

From Cultural Alignment to Organizational Priorities: Extending the Analysis through Ranked Likert-Scale Survey Data

Ranthy Pancasasti¹, Ngadiman², Abdul Wahab Samad³

¹Universitas Boyolali, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia.

²Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia.

³Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kosgoro 1957, Jakarta Indonesia.

Corresponding Author email: ranthypancasasti@uby.ac.id

Orcid Id: 0000-0002-5613-9277

Abstract

Organizational resilience increasingly depends on an organization's ability to maintain cultural coherence while continuously adapting to changing organizational and environmental conditions. This study examines how organizational values, strategic alignment, value-based leadership, and cultural implementation contribute to understanding organizational resilience through the perspective of dynamic cultural alignment. Using a questionnaire dataset comprising 250 respondents, the study conducts a descriptive re-analysis of four organizational dimensions: Organizational Values, Strategic Alignment, Value-Based Leadership, and Gap in Organizational Culture. The findings reveal that Organizational Values represent the strongest dimension, with an overall mean of 3.542, followed by Strategic Alignment at 3.491. Gap in Organizational Culture records a mean of 3.285, while Value-Based Leadership has the lowest overall mean of 3.148. The empirical pattern indicates that organizations possess relatively strong normative and strategic foundations, while the translation of these foundations through leadership and everyday cultural practices requires further strengthening. The findings suggest that cultural alignment should not be understood as a static condition of consistency, but as a dynamic organizational process that enables organizations to preserve essential values while adapting practices, capabilities, and organizational responses to changing conditions. The study contributes to organizational culture and resilience literature by positioning dynamic cultural alignment as a conceptual bridge between organizational continuity and organizational renewal. This perspective highlights the importance of integrating stable cultural foundations with leadership reinforcement, strategic coherence, organizational development, transformation, adaptability, and stability to support organizational resilience and sustainable competitiveness.

Keywords: dynamic cultural alignment; organizational resilience; organizational values; strategic alignment; value-based leadership; organizational transformation

Citation: Pancasasti, Ranthy; Ngadiman; Samad, Abdul Wahab; **From Cultural Alignment to Organizational Priorities: Extending the Analysis through Ranked Likert-Scale Survey Data**. *The Journal of Center for Energy Policy and Human Resources Capacity Development.*, E-ISSN: 3090-6962 Vol 1 Number 1, (2026), Page 96-119

INTRODUCTION

Organizations today operate in an environment characterized by continuous disruption, accelerated technological development, shifting stakeholder expectations, intensified competition, and changing patterns of work. Under these conditions, organizational survival is increasingly determined not only by the availability of resources or the effectiveness of formal strategies, but also by the ability of organizations to respond to change without losing their internal coherence. The challenge is therefore no longer simply how organizations can maintain consistency, but how they can remain coherent while continuously evolving.

Organizational resilience has consequently become an important perspective for understanding organizational capacity in uncertain and rapidly changing environments. Resilience refers not merely to an organization's ability to withstand disruption, but also to its capacity to absorb change, learn from experience, reorganize existing resources, and develop new ways of operating. From this perspective, a resilient organization is not necessarily one that preserves its existing structures. Rather, resilience may be reflected in the ability to maintain essential organizational principles while modifying structures, processes, capabilities, and practices when circumstances require it.

This challenge places organizational culture in a strategically important

position. Culture influences how organizational members interpret events, understand organizational priorities, interact with colleagues, respond to leadership, exchange knowledge, and make decisions in situations of uncertainty. Consequently, culture may become either a source of organizational resilience or a constraint on organizational renewal. Strongly embedded cultural patterns can provide identity, trust, coordination, and continuity, but they can also create resistance when established assumptions no longer correspond to changing organizational conditions.

The relationship between culture and organizational change is therefore more complex than the conventional assumption that successful transformation requires replacing an existing culture with a new one. Organizational transformation frequently occurs through a process of selective continuity and adjustment. Certain values, principles, and behavioral expectations may need to remain stable because they provide organizational identity, while other practices and routines must change to accommodate new technologies, strategies, markets, and stakeholder requirements. Organizational resilience may consequently depend on the organization's ability to distinguish between what must be preserved and what must be transformed.

This perspective introduces an important distinction between cultural consistency and cultural alignment. Cultural

consistency generally emphasizes the continuity of established values and behavioral expectations, whereas cultural alignment concerns the degree to which organizational values, leadership practices, employee behavior, strategic direction, and organizational practices remain mutually compatible. Alignment should therefore not be interpreted as permanent uniformity. In a changing organization, alignment may involve a continuous process of adjustment in which organizational members reinterpret existing values and translate them into practices that remain relevant to emerging circumstances.

Previous research has demonstrated the importance of organizational values, value-based leadership, strategic alignment, and cultural implementation in shaping organizational behavior and employee outcomes. Earlier framework development also identified organizational development, organizational transformation, adaptability, stability, and competitiveness as important dimensions associated with organizational culture. However, these dimensions were primarily positioned as interconnected elements within a broader cultural framework rather than examined as a process through which organizations build resilience. The previous study particularly highlighted the existence of a gap between intended organizational culture and culture as experienced and practiced by organizational members.

The limitation of this perspective creates an opportunity for a different theoretical direction. Instead of asking whether organizational culture is aligned, the more consequential question is how alignment enables organizations to remain resilient when their operating environment changes. Cultural alignment can be reconsidered as an organizational mechanism that connects internal development with external adaptation. Through this mechanism, organizational values can be translated into development priorities, transformation can be implemented without completely disrupting organizational identity, and adaptability can occur while maintaining sufficient stability for coordination and continuity.

