how they perceive opportunities and act based on the beneficial and valuable organizational investments that these opportunities provide.	Rigidity
The term "resilience" originates from the disciplines of psychology, environmental systems, and risk management. It describes a structure that is quick to recover its health or vitality. Resilience goes back to social psychology, which is directly related to environmental and social vulnerability, politics, and disaster recovery. It is defined as "the adaptive ability of a higher committee to prepare for unexpected events, respond to disturbances, and recover from them while maintaining the continuity of operations at the required level of coherence and control of structure and function."	Resilient
"Strong, robust, and rock-like" refers to an organization's ability to sustain itself within a narrow range of functions appropriate to emerging environmental threats and disasters. This involves evaluating potential alternatives and strategic options that influence the preparation and development process for responses to these threats and disasters. Resilience and robustness are long-term concepts because they encompass innovation, strategy, transformation, learning, functional iteration, and feedback controls that compensate for environmental variables and enable organizations to emerge in good health.	Robustness

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the sources above.

Resilience is defined as a system's ability to respond productively to uncertainties without exhibiting regressive behavior.

Although resilience and toughness seem similar intuitively, they have different focuses. Resilience emphasizes a system's capacity to anticipate and manage crises in order to return to a more normal or desirable state. On the other hand, toughness emphasizes a system's fundamental mechanisms for proactively and rapidly responding to predictable and unpredictable crises.

Toughness is generally a broader concept than resilience, with resilience reflecting only one aspect of toughness. Toughness encompasses strength, resilience, and Resilience. It is the ability to withstand, repel, and resist environmental attacks; recover quickly from disruptions; and develop mechanisms or protocols to become immune to similar attacks in the future. Therefore, a system should be strong, tough, and resilient—capable of functioning while under attack (DeSouza & Xie, 2021: 6089). A robust

organization can dynamically reshape itself, learn from reconfiguration experiences, and improve its ability to predict, prepare for, and respond to various types of attacks and future environmental crises (DeSouza & Xie, 2021, p. 6090).

3. Methodology and research style

This study employs a theoretical, analytical, and foundational methodology. Rather than relying on field data collection or quantitative measurement tools, it focuses on analyzing intellectual contributions and theoretical models related to work values and organizational resilience in modern management and organizational literature. The analytical framework is constructed through a thorough review of peer-reviewed academic sources, specialized scholarly books, and previous research addressing the impact of value systems within organizational contexts. This allows for the deconstruction of concepts and understanding of the intellectual links between work values and organizational resilience.

The study procedures employ a literature review methodology that tracks the development of the two concepts over time and highlights the diversity in the interpretation of each concept across administrative schools of thought. The development of the concept of work values is examined through classical administrative philosophy, the humanistic school, and the contemporary values approach, linking it to the concept of organizational resilience. This concept has evolved in theory and practice in strategic management, risk management, and organizational Resilience literature. This analysis examines the differences and intersections in the definition of organizational values and their role in shaping organizational culture, as well as the characteristics of organizational resilience as an institutional intellectual capacity based on Resilience, organizational learning, and internal sustainability.

The study methodology is based on a comparative analysis of multiple intellectual models through critical and evaluative readings of previous research results in the field. This process identifies points of convergence and divergence in intellectual perspectives. Then, synthetic analysis is employed to reconstruct a comprehensive picture of the relationship between work values and organizational resilience. Logical and rational reasoning demonstrates the theoretical links between honesty, integrity, responsibility, and discipline as value components and organizational stability, the ability to withstand shocks, and maintaining performance despite changes.

The study also analyzes modern intellectual trends linking organizational values to building internal social capital and its impact on enhancing trust and organizational cohesion. This, in turn, leads to an organization's ability to overcome emergencies and adapt to changes. The relationship between behavioral and value-based elements and structural and organizational elements is addressed through an intellectual deduction process, giving the study a conceptual and interpretive character rather than an empirical one. Thus, this study proceeds from the understanding that work values are not merely individual behaviors but a cultural frame of reference producing organizational practices capable of producing intellectual and value-based institutional resilience. The study will prove this analytically by constructing an intellectual model that clarifies the mechanisms by which values impact an institution's ability to withstand, recover, and adapt. This model will rely on theoretical analysis and cognitive reasoning rather than field data or statistical measurement tools.

