

The Concept of Organisational Kinetics: A Multidimensional Theoretical Framework

Oyeinkorikiye Stephan Isaiah

PhD, Department of Management
Faculty of Management Sciences
Niger Delta University Wilberforce Island,
Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Abstract

Organisations nowadays operate in volatile, uncertain, complex, and multifaceted environments that demand continuous adaptation and responsiveness. Although existing theories, such as organisational change, dynamic capabilities, and organisational agility, have advanced understanding of transformation processes, they remain fragmented and insufficient for explaining organisational movement as a continuous phenomenon. This paper develops the concept of organisational kinetics as a unifying theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of organisational change. Drawing inspiration from the scientific concept of kinetics, the study conceptualises organisations as dynamic systems driven by interacting forces that determine the speed, direction, and intensity of organisational movement. The framework proposes four interrelated dimensions: adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment. The paper argues that organisational change should be understood as continuous motion rather than as a series of discrete events. The study concludes that organisational kinetics provides a holistic lens for explaining how organisations generate, sustain, and redirect movement through the interaction of adaptive, communicative, structural, and human forces. The framework contributes to organisational theory by integrating behavioural, structural, and communicative perspectives into a unified model and provides a foundation for future empirical research.

Keywords: organisational kinetics, organisational change, dynamic capabilities, communication flow, structural flexibility, adaptive velocity

1. Introduction

Contemporary organisations operate in an environment characterised by rapid technological advancement, market volatility, digital transformation, global competition, and increasing organisational complexity. Under these conditions, the capacity to sense environmental shifts, respond rapidly, reconfigure resources, and sustain organisational momentum has become increasingly important for survival and long-term effectiveness. Recent research suggests that organisational agility is no longer simply associated with flexibility but involves the ability to sense, respond to, and enact change through the rapid reconfiguration of organisational resources and processes (Al Jabri et al., 2024; Asghar et al., 2026). Similarly, studies of organisational change capability increasingly emphasise that organisations must develop capabilities for managing continuous and episodic change, anticipating future disruptions, learning from previous change experiences, and maintaining core activities while adapting to new demands (Karasvirta, 2025). These

developments suggest that organisational effectiveness can no longer be adequately explained through static perspectives that focus primarily on structure, strategy, and outcomes.

Traditional perspectives in organisational behaviour and strategic management have provided valuable explanations of how organisations are designed, managed, and positioned. However, contemporary organisational realities increasingly require theoretical perspectives capable of explaining how organisations move, adjust, interact, and maintain momentum over time. The growing literature on dynamic capabilities, organisational agility, and organisational change capability has advanced this understanding considerably. For instance, recent empirical evidence indicates that dynamic capabilities, such as sensing, seizing, and transforming, can significantly enhance enterprise agility, particularly when supported by digital transformation and information technology alignment (Al Jabri et al., 2024). Similarly, research on workforce agility demonstrates that employees' capacity to adapt is closely connected with readiness for organisational change and digital transformation. Yet, these perspectives often concentrate on particular capabilities or outcomes rather than providing a unified explanation of the interacting forces through which organisational movement occurs. Recent scholarship on organisational change capability has itself acknowledged the multidimensional and dynamic nature of organisational adaptation, highlighting the need to understand change as an ongoing capability rather than merely as a discrete intervention (Karasvirta, 2025).

It is against this background that this paper introduces organisational kinetics as a novel theoretical lens for understanding the dynamics of organisational change and movement. Drawing inspiration from the scientific concept of kinetics, which examines motion and the forces that produce or influence it, organisational kinetics conceptualises the organisation as a dynamic system characterised by continuous movement, interaction, adjustment, and transformation. The central premise is that organisational change should not be understood merely as an event occurring at particular points in time but as an ongoing process generated by multiple and interconnected forces operating within and outside the organisation. This perspective shifts theoretical attention from the question of what an organisation is to the broader question of how and why an organisation moves. Such a shift is increasingly relevant because contemporary organisations must continuously reconfigure their resources, routines, structures, technologies, and workforce capabilities in response to environmental turbulence (Asghar et al., 2026; Chasapi, 2024).