Organizational development represents one of the first processes through which this mechanism can operate. Development involves the improvement of organizational structures, competencies, systems, relationships, and working practices. However, development is not simply a technical or administrative process. Changes in organizational systems inevitably affect how employees understand their roles, how leaders exercise authority, how knowledge is shared, and how organizational expectations are interpreted. Organizational development therefore has both structural and cultural consequences.

Beyond incremental development, organizations may encounter circumstances requiring organizational transformation. Transformation can

involve substantial changes in strategy, technology, organizational structure, business processes, leadership arrangements, or organizational identity. Such changes may challenge established assumptions and generate uncertainty among organizational members. The success of transformation may therefore depend on whether the organization is capable of creating new patterns of action while preserving sufficient cultural coherence. Transformation should not necessarily be understood as cultural replacement; it may instead involve cultural reconstruction in which selected assumptions and practices are retained while others are modified.

Adaptability becomes particularly important within this process. Organizations must be capable of learning, experimenting, responding to new information, and adjusting their practices when environmental conditions change. Yet adaptability without organizational stability may produce fragmentation. Employees may experience continuous changes in priorities, structures, and procedures without a sufficiently stable reference point. Conversely, stability without adaptability may generate rigidity and reduce the organization's ability to respond to technological, market, or institutional developments. The interaction between adaptability and stability is therefore likely to be more important than either dimension considered independently.

This adaptability–stability relationship represents one of the central problems addressed in the present study. Stability is conceptualized not as resistance to change, but as the preservation of selected organizational foundations that enable coordinated adaptation. These foundations may include core values, organizational identity, shared expectations, institutional knowledge, leadership principles, and established mechanisms of collaboration. Adaptability, in turn, concerns the capacity to modify practices, structures, skills, and responses when circumstances demand change. Organizational resilience may emerge from the organization's ability to combine these two apparently contrasting requirements.

The implications of this process extend to organizational competitiveness. In contemporary environments, competitiveness is increasingly influenced by the capacity to learn, innovate, utilize knowledge, respond to emerging opportunities, and reorganize resources effectively. Competitive advantage cannot therefore be considered exclusively as an economic or market outcome. It may also emerge from organizational capabilities that are developed internally through learning, collaboration, innovation, adaptive behavior, and effective knowledge utilization. The relationship between culture and competitiveness consequently depends partly on whether organizational culture creates conditions that support these capabilities.

From this perspective, competitiveness can be viewed as a downstream manifestation of organizational resilience rather than as an isolated organizational characteristic. Organizations that are capable of developing their capabilities, transforming their systems, adapting to changing circumstances, and preserving essential sources of coherence may be better positioned to sustain competitive performance. Cultural alignment plays a potentially important role in this process because it connects organizational intentions with actual patterns of behavior. When organizational values are consistently reflected in leadership decisions, communication, employee behavior, and organizational practices, the organization may be better equipped to coordinate its response to change.

However, alignment itself should not be assumed to be automatically beneficial. Excessive alignment may produce conformity and discourage experimentation, while insufficient alignment may generate conflicting priorities, fragmented decision-making, and resistance among organizational members. This creates a central paradox: organizations need enough alignment to coordinate collective action, but enough flexibility to reinterpret and modify established practices. Organizational resilience may therefore depend on achieving dynamic alignment rather than static alignment.

The concept of dynamic alignment provides the foundation for the present study. Dynamic alignment refers to the continuing process through which

organizational values, strategies, leadership practices, structures, and employee behaviors are adjusted in response to organizational and environmental changes while maintaining an identifiable organizational core. This concept shifts attention from the measurement of cultural congruence toward the mechanisms through which organizational coherence is continuously reconstructed.

Such a perspective also requires attention to differences in organizational experience. Organizational transformation is rarely experienced uniformly. Leaders, managers, professional employees, operational employees, and different organizational units may interpret the same change in different ways. A transformation that is perceived by senior management as necessary organizational renewal may be experienced by employees as disruption, increased uncertainty, or a loss of established identity. These differences are important because they can reveal where alignment is strengthened, where it weakens, and how organizations negotiate competing interpretations of change.

Accordingly, qualitative inquiry is particularly appropriate for examining the processes underlying organizational resilience and dynamic cultural alignment. Standardized measures can indicate the degree to which particular organizational characteristics are present, but they may provide limited insight into how employees interpret transformation, how leaders manage

tensions, how organizational practices are renegotiated, and why some cultural elements are preserved while others are changed. A qualitative approach provides greater opportunity to investigate meanings, experiences, organizational practices, tensions, and mechanisms that emerge during periods of development and transformation.

The present study therefore moves beyond treating organizational development, transformation, adaptability, stability, and competitiveness as separate dimensions of organizational culture. Instead, these dimensions are positioned within a process-oriented perspective of organizational resilience. Organizational development is viewed as a capacity-building process; transformation as organizational renewal; adaptability as the capacity to respond and learn; stability as the preservation of essential organizational foundations; competitiveness as an organizational consequence of sustained capability; and cultural alignment as an integrating mechanism connecting these processes.

Based on this positioning, the study seeks to answer four questions. First, how does cultural alignment support organizational development and capability renewal? Second, how do organizations manage cultural continuity during organizational transformation? Third, how are adaptability and stability negotiated simultaneously by organizational members? Fourth, how do these processes collectively contribute to

perceptions of organizational resilience and sustainable competitiveness?

The study offers a conceptual and empirical extension of previous research on organizational culture. Rather than reproducing a framework centered on the identification of cultural gaps, the present research examines what organizations do after alignment becomes a continuing organizational challenge. It focuses on the processes by which organizational actors preserve core principles, modify practices, develop capabilities, respond to disruption, and reconstruct cultural alignment. In doing so, the study positions organizational resilience as a broader outcome of the interaction between culture, development, transformation, adaptability, and stability.