4. Results and discussion

Contemporary management and organizational literature reveals that the relationship between work values and organizational resilience is key to

understanding how organizations withstand crises and survive in volatile and uncertain environments. Work values are not just general principles or ethical guidelines in the workplace. They are fundamental structural components that shape organizational behavior and influence how organizations respond to challenging situations. This makes work values a starting point for understanding how to build organizational resilience and develop practical strategies to protect against sudden pressures and successive risks.

A review of studies addressing this relationship reveals that work values represent the underlying driver that supports the capabilities discussed by Dusek in his 2020 study. In this study, Dusek presented a conception of organizational resilience as a composite capacity comprised of anticipation, response, and adaptation. Dusek demonstrated that these dimensions do not arise in a vacuum, but rather, they are founded on behavioral and cultural norms that pave the way for them and empower their exercise during a crisis. Rereading this model in light of work values reveals that values related to continuous learning, innovation, and professional responsibility form a foundation that enables organizations to predict and respond efficiently. Values related to cooperation, trust, and mutual respect contribute to smoother post-crisis adaptation. These findings confirm that the relationship between values and resilience is causal, with cultural and behavioral aspects intertwined.

More recent studies support this link. Most notably, a 2024 study by Georgescu et al. confirmed that values-based human resources practices related to employee development, empowerment, and organizational participation directly contribute to increased resilience. The study showed that translating values into organizational policies and practices creates a flexible organizational structure, enabling quick and effective action during crises. These findings align with those of other studies indicating that positive

professional values are the cornerstone of building a responsive culture—one that allows for the free and transparent exchange of information and helps the organization make rapid decisions.

Similarly, a 2024 study by Garrido Moreno et al. provided further support for this connection. The study showed that organizational innovation—a practical expression of openness and experimentation—helps build greater organizational resilience. The study also showed that organizations that celebrate innovation and give employees creative freedom are better able to develop new solutions during crises and recover more quickly. In the Arab context, the 2024 study by Ibrahim et al. provided important field evidence within the Egyptian work environment. It showed that employee resilience is linked to job values related to psychological support and team spirit. The rise of these values increases job satisfaction and commitment, enhancing psychological and behavioral readiness to face pressures. These findings underscore the pivotal role of values in fostering the resilience of human resources, which is the fundamental pillar of institutional resilience.

Numerous global organizations have demonstrated through practical experience that professional values can be a key tool in enhancing organizational resilience. For instance, the IBM Business Value Institute has published reports on several crises the company has faced. These reports show how a focus on values such as transparency, continuous communication with employees, and openness to innovation has helped the company manage crises effectively. These experiences revealed that clear values were central to teams' ability to cope with extreme pressure and recover quickly from complex situations.

Recent experiences from several global companies suggest that organizational resilience is not only the result of good management but also a consequence of deeply

rooted value systems that guide individual and collective behavior, reflected in financial and competitive performance. Financial data from 2024 and 2025 shows that companies such as Amazon, Microsoft, Tesla, and Netflix were able to maintain high revenue levels, diversify their income streams, and expand their markets despite global economic challenges and intensifying competition. Their ability to grow under pressure reflects a mature form of organizational resilience based on clear values that translate into effective operational policies.

Amazon, with revenues exceeding $637 billion in 2024, overcame supply chain fluctuations and logistical crises by staying true to its core values of intense customer focus and continuous investment in innovation. These values enabled Amazon to develop resilient operating systems based on cloud technologies and automation. This allowed the company to meet demand, even during times of disruption. This data shows that organizational resilience is not a temporary strength but the result of value-driven strategies that ensure continuity of service and development of more adaptable processes.