Organisational kinetics, therefore, focuses on the underlying kinetic forces that influence the speed, direction, intensity, and continuity of organisational movement. To operationalise this perspective, the paper proposes four interrelated dimensions: adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment. Together, these dimensions provide a multidimensional explanation of how organisations initiate, facilitate, sustain, and direct movement in changing environments. The framework recognises that organisational movement does not result from a single factor; rather, it emerges from the interaction between an organisation's capacity to respond to change, the flow of information and communication, the flexibility of organisational structures, and the extent to which employee motivation and energy are aligned with organisational objectives.

The first dimension, adaptive velocity, refers to the speed and effectiveness with which an organisation detects, interprets, and responds to internal and external changes. It encompasses responsiveness in

decision-making, speed of implementation, learning speed, and the capacity to translate environmental signals into organisational action. The second dimension, interactional flow, concerns the movement of information, knowledge, communication, feedback, and meaning across organisational boundaries. For example, recent research has shown that change communication can strengthen trust and clarity while influencing employees' cognitive, affective, and behavioural attitudes towards organisational change (Francés-Renau & Miquel-Segarra, 2026). The third dimension, structural flexibility, refers to the capacity of organisational structures, systems, procedures, routines, roles, and decision-making arrangements to be modified or reconfigured in response to emerging demands. A rigid organisation may possess considerable resources but still struggle to move when its structures prevent timely adaptation. Structural flexibility, therefore, recognises that organisational movement requires structures capable of accommodating experimentation, decentralisation, cross-functional collaboration, resource reallocation, and process redesign. Recent research on organisational change capability identifies structural and organisational conditions as important components of the capacity to manage both continuous and episodic change (Asghar et al., 2026)). The fourth dimension, energetic alignment, focuses on the human and motivational energy that sustains organisational movement. Organisations do not change through structures and technologies alone; movement is ultimately enacted by people whose motivation, engagement, psychological readiness, commitment, and well-being influence the extent to which organisational intentions are translated into action. It therefore represents the human-energy dimension of organisational movement. The integration of these four dimensions distinguishes organisational kinetics from conventional approaches that examine organisational change through relatively separate constructs.

More importantly, organisational kinetics complements but also extends existing theories of organisational change, systems, dynamic capabilities, communication, and human resource management. Its intellectual foundation is compatible with Systems Theory, which views organisations as interconnected systems whose components continuously interact with one another and with their external environments. However, organisational kinetics extends the systems perspective by making movement itself the central unit of theoretical attention. It also complements the Dynamic Capabilities View, which emphasises an organisation's ability to sense opportunities and threats, seize opportunities, and transform resources and routines. Recent scholarship continues to demonstrate the relevance of dynamic capabilities, for organisational agility and adaptation, particularly under technological and environmental turbulence (Al Jabri et al., 2024; Asghar et al., 2026). Nevertheless, organisational kinetics differs by bringing together temporal speed, communicative movement, structural reconfiguration, and human energy within one integrated framework.

The need for such a perspective is reinforced by recent developments in organisational change research. Contemporary scholarship increasingly recognises that change capability is dynamic, multidimensional, and context-dependent rather than a simple organisational attribute. For example, conceptualised organisational change capability around multiple temporal dimensions, including learning from past change, managing continuous and episodic change, maintaining organisational operations during change, and anticipating future change. Similarly, Karasvirta (2025) distinguishes organisational change capability from organisational change capacity, demonstrating that the former concerns an organisation's ability to enact and manage change rather than simply possessing resources that make change possible. More recent work further shows that organisational agility requires multilevel microfoundations through which

capabilities are translated into actual organisational responses under technological change (Asghar et al., 2026). These developments support the argument that organisational scholarship needs to pay greater attention to the processes and forces through which movement is generated, rather than concentrating exclusively on change antecedents or outcomes.

A further gap concerns the relationship between communication, organisational structure, and human energy. Although recent research has examined change communication, employee engagement, organisational agility, and change capability, these dimensions are frequently investigated independently. For example, communication research highlights the importance of clarity, trust, participation, and feedback in change processes, whereas agility research focuses more heavily on responsiveness and resource reconfiguration. Similarly, employee engagement studies tend to emphasise psychological and motivational conditions for successful change. Organisational kinetics brings these strands together by proposing that organisational movement is produced through their simultaneous and reciprocal interaction. This integration is particularly important because contemporary organisations increasingly operate through interconnected digital systems, hybrid work arrangements, cross-functional teams, and rapidly changing technological environments, where information, structures, and human behaviour continuously influence one another.