The central argument of this study is that organizational resilience does not emerge from stability alone, nor from continuous transformation. It develops through the organization's capacity to combine continuity with renewal. Cultural alignment becomes meaningful in this context not because it eliminates differences or change, but because it provides a shared reference through which organizational members can coordinate adaptation. Organizations may therefore remain competitive not by preserving culture unchanged, but by developing the capacity to evolve while retaining the cultural foundations necessary for collective identity and coordinated action.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Dynamic Cultural Alignment

Organizational culture provides a shared system of values, beliefs, norms, and behavioral expectations that influences how organizational members understand and perform their roles. Culture can therefore become an important organizational resource when it supports coordination, consistency, and the effective use of organizational capabilities (Barney, 1991).

However, culture should not be treated as a static organizational property. Organizational environments change continuously, and changes in technology, strategy, leadership, workforce composition, and stakeholder expectations can alter the way cultural values are interpreted and enacted. Consequently, the relevance of organizational culture depends not only on the strength of shared values but also on the organization's capacity to maintain meaningful alignment while circumstances evolve (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

Cultural alignment in this context refers to the compatibility between what an organization formally intends and what organizational members actually understand, experience, and practice. Alignment can be reflected in the consistency between organizational values, leadership behavior, strategic priorities, communication, employee behavior, and organizational practices.

Nevertheless, alignment should not be interpreted as complete uniformity. Organizations consist of individuals and groups with different responsibilities, experiences, interests, and interpretations. Some degree of variation is therefore inevitable. What becomes strategically important is whether such variation can be coordinated around a sufficiently shared organizational direction.

This leads to the concept of dynamic cultural alignment. Dynamic cultural alignment emphasizes the organization's ability to preserve essential cultural principles while allowing their interpretation and implementation to evolve. Core organizational values may remain relatively stable, while operational practices, technologies, structures, and behavioral patterns change. Alignment therefore exists when the relationship between these elements remains sufficiently coherent despite organizational transformation.

This perspective changes the analytical question from whether organizational culture is aligned to how cultural alignment can be continuously maintained and reconstructed. Such a shift is important because alignment can weaken when organizational strategies change faster than employees' understanding, when leadership behavior contradicts stated values, when communication is inconsistent, or when different organizational units develop conflicting practices. Dynamic alignment therefore requires continuous learning, communication, leadership consistency,

and adaptation (Weick & Quinn, 1999; Hung et al., 2010).

2.2 Organizational Development as Capability Renewal

Organizational development can be viewed as a continuous process through which organizations improve their structures, systems, people, relationships, and capabilities. It is broader than isolated managerial interventions because development affects the way organizational members perform their work and understand organizational priorities.

The cultural dimension of organizational development is particularly important. Changes in organizational processes may alter employee roles, patterns of communication, leadership relationships, knowledge-sharing practices, and behavioral expectations. As a result, organizational development and cultural development can be mutually reinforcing processes.

From a capability perspective, organizational development represents the process through which an organization renews its capacity to perform effectively under changing conditions. Capability renewal may involve employee development, knowledge acquisition, leadership development, process improvement, collaboration, innovation, and improvements in organizational coordination. This perspective is consistent with the concept of dynamic capabilities, in which organizations renew and reconfigure their capabilities

in response to changing environments (Teece et al., 1997; Teece, 2007).

An organization may possess strong existing capabilities but become vulnerable when those capabilities are no longer appropriate for a changing environment. Development therefore involves not only strengthening existing capabilities but also identifying which capabilities must be redesigned, replaced, or newly developed. Cultural alignment provides an important context for this process because shared organizational priorities can support coordination and collective action.

2.3 Organizational Transformation as Organizational Renewal

Organizational transformation differs from incremental development because it may involve fundamental changes in how an organization creates value, coordinates activities, deploys technology, structures authority, and defines its identity. Transformation can be triggered by technological disruption, competitive pressure, regulatory change, market shifts, organizational restructuring, or changes in strategic direction.

Transformation creates a cultural challenge because established assumptions may no longer fit the emerging organizational environment. Employees may need to learn new technologies, adopt new work processes, accept new responsibilities, or operate under different leadership and coordination mechanisms. These changes can create uncertainty and

resistance, particularly when organizational members perceive that transformation threatens established identities or ways of working.

However, transformation should not automatically be interpreted as the replacement of an existing culture. Some cultural elements may need to be preserved because they provide organizational identity, trust, and continuity, while other elements may need to change because they restrict innovation or responsiveness. Transformation can therefore be understood as a process of selective organizational renewal (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

Selective renewal involves identifying which organizational values and practices constitute a stable core and which practices need to evolve. Dynamic cultural alignment becomes relevant in this process because it allows organizations to communicate why certain principles remain important while simultaneously explaining why particular practices must change. The ability to reconfigure organizational resources and capabilities is also central to organizational transformation (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007).

2.4 Adaptive Capability and Organizational Learning

Organizational adaptability refers to the capacity to recognize environmental changes, interpret new information, modify organizational responses, and develop new ways of operating.

Adaptability is therefore more than structural flexibility. It requires learning and behavioral adjustment at both organizational and individual levels.

Organizational culture can influence this adaptive process. Cultures that encourage learning, knowledge sharing, experimentation, participation, and open communication may create more favorable conditions for adaptation. Conversely, rigid routines and restricted communication may constrain the willingness of organizational members to experiment with new approaches.

Adaptability also depends on how organizations transform experience into organizational learning. Change generates information about what works, what fails, and what needs to be modified. Organizations that can capture and distribute such knowledge may become better prepared for future disruptions. Thus, adaptability is not merely a response to a single external event; it can become a cumulative organizational capability (Zollo & Winter, 2002).