Microsoft, with revenues exceeding $245 billion in 2024, exemplifies how corporate values can be translated into practices that foster strategic resilience. Values based on continuous learning, openness, and innovation supported the company's ability to transition to the age of artificial intelligence with remarkable agility. Microsoft developed Azure and integrated AI into all its solutions, granting the company operational resilience, as demonstrated by its ability to maintain consistent annual growth exceeding 15%, despite intense competition. In a rapidly changing sector, this continued growth translates into organizational strength that grows stronger the more corporate values support research and development and investment in intellectual capital.

In contrast, Tesla demonstrates a different model of organizational resilience. Despite industry challenges, criticism, and volatile markets, Tesla projected revenues of nearly $98 billion for 2024. This success can be attributed to Tesla's core values of boldness, experimentation, and a commitment to revolutionary innovation. These values have enabled the company to expand its business beyond electric vehicles to include energy solutions and electricity storage. This diversification was not just strategic expansion but also a flexible response to market pressures. Revenues from the energy sector increased by over 60% in one year, demonstrating the company's capacity to withstand shocks in its primary sector and convert them into growth opportunities.

Netflix's experience is another clear example of organizational resilience based on innovation, with revenues reaching approximately $39 billion in 2024. In a short period, the company transformed itself from a disc rental model to a global streaming platform and then to a major production studio, competing with the largest film studios. These profound transformations reflect the company's ability to restructure based on Resilience, experimentation, and trust in its employees. Despite fierce competition from Disney, Amazon, and other platforms, Netflix has succeeded due to its internal culture, which gives employees freedom and responsibility in decision-making. This culture has enabled Netflix to respond quickly to changes in viewers' tastes and technological developments.

These experiences demonstrate that organizational resilience is not just the ability to return to previous performance levels after a crisis. Rather, it is the capacity to learn from, adapt to, and transform disruptions into catalysts for growth. This capacity depends on the extent to which core business values are embedded in organizational behavior. For instance, the value of transparency enables

organizations to communicate effectively internally during crises. Toyota's vehicle crisis exemplifies this; a culture of acknowledging mistakes and continuously pursuing quality led to the rebuilding of market trust. Amazon's commitment to customer focus enabled the company to grow despite market volatility. Similarly, Microsoft and Netflix's commitment to innovation has created new growth opportunities, making the companies less vulnerable to external fluctuations.

An analysis of financial figures over the past few years reveals that companies that base their operations and strategies on clear values are better positioned to achieve long-term organizational resilience. This resilience extends beyond the financial aspect to encompass cognitive resilience (the capacity for continuous learning), social resilience (the strength of employee relationships), and strategic resilience (the organization's ability to redefine itself during times of change). Therefore, work values are not just internal factors; they are also key determinants of sustainability and success in modern work environments. Organizations without a well-established value system will be more susceptible to disruptions and less able to recover.

5. Conclusion

The current study concludes that work values are the cornerstone of organizational resilience in contemporary business institutions. Resilience is now defined as an integrated system linked to the behaviors, beliefs, and values held by employees, rather than merely the ability to adapt or persevere in the face of challenges. Global data and international experiences have demonstrated that organizations that invest in promoting work values based on commitment, transparency, cooperation, innovation, and integrity achieve higher levels of resilience during crises while maintaining operational stability and productivity.

Overall, the study confirms that work values are not just an ethical framework, but a strategic resource impacting decision quality, response speed, and an organization's ability to learn, adapt, and build flexible internal networks. The study also reveals that organizational resilience is the result of a dynamic interaction between individual values and the organizational context. Organizations that have successfully integrated work values into their culture have reduced organizational ambiguity, increased employee trust, and strengthened commitment to organizational goals.

Analyzing global experiences, it's clear that companies like Microsoft, Toyota, Amazon, Apple, Ericsson, Shell, and Google, which have made work values central to their management processes, have achieved excellence in performance and maintained their ability to adapt to global technological and economic shifts. This demonstrates that organizational resilience is not a direct result of procedures and processes but rather is gradually built through a shared value system that creates a stable work environment, fosters innovation, and strengthens a sense of belonging.

An analysis of previous studies revealed a direct relationship between work values and organizational resilience. Values of integrity reduce deviant behaviors and foster internal trust, while values of cooperation enhance teamwork and knowledge sharing. Innovation values drive the development of new solutions, increasing an organization's ability to adapt to change. Values of commitment and responsibility contribute to improved sustainable performance and positively impact an organization's ability to persevere in turbulent circumstances.