The conceptual gap, therefore, is not necessarily the absence of research on organisational agility, change, communication, or employee motivation. Rather, the gap lies in the absence of an integrated theoretical explanation of organisational movement as a phenomenon produced by interacting kinetic forces. Existing perspectives provide valuable explanations of particular aspects of organisational adaptation, but they provide limited conceptual integration of the speed of response, movement of information, reconfiguration of structures, and mobilisation of human energy within a single framework. Organisational kinetics seeks to address this gap by positioning these forces as mutually reinforcing components of organisational movement. In doing so, it moves beyond viewing change as an intervention and instead conceptualises organisations as systems that are continuously moving, adjusting, accelerating, decelerating, and reconfiguring.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Concept of Organisational Kinetics

Organisational kinetics is conceptually grounded in the proposition that organisations are not static entities but continuously evolving systems characterised by perpetual motion, interaction, and transformation. This perspective draws its intellectual inspiration from the natural sciences, particularly kinetics in physics and chemistry, which examines the relationship between motion and the forces that produce or influence it (Atkins & de Paula, 2018). Organisational kinetics therefore seeks to explain how various organisational forces interact to generate movement, adaptation, and change over time. Organisational kinetics can be defined as the systematic study of the internal and external forces that influence the speed, direction and intensity of organisational actions, processes, and changes, and how these forces affect organisational performance. From a systems perspective, organisations can be understood as open systems that continuously exchange information, energy, and resources with their environment. This aligns with the foundational work of General Systems Theory, which emphasises that system behaviour cannot be understood by analysing components in isolation but must be examined through the interaction of

interdependent parts (von Bertalanffy, 1968). Organisational kinetics extends this view by arguing that these interactions are not merely structural or functional but kinetic in nature, meaning that they produce continuous movement within the organisation.

Unlike traditional organisational models that conceptualise change as episodic or sequential, organisational kinetics assumes that movement is the default state of organisational existence. This view is consistent with process-based theories of organisation, particularly the argument advanced by Weick and Quinn (1999), who distinguish between “episodic change” and “continuous change”. While episodic perspectives view change as a break in equilibrium, continuous change perspectives suggest that organisations are constantly adjusting through ongoing micro-level processes. Organisational kinetics builds on the latter view but goes further by explicitly framing these adjustments as the outcome of interacting forces that generate organisational motion.

A key distinction of organisational kinetics lies in its departure from dominant strategic management theories such as dynamic capabilities. The dynamic capabilities framework emphasises an organisation's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure competencies in response to environmental change (Teece et al., 1997). While this theory significantly advances understanding of adaptability, it still tends to conceptualise change as a capability-driven response rather than continuous motion. Organisational kinetics, in contrast, positions motion itself not capability deployment as the fundamental condition of organisational life. In this sense, capabilities are not isolated mechanisms but expressions of underlying kinetic forces.

Furthermore, organisational kinetics extends beyond the organisational agility literature, which primarily focuses on speed, flexibility, and responsiveness in volatile environments. Agility research tends to emphasise outcomes such as rapid adaptation and responsiveness but often under-theorises the internal forces that generate such outcomes (Rigby et al., 2016). Organisational kinetics addresses this gap by identifying four interacting drivers of movement: adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment. Interactional flow is particularly significant in this framework because it incorporates communication processes as kinetic forces. Communication scholars have long emphasised that information exchange is central to organisational functioning (Morrison, 2014). However, organisational kinetics expands this view by including not only explicit communication but also strategic communication behaviours such as silence, timing of disclosure, and selective information withholding (Isaiah & Akpolo, 2026; Brinsfield, 2013; Milliken et al., 2003). These behaviours influence the direction and intensity of organisational movement by shaping what information circulates and what remains latent within the system.

In addition, organisational kinetics incorporates human motivation and energy as fundamental drivers of motion. This aligns with psychological theories of motivation, particularly Self-Determination Theory, which argues that autonomy, competence, and relatedness enhance intrinsic motivation and sustained engagement (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Within a kinetic framework, motivational energy is not merely an individual-level construct but a systemic force that influences the speed and quality of organisational movement. Structurally, organisational kinetics also challenges traditional hierarchical perspectives by emphasising structural flexibility as a condition for sustained motion. Rather than viewing structure as a fixed framework, it conceptualises structure as a dynamic configuration that continuously adapts to

internal and external forces. This aligns with contemporary organisational design research, which highlights the need for modular, adaptive, and network-based organisational forms in complex environments (Jacobides et al., 2018). Organisational kinetics represents a shift from static and capability-based explanations of organisational behaviour towards a dynamic, force-based understanding of organisational life. By conceptualising organisations as systems in continuous motion shaped by interacting communicative, structural, motivational, and environmental forces, the framework provides a more integrative explanation of how change occurs. It positions motion—not stability—as the default condition of organisations and offers a foundation for rethinking organisational theory from a process-centred perspective.