Within this perspective, adaptive capability can be conceptualized as the ability of organizational members and organizational systems to learn, adjust, and respond without losing their shared organizational direction. This definition connects adaptability with dynamic cultural alignment. Adaptation becomes more sustainable when changes in behavior and practices remain connected to an understandable

organizational purpose (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007).

2.5 Stability as the Organizational Foundation for Change

Organizational stability is often contrasted with adaptability, yet treating the two as opposing organizational conditions may provide an incomplete understanding of organizational resilience. Stability provides continuity in organizational identity, expectations, coordination, institutional knowledge, and relationships. Without some degree of stability, continuous change may create uncertainty and organizational fragmentation.

Stability in this perspective is therefore not defined as resistance to change. Instead, it refers to the capacity to maintain essential organizational foundations while allowing other elements of the organization to evolve. Core values, ethical principles, organizational identity, strategic purpose, and fundamental coordination mechanisms may constitute stable elements, while technologies, procedures, structures, and operational practices remain open to adjustment.

This conceptualization creates an important distinction between stable foundations and flexible practices. An organization may maintain a stable sense of purpose while continuously changing how that purpose is achieved. Such a configuration can provide organizational continuity without preventing innovation.

The relationship between adaptability and stability therefore represents a balancing process. Excessive stability may produce organizational rigidity, whereas excessive adaptability without stable reference points may produce inconsistency. Organizational resilience is more appropriately understood as the capacity to maintain essential organizational foundations while adapting to changing conditions (Duchek, 2020; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011).

2.6 Cultural Alignment and Organizational Resilience

Organizational resilience represents a broader organizational capacity to anticipate, absorb, respond to, and recover from disruption while continuing to develop. Importantly, resilience should not be limited to crisis recovery. A resilient organization also possesses the ability to learn from disruption and use changing circumstances as an opportunity for organizational renewal (Duchek, 2020).

Dynamic cultural alignment can conceptually contribute to resilience by creating a shared reference system during periods of uncertainty. When organizational members perceive consistency between values, leadership behavior, communication, and strategic decisions, coordination may become easier during periods of disruption. Organizational resilience therefore involves not only responding to external pressures but also maintaining sufficient

internal coherence while adapting (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011).

However, cultural alignment contributes to resilience only when it remains sufficiently flexible. A highly coherent culture that rejects alternative perspectives may reduce experimentation and adaptation. Consequently, resilient cultural alignment should combine coherence with openness.

This relationship can be conceptualized as follows:

Dynamic Cultural Alignment →
Coordinated Adaptation →
Organizational Resilience

Dynamic cultural alignment establishes a shared organizational reference point. Coordinated adaptation translates that reference point into changing behaviors and practices. Organizational resilience can then be understood as the broader capability to maintain continuity while responding to disruption and environmental change (Duchek, 2020).

This conceptualization also provides a different interpretation of the earlier “gap” perspective. A cultural gap is not necessarily only a problem to be eliminated. Differences between intended and experienced culture can provide diagnostic information about where organizational systems, leadership practices, communication, or strategic implementation require adjustment. The organizational challenge is therefore not merely to eliminate every cultural difference, but to

understand which differences threaten organizational coherence and which may support learning and renewal.

2.7 From Resilience to Sustainable Competitiveness

Organizational competitiveness is increasingly dependent on capabilities that are difficult to reproduce through formal resources alone. These include organizational learning, knowledge integration, innovation, employee capabilities, adaptive behavior, effective leadership, and the ability to coordinate resources under changing conditions. Such capabilities are closely related to the resource-based view and dynamic capabilities perspective (Barney, 1991; Teece, 2007).

Culture can influence competitiveness because it shapes how organizational members cooperate, exchange knowledge, respond to opportunities, manage uncertainty, and generate new ideas. Earlier research has also connected organizational culture with knowledge management, innovation, organizational development, and competitiveness (Hung et al., 2010).

From a resilience perspective, competitiveness is not simply a final economic outcome. Sustainable competitiveness reflects the organization's continuing ability to renew its capabilities and remain relevant when environmental conditions change. An organization may achieve short-term competitive success through a particular product, technology, or strategy, but long-term competitiveness requires the

capacity to continuously modify and renew those resources (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007).

The relationship can therefore be represented as:

Capability Renewal → Adaptive
Resilience → Sustainable
Competitiveness

Capability renewal enables organizations to develop new competencies. Adaptive resilience allows those competencies to be mobilized under uncertainty and change. Sustainable competitiveness represents the longer-term capacity to maintain relevance and effectiveness.

Cultural alignment supports this sequence by connecting organizational intentions with collective action. When values, leadership, strategic priorities, and employee behavior reinforce one another, organizational capabilities may be mobilized more effectively. Nevertheless, alignment must remain dynamic so that the organization does not become trapped by previously successful patterns.

2.8 The Adaptability–Stability Paradox

One of the central theoretical issues emerging from the literature is the apparent paradox between adaptability and stability. Organizations need stability to preserve identity, coordination, and continuity, but they also need adaptability to respond to environmental change. This tension is consistent with the broader literature on organizational change and dynamic capabilities (Weick & Quinn, 1999; Teece, 2007).

This paradox suggests that organizational effectiveness cannot be adequately explained by assuming that more stability is always better or that more adaptability is always better. Instead, the relevant issue is the organization's ability to determine what should remain stable and what should change.

The paradox can be understood through three organizational processes. First, organizations establish a stable core consisting of values, purpose, identity, and principles that provide continuity. Second, organizations create adaptive peripheries involving practices, technologies, structures, and processes that can be modified as circumstances change. Third, organizations require alignment mechanisms that connect the stable core with adaptive practices.