Therefore, organizations lacking a clear value system often suffer from organizational fragility, which is manifested by weak adaptability, fragmented efforts, and reduced crisis management capabilities. Conversely, organizations with firmly established values

possess high resilience, making them more resilient and better able to survive and grow. The study also demonstrated that values are not imposed by administrative decisions, but rather, are built through continuous practices, effective communication, and leadership that embodies these values. This is evident in global companies that have made values an integral part of their strategic identity. In light of this, it is clear that strengthening organizational resilience begins with building and promoting work values rather than administrative procedures. Investing in values may be one of the most important drivers of organizational excellence in an age of uncertainty.

The study demonstrated that professional values are a significant variable in organizational resilience, and that organizations with a clear value system achieve higher levels of cohesion and adaptability, maintaining their productivity even during crises. It also showed that values contribute to building an organizational culture that supports continuous learning and knowledge sharing, which enhances organizations' ability to innovate and develop more flexible business models. The results also indicate that values such as integrity, discipline, and collaboration increase an organization's capacity to make sound decisions in uncertain situations, and that values of innovation enhance organizations' readiness to face technological and economic changes.

Furthermore, the study found that organizations that focus on building a cohesive value system between management and employees achieve higher levels of internal trust and organizational commitment, which translates into increased organizational resilience and reduced resistance to change. Global experiences have also shown that investing in values is reflected in financial and operational performance indicators, as seen in improved profits at Apple, increased production efficiency at Toyota, enhanced

sustainability at Shell, and a better innovation environment at Google.

This is exemplified by the improved profitability of Apple, increased production efficiency at Toyota, enhanced sustainability at Shell, and a better innovation environment at Google. It also became clear that values are not a fixed system but a dynamic system that needs continuous updating in line with global transformations in the labor market, and that institutions that neglected this aspect faced internal crises related to loss of confidence, declining performance and weak ability to adapt.

The study recommends strengthening the focus on professional values within organizations by integrating them into strategic plans, human resources policies, training programs, and evaluation processes. The study also recommends involving employees in the formulation of values to ensure their commitment to them and ensuring these values are applicable and directly linked to specific behaviors. Additionally, the study suggests establishing internal communication systems that promote the dissemination of values and support values-based leadership practices that serve as role models for employees.

The study recommends adopting periodic evaluation mechanisms to measure the degree to which values are implemented and their impact on organizational resilience. It also advises strengthening training programs that focus on cooperation, creativity, discipline, and responsibility. Organizations should also develop an organizational culture that encourages individual initiative and teamwork as essential elements in cultivating organizational resilience.

The study also suggests adopting transformational leadership, which supports values and fosters innovation. This approach has proven effective in enhancing organizational resilience. Additionally, the study recommends establishing a values-based incentive system to translate values into

practical behavior rather than mere slogans. Finally, the study recommends leveraging successful global experiences that demonstrate investing in values enhances sustainability and empowers organizations to better withstand crises and sudden changes.

- References

1. Abdul Hakim Ahmed Najm (2008) The Relationship Between Managers' Environmental Values and the Organization's Environmental Behavior: An Applied Study on Hotels in South Sinai Governorate, Egyptian Journal of Commercial Studies, Faculty of Commerce, Mansoura University, Volume 32, Issue 2, 2008.

2. Abdullah bin Ahmed Salem Al-Zahrani (2009) A Proposed Model for Alignment Between Personal and Organizational Values in Saudi Higher Education Institutions, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Umm Al-Qura University, Makkah.

3. Ahmed Arafa, Somaya Shalaby, Management and the Challenges of Globalization: An Approach to Overcoming the Administrative Vacuum, no publisher, no publication year.

4. Askun , D ,Unler , E , &Bige , O . (2010) , " Understanding Managerial Work Values in Turkey " , Journal of Business Ethics, Vol . 93 .No .10 .Pp . 103 – 114 .