3. Theoretical Foundations

3.1 Systems Theory

The framework of organisational kinetics is fundamentally grounded in General Systems Theory, which conceptualises organisations as open, interdependent systems composed of interconnected subsystems (von Bertalanffy, 1968). From this perspective, an organisation cannot be fully understood by analysing its parts in isolation because each component continuously interacts with and influences others. This interdependence creates patterns of mutual influence that generate organisational behaviour over time. The relevance of systems theory to organisational kinetics lies in its emphasis on interaction, feedback loops, and interconnectivity, which are essential conditions for organisational movement. In kinetic terms, any change in one subsystem, such as structure, leadership, or communication, produces ripple effects throughout the organisation, altering its overall direction and behaviour. This supports the central assumption of organisational kinetics that organisations are never static but are constantly in motion due to internal and external forces acting simultaneously. However, while traditional systems theory explains interdependence and structure, it does not fully account for the dynamic, “force-driven” nature of movement within systems. Organisational kinetics extends this foundation by arguing that systems are not only interconnected but also continuously energised by forces such as communication flow, motivation, and adaptive responsiveness. Thus, systems theory provides the structural logic, while organisational kinetics introduces the concept of motion as an active and continuous process.

3.2 Dynamic Capabilities Theory

The Dynamic Capabilities framework explains how organisations achieve competitive advantage through their ability to sense opportunities and threats, seize them through resource mobilisation, and transform their resource base accordingly (Teece et al., 1997). This theory is highly relevant to organisational kinetics because it highlights adaptability as a core organisational requirement in rapidly changing environments. The relevance of dynamic capabilities to this study lies in its explanation of organisational responsiveness and adaptation mechanisms. It provides insight into how organisations evolve strategically in response to environmental changes. However, the limitation of this theory is that it tends to conceptualise adaptation as a discrete capability-activation process rather than as a continuous state of organisational existence. Organisational kinetics builds on this limitation by reframing dynamic capabilities as continuous kinetic forces rather than episodic responses. Instead of viewing sensing, seizing, and transforming as separate strategic phases, organisational kinetics interprets them as ongoing movements embedded in everyday organisational functioning. This means that adaptation is not something organisations occasionally do; rather, it is something they are constantly doing through continuous

interaction between structural, communicative, and motivational forces. Therefore, dynamic capabilities theory contributes the strategic foundation for understanding adaptability, while organisational kinetics extends it by embedding capability processes within a continuous motion-based framework.

3.3 Communication and Interaction Theory

Communication theories are central to organisational kinetics because organisational movement is fundamentally shaped by the flow of information, meaning, and interaction. Organisational communication determines how decisions are made, how coordination is achieved, and how power and influence are distributed within the system (Morrison, 2014). A particularly important dimension of communication relevant to this study is organisational silence, which refers to the intentional withholding of information, concerns, or opinions by employees (Milliken et al., 2003). Contrary to traditional assumptions that silence is passive or dysfunctional, research shows that silence can also be strategic, serving purposes such as risk avoidance, political navigation, and power management (Brinsfield, 2013). This makes silence a critical component of interactional dynamics within organisations. The relevance of communication theory to organisational kinetics lies in its explanation of interactional flow as a kinetic force. Communication is not merely a transmission process but a dynamic system of exchange that influences the direction, speed, and intensity of organisational movement. Information flows determine how quickly organisations respond to change (adaptive velocity), how effectively structures are coordinated (structural flexibility), and how aligned actors are in their actions. Organisational kinetics extends communication theory by integrating both overt communication (dialogue, feedback, and information sharing) and covert communication behaviours (silence, withholding, and delayed disclosure) into a unified framework of interactional flow. This provides a more comprehensive understanding of how communication shapes organisational motion beyond traditional linear models.