This framework suggests that resilience depends on the quality of the relationship among these three elements rather than on the dominance of one element over another. Dynamic capabilities emphasize the importance of reconfiguration, while organizational change perspectives emphasize the simultaneous presence of continuity and change (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Weick & Quinn, 1999).

2.9 An Integrative Perspective

The literature reviewed above supports an integrated view in which organizational development, transformation, adaptability, stability, cultural alignment, resilience, and competitiveness are interconnected

processes rather than isolated organizational characteristics.

Organizational development provides capability renewal. Organizational transformation creates opportunities and pressures for organizational redesign. Adaptive capability enables organizations to respond to changing conditions. Stability provides continuity and organizational identity. Dynamic cultural alignment connects these processes by ensuring that changing practices remain sufficiently coherent with organizational purpose and values (Teece et al., 1997; Ducheck, 2020).

Organizational resilience can consequently be understood as a broader capability arising from the interaction of continuity, adaptation, learning, and renewal, while sustainable competitiveness represents a longer-term organizational implication of continued capability development (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011; Teece, 2007).

The proposed conceptual sequence is therefore:

Organizational Development →
Organizational Transformation →
Dynamic Cultural Alignment → Adaptive
Capability ↔ Organizational Stability →
Organizational Resilience → Sustainable
Competitiveness

The arrows in this framework should not be interpreted as predetermined linear causal relationships. Rather, they represent an analytical map for interpreting the relationships among the concepts. Transformation may stimulate

development, adaptation may reshape alignment, and changes in competitiveness may create new pressures for transformation.

This perspective provides the theoretical basis for the present quantitative descriptive re-analysis. The empirical analysis focuses specifically on Organizational Values, Value-Based Leadership, Strategic Alignment, and Gap in Organizational Culture, while organizational development, transformation, adaptability, stability, resilience, and sustainable competitiveness serve as the broader conceptual lens for interpreting the findings.

The literature therefore points to a central gap: although organizational culture, cultural alignment, organizational development, transformation, adaptability, stability, and competitiveness have each received attention, there remains value in examining how these dimensions can be conceptually connected as a dynamic organizational process through which resilience and renewal may be supported. The present study addresses this perspective through a descriptive re-analysis of questionnaire data, rather than testing direct causal relationships among all of these broader concepts.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative descriptive approach based on a re-analysis of an existing questionnaire dataset. The dataset consisted of responses from 250 respondents

measured using a ranked Likert-scale questionnaire. The re-analysis was conducted to examine organizational values, value-based leadership, strategic alignment, and cultural alignment from a broader perspective of organizational development and resilience.

The questionnaire contained four main constructs: Organizational Values (OV), Value-Based Leadership (VL), Strategic Alignment (SA), and Gap in Organizational Culture (GC), with ten indicators for each construct. Each indicator was assessed using a Likert-scale response format.

The analysis focused on descriptive statistics, particularly the mean scores of each construct and its indicators. The results were interpreted comparatively to identify the relative strengths and areas requiring greater attention in organizational cultural alignment. Because this study represents a re-analysis of an existing dataset, the findings are interpreted as descriptive empirical patterns rather than causal relationships.

The analytical interpretation connects these measured dimensions with the broader concepts of organizational development, transformation, adaptability, stability, resilience, and sustainable competitiveness. These broader concepts serve as the conceptual framework for interpreting the empirical patterns rather than as separately measured variables in the questionnaire.

RESULT

4.1 Overall Empirical Pattern

The empirical findings reveal a differentiated pattern across the four organizational dimensions examined. Organizational Values emerged as the strongest dimension, with an overall mean score of 3.542, followed by Strategic Alignment with a mean of 3.491. Gap in Organizational Culture recorded a mean of 3.285, while Value-Based Leadership showed the lowest mean score at 3.148. This pattern indicates that the organizations represented in the dataset possess a relatively strong foundation in terms of organizational values and strategic direction, while the translation of these foundations into leadership practices and cultural implementation remains comparatively less consistent.

The overall pattern is important because it suggests that organizational resilience cannot be understood solely from the presence of formal values or strategic priorities. Rather, resilience appears to depend on how effectively these organizational foundations are translated into leadership behavior, communication, employee practices, and organizational routines. The difference between the stronger values and strategic alignment dimensions and the relatively lower leadership dimension points to a potential implementation issue in which organizational principles are more strongly established at the normative and strategic levels than at the behavioral level.

4.2 Organizational Values as the Strongest Organizational Foundation

Organizational Values produced the highest overall result among the four dimensions, with a mean of 3.542. This finding indicates that organizational values constitute the strongest perceived foundation within the observed organizational setting. The highest individual result was recorded by OV5, with a mean of 3.608, followed by OV3 at 3.576 and OV8 at 3.568. OV4 and OV10 both recorded a mean of 3.548.

The concentration of the highest-ranked indicators within the Organizational Values dimension demonstrates that respondents generally perceive organizational values as relatively well established. Values therefore appear to provide an important reference point for organizational behavior and decision-making. Rather than functioning merely as formal statements, organizational values show evidence of being recognized as an important component of organizational practice.

From the perspective of the present study, this result provides an empirical basis for viewing cultural alignment as a dynamic process that begins with a relatively stable normative foundation. A stable value foundation provides continuity while organizations respond to changing internal and external conditions. However, the relatively strong position of organizational values does not automatically guarantee organizational resilience. The subsequent translation of those values into leadership, strategic

implementation, and employee behavior remains essential.