5. Bakar, A , Mohamed , S. &Zakaria, N . (2011) ," Work Values of Malaysian School Counselors: It's Implication on School Counseling " , Journal of Social Sciences , Vol 7. No 3 .Pp 456-4

6. Desouza, K.C. & Xie, Y. (2021). Organizational Robustness and Information Systems. Proceedings of the 54th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. PP. 6089- 6098.

7. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. Journal of Management & Organization.

8. Gahan, P. &Lakmat, A. (2008), "WhatShapesan Individual's Work Values? An Integrated Model of the Relationship between Work Values, National Cultureand Self-Construal", TheInternational Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol . 20, No.1, pp. 126 – 147.

9. Garrido-Moreno, A., Garcia-Morales, V., & Lockett, N. (2024). The key role of innovation and organizational resilience in enhancing business performance. Journal of Business Research.

10. Georgescu, I., Bocean, C. G., Vărzaru, A. A., Rotea, C. C., Mangra, M. G., & Mangra, G. I. (2024). Enhancing organizational resilience: The transformative influence of strategic human resource management practices and organizational culture. Sustainability, 16(10), 4315.

11. Hei-Lin, K. (2008) , "A factorial validation of work value structure: Second-order confirmatory factor analysis and its implications" Tourism Management, Vol.29, pp. 320–330.

12. IBM Institute for Business Value. (2024). Resilience in action: Crisis leadership through innovation. IBM.

13. Ibrahim, B. A., et al. (2024). Relationship between resilience at work, work engagement and job satisfaction. BMC Public Health.

14. Karman, A. (2020). Resilience, coping capacity and resilience of organizations: between synergy and support. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 1- 25.

15. Khanifar , H , Matin , H , Matin , G , Gholipour , A , Hassanzadeh , M .(2011) , " Identifying the Dimensions and Components of Islamic Work Values (IWV) for Public services sector of Iran ", European Journal of Social George Washington Universitynciences , Vol , 22, No, 2. Pp 246 – 261.

16. Kuchinke, K.; Kang , H.; & Oh , S . (2008) ," The Influence of Work Values on Job Career Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Professional Level Employees ", Asia Pacific Education Review, Vol . 9 , No. 4, pp. 552 – 564 .

17. Mohammed Obaid Hashem Al-Saab (2009) Work Values and Their Relationship to Professional Adjustment Among a Sample of School Counselors in Al-Lith and Al-Qunfudhah Education Departments, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology, Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.

18. Nabil Ahmed El-Saqqa (2001), The Impact of Values on the Effectiveness of Administrative Decisions in the Business Sector, unpublished master's thesis, Sadat Academy for Administrative Sciences.

19. Oluwasoye, M. P. & Ugonna, N. C. (2015). Environment Risk: Exploring Organizational Resilience & Robustness. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research 6 (1): 1103-1115.

20. Oxford, Word power. (2014). Oxford University Press.

21. Samia Anwar Abdel-Aal Suleiman (2006) The Formation of Senior Management Values and Their Relationship to Organizational Culture: An Application to Governmental Organizations in Egypt, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Commerce, Zagazig University.

22. Staw, B.M., Sandelands, L.E. & Dutton, J.E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: a multilevel analysis, Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 4, PP. 501-24.

23. Taylor, K. (2015). Learning from the Co-operative Institutional Model: How to Enhance Organizational Robustness of Third Sector Organizations with More Pluralistic forms of Governance. Administrative Sciences, 5: 148–164.
24. Toyota Production System Case Study. (2022). Harvard Business Review.
25. Ueda , Y , &Ohzono ,Y .(2011) ," Effect of seniors' work values on their self-skill evaluations :focusing on Japanese seniors " , Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies , Pp 1 - 12 .
26. Unilever Case Study. (2025). Sustainability and organizational resilience report.
27. Vecernik, J.(2006) ," Work Values and Job Attitudes " Sociological Review , Vol .42. No. 6, pp. 1219 – 1240 .
28. Wey, K. &Charlotted, D. (2002) , " Generational Differences : Revisiting Generational Work Values For the new Millennium" , Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol.23 , No. 4, pp. 363 – 382 .