3.4 Motivation and Energy Perspective

The motivational foundation of organisational kinetics is anchored in Self-Determination Theory, which explains human behaviour in terms of autonomy, competence, and relatedness as key drivers of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Within organisational contexts, these motivational drivers significantly influence employee engagement, commitment, and performance. The relevance of motivation theory to this study lies in its explanation of human energy as a driving force of organisational movement. Organisations do not move solely through structures or systems but through the collective energy, engagement, and psychological investment of individuals. When employees are motivated and aligned with organisational goals, their energy contributes to coordinated action, efficiency, and sustained performance. Organisational kinetics extends this perspective by conceptualising motivation not only as an individual psychological construct but also as a systemic energy force that influences organisational motion. This leads to the concept of energetic alignment, where the direction of employee effort is synchronised with organisational objectives. When alignment is high, organisational movement becomes smooth, efficient, and goal-directed; when misaligned, movement becomes fragmented and inefficient. Thus, motivation theory provides the psychological foundation for understanding individual behaviour, while organisational kinetics integrates this into a broader systemic explanation of how collective energy drives organisational dynamics.

4. Dimensions of Organisational Kinetics

4.1 Adaptive Velocity

Adaptive velocity refers to the rate at which an organisation responds to internal and external environmental changes. It reflects how quickly decisions are made, implemented, and adjusted in response to uncertainty, disruption, or opportunity. In fast-changing environments, organisations with high adaptive velocity are better positioned to maintain competitiveness because they can rapidly translate environmental signals into actionable responses. From a theoretical standpoint, adaptive velocity is closely linked to the idea of organisational agility, which emphasises speed, flexibility, and responsiveness in turbulent contexts (Rigby et al., 2016). However, within the framework of organisational kinetics, adaptive velocity is not merely a performance outcome but a continuous dynamic force that determines the overall movement of the organisation. It reflects the “speed component” of organisational motion, similar to how velocity in physics describes both magnitude and direction of movement. Analogically, adaptive velocity can be compared to the speed of a river current. A fast-moving river adjusts quickly to obstacles, changes direction smoothly, and reshapes its path over time. Similarly, organisations with high adaptive velocity respond fluidly to disruptions such as technological shifts, market volatility, or policy changes. In contrast, organisations with low adaptive velocity resemble stagnant water, where responses are delayed and adaptation is constrained. Thus, adaptive velocity is a critical determinant of how quickly organisational systems transition from one state to another while maintaining alignment with environmental demands.

4.2 Interactional Flow

Interactional flow describes the movement of information, meaning, and communication within organisations. It encompasses both formal communication channels, such as reporting structures and meetings, and informal interactions, such as conversations, networks, and social exchanges. Importantly, it also includes strategic communication behaviours such as silence, selective disclosure, timing of information release, and active listening (Morrison, 2014; Milliken et al., 2003; Brinsfield, 2013). Within organisational kinetics, interactional flow represents the communication-based force that drives coordination and shared understanding. Efficient interactional flow reduces ambiguity, enhances collaboration, and improves decision-making speed. When communication flows smoothly, organisational movement becomes more coordinated and predictable. Conversely, blocked or distorted communication creates friction that slows organisational motion. Analogically, interactional flow can be compared to the circulatory system in the human body. Just as blood circulation ensures that oxygen and nutrients reach all parts of the body, organisational communication ensures that information and meaning reach all parts of the organisation. If circulation is smooth, the system functions effectively; if blocked, performance declines. Similarly, poor interactional flow leads to organisational “clots”, such as misinformation, silos, or delayed decisions. Interactional flow therefore serves as the informational engine of organisational kinetics, shaping how knowledge, meaning, and decisions move across the system.

4.3 Structural Flexibility

Structural flexibility refers to the ability of organisational systems, hierarchies, roles, and processes to adapt, reorganise, or transform in response to internal demands and external environmental pressures. It reflects the extent to which an organisation can redesign itself without losing coherence or functionality. Flexible structures enable organisations to innovate, decentralise decision-making, and respond effectively to disruptions. In contrast, rigid structures slow adaptation and reduce responsiveness. Structural flexibility

is therefore a key enabler of sustained organisational movement in uncertain environments. This dimension aligns with systems-based views of organisations, which emphasise adaptability and interdependence within organisational structures (von Bertalanffy, 1968). However, organisational kinetics extends this perspective by framing structure not as a fixed arrangement but as a dynamic configuration that continuously adjusts in response to kinetic forces such as communication flow and environmental pressure. Analogically, structural flexibility can be compared to the flexibility of a bamboo tree in strong wind. Unlike rigid trees that break under pressure, bamboo bends and adapts to external forces while maintaining structural integrity. Similarly, organisations with high structural flexibility bend in response to environmental pressures without collapsing, enabling survival and continued movement. Thus, structural flexibility functions as the architectural adaptability of organisational kinetics, allowing movement to occur without structural breakdown.