4.3 Strategic Alignment as a Source of Organizational Coherence

Strategic Alignment recorded the second-highest overall mean, at 3.491. The strongest indicator within this dimension was SA9, with a mean of 3.552, followed by SA7 at 3.528 and SA6 at 3.524. SA2 recorded a mean of 3.508, while SA8 reached 3.484.

The relatively high position of Strategic Alignment suggests that organizational members perceive a meaningful degree of coherence between organizational direction and internal priorities. This finding complements the strong result for Organizational Values. Together, the two dimensions indicate that the organizations have both a normative foundation and a strategic orientation that can support coordinated organizational action.

The result also suggests that alignment operates beyond the level of individual values. Organizational values become more consequential when they are reflected in organizational priorities and strategic direction. Thus, strategic alignment can be understood as an important bridge between what the organization considers important and how it directs organizational resources and activities.

Within the resilience perspective adopted in this study, strategic coherence provides organizations with a reference structure during periods of change. When

external conditions change, organizations may need to modify strategies, structures, or practices without abandoning their fundamental direction. Strategic alignment therefore contributes to the ability to adapt while maintaining organizational coherence.

4.4 Value-Based Leadership as a Critical Area for Strengthening Alignment

Value-Based Leadership recorded the lowest overall mean among the four dimensions, at 3.148. The highest indicators within this dimension were VL2, with a mean of 3.180, VL7 at 3.176, and VL8 and VL4, each at 3.172. VL10 recorded a mean of 3.156. At the lower end of the dimension, VL6 recorded 3.104, followed by VL5 at 3.116 and VL1 at 3.124.

The lower relative position of Value-Based Leadership is a significant finding because it creates a contrast with the stronger results for Organizational Values and Strategic Alignment. The data suggest that organizational values and strategic direction may be relatively well established, while their consistent reinforcement through leadership behavior is comparatively weaker.

This pattern indicates that leadership represents a critical translation mechanism between organizational principles and organizational practice. Values become culturally meaningful when leaders consistently demonstrate them through decisions, communication, role modeling, and interactions with employees. Consequently, strengthening

value-based leadership may be important for converting organizational values from formal or normative principles into lived organizational practices.

The finding also provides an important explanation for why cultural alignment may not be fully realized even when organizational values are relatively strong. Alignment requires more than agreement with organizational principles; it requires consistent behavioral enactment. Leadership therefore becomes a central mechanism through which organizational values are reinforced, interpreted, and adapted to changing organizational circumstances.

4.5 Cultural Alignment in Organizational Practice

The Gap in Organizational Culture dimension produced an overall mean of 3.285, placing it between Strategic Alignment and Value-Based Leadership. The strongest indicator in this dimension was GC9, with a mean of 3.332, followed by GC1 at 3.328 and GC4 at 3.304. GC10 recorded a mean of 3.288, while GC6 reached 3.280.

The results indicate that cultural implementation is present at a moderate-to-relatively strong level, but it does not reach the same level as the organization's formal values and strategic alignment. This difference is important because it indicates that the existence of organizational values does not necessarily translate uniformly into organizational practice.

The results can therefore be interpreted through the concept of dynamic cultural alignment. Cultural alignment is not simply the absence of inconsistency or organizational gaps. Instead, it reflects the degree to which organizational values, communication, leadership, and employee behavior remain sufficiently coherent while organizational practices evolve. The position of the Gap in Organizational Culture dimension suggests that organizations have established a cultural foundation, but continued effort is required to ensure that this foundation is consistently enacted across organizational contexts.

The relatively strong result for GC9 also indicates that cultural implementation across organizational units is an important aspect of organizational alignment. This finding suggests that alignment needs to extend beyond individual departments or groups. Organizational resilience requires a sufficient degree of cultural coherence across organizational boundaries while still allowing local adaptation to operational conditions.

4.6 Integrated Finding: From Cultural Alignment to Organizational Resilience

Taken together, the empirical results reveal a sequential pattern in which Organizational Values and Strategic Alignment provide the strongest foundations, Cultural Alignment represents the intermediate condition, and Value-Based Leadership emerges as the area with the greatest relative

opportunity for strengthening. The results therefore suggest that organizational resilience is not generated by a single organizational attribute but by the interaction between stable organizational foundations and the capacity to translate those foundations into practice.

The findings point toward a distinction between organizational continuity and organizational adaptation. Organizational Values provide continuity by establishing principles that guide organizational members, while Strategic Alignment provides coherence by connecting these principles with organizational direction. Cultural implementation then represents the process through which these foundations are translated into everyday organizational practices. Value-Based Leadership becomes particularly important because leaders determine how organizational principles are interpreted, communicated, reinforced, and adapted in response to organizational change.

The empirical pattern therefore supports the central proposition of this study that organizational resilience can be understood as an outcome of dynamic cultural alignment. Organizations require a stable cultural core, but they also require sufficient flexibility to modify practices, respond to environmental changes, and renew organizational capabilities. Resilience consequently emerges not from maintaining organizational culture unchanged, but from maintaining essential coherence

while allowing organizational practices and capabilities to evolve.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the strongest organizational foundation lies in the internalization of organizational values and strategic coherence, whereas the translation of these foundations through leadership and cultural practice remains comparatively less developed. This finding shifts the analytical focus from whether an organization possesses a culture toward how effectively that culture is continuously aligned with organizational development, transformation, adaptation, and stability. Such dynamic alignment provides the foundation for understanding how organizations can strengthen resilience and, ultimately, sustain competitiveness in changing environments.

DISCUSSION

5.1 Organizational Values as the Foundation of Dynamic Cultural Alignment

The findings demonstrate that Organizational Values represent the strongest dimension among those examined. This result suggests that organizational resilience begins with the existence of a relatively stable normative foundation. Organizational values provide organizational members with shared references concerning what is considered important, appropriate, and desirable within the organization.

However, the findings also indicate that strong organizational values should not be interpreted as evidence that

organizational culture is automatically aligned in all organizational practices. Values provide direction, but their organizational consequences depend on how they are interpreted and enacted. This distinction is particularly important in dynamic organizational environments, where organizations must respond to technological developments, changing stakeholder expectations, competitive pressures, and internal transformation.

The present findings therefore extend the conventional understanding of cultural alignment. Alignment should not be viewed as a static condition in which every organizational practice remains unchanged. Instead, it is better understood as a continuing process through which the organization preserves essential values while allowing their implementation to evolve. In this sense, organizational values constitute the stable core of the organization, while cultural practices represent the adaptive layer through which that core is translated into changing circumstances.

This interpretation positions cultural alignment as a potential organizational capability rather than merely a cultural outcome. Organizations that are able to maintain coherence around fundamental values while adjusting their practices are better positioned to absorb disruption without losing their organizational identity.

5.2 Strategic Alignment as the Bridge Between Values and Organizational Action

The relatively strong position of Strategic Alignment provides further evidence that organizational resilience depends on the connection between organizational principles and organizational direction. Strategic alignment ensures that organizational values do not remain isolated at the normative level but are connected with priorities, objectives, and organizational action.

The findings suggest that organizations can possess a relatively strong strategic foundation even when the translation of that foundation into leadership and cultural practice is less consistent. This observation is theoretically important because it demonstrates that alignment operates across multiple organizational levels. Values establish what the organization stands for, whereas strategic alignment determines how those principles are connected to organizational priorities.

From a resilience perspective, strategic alignment provides continuity during periods of change. Organizational transformation frequently requires changes in structures, technologies, processes, and capabilities. Without strategic coherence, these changes can generate fragmentation and uncertainty. Strategic alignment therefore allows organizations to modify their practices while maintaining a recognizable direction.

The finding supports the argument that resilience should not be equated with organizational rigidity. A resilient organization is not one that preserves

every existing practice. Rather, it is one that can modify practices and strategies while retaining sufficient coherence to prevent organizational fragmentation. Strategic alignment consequently functions as an important connecting mechanism between stability and adaptation.

5.3 The Leadership Translation Gap

One of the most important findings is the relatively lower position of Value-Based Leadership compared with Organizational Values and Strategic Alignment. This result reveals a potential translation gap between what organizations value and how those values are enacted through leadership.

This finding has significant theoretical implications. Organizational culture is not sustained simply because values have been formally established. Leaders play a critical role in converting organizational values into observable behavior. Through decisions, communication, role modeling, recognition, and responses to organizational problems, leaders communicate which values are genuinely prioritized.

The lower relative position of Value-Based Leadership therefore suggests that strengthening organizational resilience requires more than defining appropriate values and aligning strategic priorities. Organizations must also ensure that leaders consistently embody and reinforce those values. Without such reinforcement, organizational values may remain primarily normative rather

than becoming deeply embedded in organizational routines.

This finding also provides a new interpretation of cultural misalignment. Misalignment does not necessarily originate from the absence of organizational values. It can emerge when there is inconsistency between formal values, strategic intentions, leadership behavior, and everyday organizational practices. Consequently, leadership represents a critical point at which cultural alignment can either be reinforced or weakened.

5.4 Cultural Alignment as a Dynamic Organizational Process

The findings concerning Gap in Organizational Culture provide an important basis for reconsidering the meaning of cultural alignment. The moderate-to-relatively strong result suggests that cultural implementation exists, but it does not completely match the stronger position of organizational values and strategic alignment.

Rather than interpreting this result simply as evidence of an organizational deficiency, the present study views it as evidence of the dynamic nature of organizational culture. Some degree of difference between formal values and practical implementation may be unavoidable when organizations operate across different units, functions, professional groups, and changing environmental conditions.

The critical issue is therefore not whether differences exist, but whether

organizations possess mechanisms for maintaining sufficient coherence while managing those differences. Communication, leadership, shared values, employee behavior, and cross-unit consistency become mechanisms through which organizations continually restore alignment.

This perspective shifts the concept from a static "culture gap" toward dynamic cultural alignment. Dynamic alignment describes the organizational capacity to continuously reconcile stability and change. It allows the organization to retain its fundamental identity while modifying practices in response to new circumstances.

Such an interpretation is particularly relevant for organizational transformation. Transformation that ignores cultural foundations may create resistance, fragmentation, or loss of organizational identity. Conversely, culture that resists every form of change can prevent organizational renewal. Dynamic alignment provides a middle position in which transformation is permitted without abandoning the organizational core.

5.5 Adaptability and Stability as Complementary Capabilities

The empirical pattern can also be interpreted from the perspective of adaptability and stability. Although these capabilities were not measured as separate constructs in the questionnaire, the findings provide a basis for considering how organizations may

balance continuity and change through cultural alignment.

Organizational values and strategic alignment can provide continuity, shared expectations, and organizational direction, while leadership and cultural implementation determine how these foundations are translated into practice. From this perspective, adaptability does not necessarily require abandoning existing organizational principles. Instead, organizations may adapt their practices while maintaining coherence around fundamental values.

Thus, adaptability and stability can be viewed as complementary organizational requirements. The relevant issue is not whether organizations should prioritize stability or change, but how they can maintain essential organizational foundations while allowing practices and capabilities to evolve.

5.6 From Cultural Alignment to Organizational Resilience

The findings provide a conceptual basis for connecting cultural alignment with organizational resilience. Organizational Values showed the strongest mean score, followed by Strategic Alignment, while Value-Based Leadership recorded the lowest relative mean among the four measured dimensions. Cultural implementation occupied an intermediate position.