4.4 Energetic Alignment

Energetic alignment refers to the degree of synchronisation between employee motivation, engagement, and organisational objectives. It captures how effectively individual psychological energy is directed towards collective organisational goals. When alignment is high, employees exhibit greater commitment, persistence, and productivity, resulting in sustained organisational performance. This dimension is strongly grounded in Self-Determination Theory, which argues that autonomy, competence, and relatedness enhance intrinsic motivation and well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Within organisational contexts, these motivational drivers translate into higher engagement and improved performance outcomes. In the context of organisational kinetics, energetic alignment is conceptualised as the driving force of organisational motion at the human level. While adaptive velocity determines speed, interactional flow determines communication efficiency, and structural flexibility determines adaptability, energetic alignment determines the level of sustained effort behind movement. Analogically, energetic alignment can be compared to the fuel system of an engine. Even if an engine is well designed and structurally sound, it cannot function without fuel. Similarly, an organisation may have strong systems and communication flows, but without aligned human energy, its movement becomes weak or inconsistent. When fuel (energy) is properly aligned and consistently supplied, the system operates smoothly and efficiently. Another analogy is that of a rowing team in a boat. Even if the boat is well built (structure) and the water is navigable (environment), progress depends on all rowers synchronising their energy and direction. If one rower is out of sync, movement becomes inefficient. Likewise, energetic alignment ensures coordinated effort towards shared organisational goals. Therefore, energetic alignment represents the motivational and psychological force that sustains continuous organisational movement within the kinetic framework.

5. Integrated Framework of Organisational Kinetics

The four dimensions of organisational kinetics; adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment do not operate in isolation. Rather, they function as an interdependent and mutually reinforcing system of forces that collectively generate continuous organisational movement. Within this framework, organisational behaviour is understood as the outcome of dynamic interactions among these forces rather than as the product of any single dimension.

First, adaptive velocity is strongly shaped by interactional flow. The speed at which an organisation responds to environmental changes is directly influenced by how efficiently information moves across its

communication networks. When interactional flow is effective, characterised by clear messaging, timely feedback, and reduced communication barriers, decision-making becomes faster and more accurate. Conversely, communication breakdowns, such as information silos, delayed reporting, or strategic silence, can slow adaptive responses and reduce organisational responsiveness (Morrison, 2014; Milliken et al., 2003). In kinetic terms, interactional flow acts as the informational lubricant that reduces friction and increases the speed of organisational motion. Second, structural flexibility provides the enabling architecture for adaptation and movement. Even when communication flows efficiently and adaptive velocity is high, rigid organisational structures can constrain responsiveness. Structural flexibility allows organisations to reconfigure roles, processes, and hierarchies in response to emerging conditions without disrupting overall coherence. This aligns with systems-based thinking, which emphasises that adaptive systems must maintain internal flexibility to survive environmental turbulence (von Bertalanffy, 1968). In this sense, structural flexibility functions as the organisational elasticity that absorbs external shocks while preserving continuity of movement.

Third, energetic alignment sustains and powers organisational movement over time. While adaptive velocity determines speed and structural flexibility enables adjustment, energetic alignment ensures sustained effort, commitment, and engagement from organisational members. When employee motivation is aligned with organisational goals, individual and collective energy is efficiently directed towards productive action (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Without this alignment, even highly flexible and communicatively efficient organisations may experience stagnation due to disengagement or inconsistent effort. Energetic alignment, therefore, acts as the driving force or fuel source that sustains continuous motion within the system. Importantly, these interactions create feedback loops within the organisational system. For example, high energetic alignment can enhance interactional flow, as motivated employees are more likely to communicate openly and effectively. Improved interactional flow, in turn, strengthens adaptive velocity by enabling quicker and more informed decisions. Similarly, structural flexibility reinforces both interactional flow and energetic alignment by creating an environment that supports participation, autonomy, and responsiveness. Collectively, these interdependencies form a dynamic kinetic system in which organisational movement is continuously produced, adjusted, and sustained. Rather than viewing organisations as entities that transition from one stable state to another, organisational kinetics conceptualises them as systems in perpetual motion, constantly shaped by interacting forces.

Within this perspective, stability is redefined. Stability does not represent the absence of change or motion; rather, it is understood as a temporary equilibrium state resulting from balanced kinetic forces. When adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment are in equilibrium, organisational movement becomes smooth, coordinated, and predictable. However, when one or more forces become misaligned or weakened, instability emerges, resulting in friction, inefficiency, or disrupted organisational performance. Analogically, this integrated framework can be compared to a moving vehicle system. Adaptive velocity represents the speed of the vehicle, interactional flow represents the efficiency of its internal communication system (signals and control mechanisms), structural flexibility represents the vehicle's ability to adjust to road conditions, and energetic alignment represents the fuel and engine power driving the system. When all components function harmoniously, the vehicle moves smoothly and efficiently. When one component fails, the entire system experiences disruption. The integrated framework of organisational kinetics provides a holistic explanation of organisational movement as a

continuously evolving system shaped by interacting communicative, structural, and motivational forces. It emphasises that organisational effectiveness is not the result of isolated factors but the dynamic balance of multiple kinetic forces operating simultaneously within a complex system.

6. Reframing Organisational Change

Organisational kinetics reframes organisational change as a process of continuous motion rather than as a series of discrete, episodic events. Traditional change theories often conceptualise organisations as moving from one relatively stable state to another through planned interventions or structured phases. However, process-based perspectives argue that organisations are constantly in flux, with change emerging through ongoing adjustments embedded in everyday activities rather than occurring as isolated transformations (Weick & Quinn, 1999). From this viewpoint, what is often perceived as organisational stability is better understood as a temporary equilibrium shaped by ongoing internal and external interactions. Within the organisational kinetics framework, this continuous motion is generated through the interaction of four key dimensions: adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment.

Adaptive velocity determines how quickly organisations respond to environmental changes, while interactional flow governs how effectively information, meaning, and communication circulate within the system. Structural flexibility enables organisations to reconfigure processes and structures in response to emerging demands, and energetic alignment ensures that employee motivation and engagement sustain the change process over time. Together, these dimensions explain how change is continuously produced, adjusted, and maintained within organisations rather than occurring as a one-time shift between states. This perspective aligns with and extends process-based theories of change by emphasising that organisations are always in a state of becoming rather than becoming something new at fixed intervals (Weick & Quinn, 1999). It also draws support from systems thinking, which highlights the importance of interdependence and feedback in shaping organisational behaviour (von Bertalanffy, 1968). In addition, communication dynamics and employee motivation play central roles in sustaining movement, as information flow and psychological engagement directly influence how change unfolds over time (Morrison, 2014; Deci & Ryan, 2000). In this sense, organisational kinetics provides a more integrated explanation of change as a continuous, multidimensional process driven by interacting forces.

7. Theoretical Implications

The organisational kinetics framework makes a significant contribution to organisational theory by offering a unified, multidimensional model that integrates previously fragmented perspectives on organisational behaviour and change. Rather than treating organisational change, communication, structure, and motivation as separate domains of inquiry, the framework conceptualises them as interdependent kinetic forces that collectively generate continuous organisational movement. In doing so, it bridges key gaps between systems theory, communication theory, and dynamic capabilities literature, which have traditionally developed along parallel but largely disconnected trajectories (von Bertalanffy, 1968; Teece et al., 1997; Morrison, 2014). Specifically, the framework extends systems thinking by moving beyond interdependence to emphasise motion as the defining characteristic of organisational life. It also expands dynamic capabilities theory by reframing adaptation not as episodic capability deployment but as continuous movement embedded in everyday organisational processes. Furthermore, it enriches communication theory by incorporating both formal and informal interactional processes, including

strategic silence and timing of disclosure, as central drivers of organisational dynamics (Milliken et al., 2003; Brinsfield, 2013). Overall, organisational kinetics advances a more integrative and process-oriented understanding of organisations as dynamic systems in perpetual motion.

8. Managerial Implications

From a managerial perspective, the organisational kinetics framework provides a practical lens for understanding and improving organisational performance in dynamic environments. Managers can use the framework to enhance organisational responsiveness (adaptive velocity) by improving decision-making speed and reducing bureaucratic delays. It also highlights the importance of strengthening communication systems (interactional flow) to ensure timely, accurate, and transparent information exchange across all levels of the organisation. In addition, the framework emphasises the need for structural adaptability (structural flexibility), encouraging managers to design more responsive, decentralised, and flexible organisational structures that can adjust to environmental uncertainty. Equally important is the role of employee motivation and engagement (energetic alignment), which ensures that human energy is effectively directed towards organisational goals (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In managing both structural and human dimensions of organisational movement simultaneously, managers can create more resilient, adaptive, and high-performing organisations capable of sustaining continuous change.