This pattern suggests that organizational resilience may be supported by the interaction between a stable value foundation, strategic coherence,

leadership implementation, and cultural practices. However, because organizational resilience was not directly measured in the present questionnaire, this relationship should be understood as a conceptual interpretation rather than a tested causal relationship.

From this perspective, organizational development can be understood as continuous capability renewal. Organizations may strengthen their capacity to respond to change when new capabilities and practices remain connected to established cultural and strategic foundations. Similarly, transformation can be viewed as selective organizational renewal rather than complete replacement of existing organizational principles.

5.7 Implications for Sustainable Competitiveness

The findings also provide a conceptual basis for discussing sustainable competitiveness. The relatively strong positions of Organizational Values and Strategic Alignment indicate the importance of cultural and strategic coherence in supporting organizational functioning. However, competitiveness itself was not directly measured in this study.

Therefore, the present findings should not be interpreted as evidence that cultural alignment directly produces competitive advantage. Rather, dynamic cultural alignment can be considered a potential organizational foundation through which organizations maintain

coherence while responding to changing environmental demands.

In this perspective, sustainable competitiveness may depend on the organization's ability to preserve important organizational principles while continuously developing capabilities, adapting practices, and maintaining strategic direction.

5.8 Theoretical Contribution: Reframing Cultural Alignment as a Resilience Mechanism

The principal theoretical contribution of this study is the proposed reframing of cultural alignment from a static condition of consistency toward a dynamic organizational process. The empirical findings show that Organizational Values, Strategic Alignment, Value-Based Leadership, and cultural implementation represent different but interconnected dimensions of organizational alignment.

Organizational Values can provide a stable cultural foundation, Strategic Alignment connects organizational principles with direction, leadership translates values into organizational behavior, and cultural implementation reflects how these elements are expressed in practice. The interaction among these dimensions provides a useful conceptual basis for discussing organizational resilience, although resilience itself was not directly measured.

The contribution of this perspective is therefore to emphasize the need to manage the relationship between

continuity and change. Dynamic cultural alignment allows organizations to maintain sufficient cultural coherence while creating room for organizational development, transformation, and adaptation. In this sense, resilience is proposed as a broader conceptual implication of effective alignment rather than as a directly tested outcome of the present study.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how organizational values, strategic alignment, value-based leadership, and cultural implementation contribute to an understanding of organizational resilience through the perspective of dynamic cultural alignment. Rather than treating organizational culture as a static system of shared values, the study conceptualizes cultural alignment as an ongoing organizational process through which continuity and change are continuously reconciled.

The findings demonstrate that Organizational Values represent the strongest organizational foundation, followed by Strategic Alignment. This pattern indicates that the organizations examined possess relatively strong normative and strategic foundations. However, the comparatively lower position of Value-Based Leadership indicates that translating organizational values and strategic priorities into consistent leadership practices remains an important area for organizational strengthening. The findings further show that cultural implementation occupies an

intermediate position, suggesting that organizational alignment is present but requires continuous reinforcement across organizational practices and units.

The central conclusion is that organizational resilience should not be understood simply as the ability to maintain existing organizational conditions. Resilience requires the simultaneous preservation of organizational coherence and the capacity for renewal. Organizational values provide a stable cultural core, strategic alignment connects this core with organizational direction, leadership translates values into behavior, and cultural alignment enables organizational members to maintain coherence while responding to changing conditions.

The study therefore proposes dynamic cultural alignment as a useful conceptual lens for understanding how organizations can balance stability and adaptability. Under this perspective, organizational development and transformation do not require the abandonment of established organizational values. Instead, they involve renewing capabilities and practices while maintaining essential cultural principles. Adaptability and stability consequently become complementary organizational

capabilities rather than opposing conditions.

The findings also indicate that sustainable competitiveness should be considered in relation to an organization's capacity for continuous renewal. Organizations that maintain strong cultural and strategic coherence while developing the ability to adapt are better positioned to respond to environmental changes without losing organizational identity. Thus, resilience emerges not from cultural rigidity, but from the ability to preserve what is essential while changing what is necessary.

Overall, this study contributes to the organizational culture and resilience literature by shifting the focus from cultural consistency toward the continuous process of cultural alignment. The proposed perspective emphasizes that resilient organizations are capable of maintaining a stable cultural foundation while simultaneously developing, transforming, learning, and adapting. Dynamic cultural alignment consequently provides a conceptual bridge between organizational continuity and organizational renewal and offers a foundation for understanding how organizations can pursue resilience and sustainable competitiveness in changing environments.

REFERENCES

- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>

- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13, 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266\(200010/11\)21:10/11%3C1105::AID-SMJ133%3E3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11%3C1105::AID-SMJ133%3E3.0.CO;2-E)
- Hung, R. Y. Y., Yang, B., Lien, B. Y. H., McLean, G. N., & Kuo, Y. M. (2010). Dynamic capability: Impact of process alignment and organizational learning culture on performance. *Journal of World Business*, 45(3), 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2009.09.003>
- Joussen, T. P. (2025). Enabling strategic change toward resilience: A systematic review from a dynamic capabilities perspective. *Strategic Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2626>
- 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>
- Leoni, L., & Panizzon, M. (2026). Hotel organizational resilience: A dynamic capabilities framework. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 67(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/19389655261431754>
- Raetze, S., Duchek, S., Maynard, M. T., & Kirkman, B. L. (2022). Resilience in organizations: An integrative multilevel review and editorial perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(10), 1731–1748. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001000>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 361–386. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.361>
- Zollo, M., & Winter, S. G. (2002). Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. *Organization Science*, 13(3), 339–351. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.3.339.2780>