9. Research Gaps and Future Research

Despite its theoretical contributions, organisational kinetics remains an emerging conceptual framework that requires substantial empirical validation to establish its robustness and practical applicability. At present, the framework is primarily theoretical, and there is a need for future studies to operationalise its core dimensions; adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment into reliable and valid measurement scales. Such measurement development would enable researchers to quantitatively assess the strength, interaction, and predictive power of each dimension within different organisational contexts. In addition, future research should employ quantitative and longitudinal research designs to examine how kinetic forces evolve over time and how they jointly influence organisational performance, adaptability, and sustainability. Cross-sectoral studies are also essential to determine whether the framework is universally applicable or context-dependent, particularly across industries such as banking, healthcare, manufacturing, and public administration. Furthermore, comparative studies across different cultural and economic environments would help to refine the framework and enhance its generalisability, thereby strengthening its contribution to organisational theory and practice.

10. Conclusion

This paper has developed the concept of organisational kinetics as a multidimensional theoretical framework for understanding organisational change from a dynamic and process-oriented perspective. It conceptualises organisations as systems in continuous motion and shifts scholarly attention away from static structures and episodic models of change towards the underlying forces that continuously generate organisational movement. The framework demonstrates that organisational kinetics is shaped by the interaction of four interdependent dimensions: adaptive velocity, interactional flow, structural flexibility, and energetic alignment. Collectively, these dimensions explain how organisations respond, adapt, and evolve in complex environments. The study concludes that organisational kinetics provides a holistic lens for explaining how organisations generate, sustain, and redirect movement through the interaction of

adaptive, communicative, structural, and human forces. It provides a more integrated and holistic understanding of change by emphasising that organisational stability is not the absence of motion but a temporary balance of dynamic forces operating within the system.

References

1. Al Jabri, M. A., Shaloh, S., Shakoor, N., Haddoud, M. Y., & Obeidat, B. Y. (2024). The impact of dynamic capabilities on enterprise agility: The intervening roles of digital transformation and IT alignment. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 10(2), 100266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100266>
2. Almazrouei, F., Sarker, A. E., Zervopoulos, P., & Salman, Y. (2024). Organizational structure, agility, and public value-driven innovation performance in the UAE public services. *Heliyon*, 10(13), e33261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33261>
3. Asghar, J., Kanbach, D. K., & Kraus, S. (2025). Toward a multidimensional concept of organizational agility: A systematic literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 76, 885–911. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-025-00497-6>
4. Asghar, J., Weiss, L., & Kanbach, D. K. (2026). Organizational agility under technological change: A qualitative study of multilevel microfoundations across dynamic capability domains.
5. Atkins, P., & de Paula, J. (2018). *Atkins' physical chemistry* (11th ed.). Oxford University Press.
6. Brinsfield, C. T. (2013). Employee silence motives: Investigation of dimensionality and development of measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(5), 671–697.
7. **Chasapi, P., Pateli, A., Mylonas, N., & Kourouthanassis, P. (2024).** The impact of organizational resources on organizational agility in hospitality industry: A dynamic capabilities approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 26, e2779. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2779>
8. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
9. **Francés Renau, A. L., & Miquel-Segarra, S. (2026).** Comunicación interna y transformación organizativa: Cultura, escucha y gestión del cambio en el contexto organizativo contemporáneo. *methaodos.Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 14(1), m261401a05. <https://doi.org/10.17502/mrcs.v14i1.923SSRN>. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6536883>
10. Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(8), 2255–2276.
11. Karasvirta, S. (2025). Organizational change capability: Toward a conceptual and empirical definition. *Strategy & Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SL-08-2025-0267>
12. Karasvirta, S. (2026). Managing planned organizational change: A closer look at change organizations, change management practices and organizational change capability [Doctoral dissertation, University of Turku].
13. Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453–1476.
14. Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 173–197.
15. Rigby, D. K., Sutherland, J., & Noble, A. (2016). Agile at scale. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(5), 88–96.

16. Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
17. von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory*. George Braziller.
18. Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361–386.