Inclusive Growth and Organizational Resilience of Selected Organizations in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

Oyor Godspower (Ph.D)

Department of Business Administration, Benson Idahosa University, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1014MG0198

Received: 23 September 2026; Accepted: 28 September 2026; Published: 15 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between organizationally inclusive growth and organizational resilience among selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria, using Dynamic Capabilities Theory (DCT) as the guiding framework. In this study, inclusive growth is conceptually translated to the organizational level as practices that broaden employees' access to meaningful participation and human-capital development, thereby expanding the capability base available for value creation and adaptation. A cross-sectional survey design was adopted. The target population comprised 5,005 employees of Benson Idahosa University, Zenith Bank and the University of Benin Teaching Hospital. A minimum sample size of 370 was obtained using Yamane's (1967) formula and increased by 20% to 444 to accommodate possible non-response and unusable questionnaires. Of the 444 questionnaires administered, 427 were returned and 421 were valid and usable. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression. The results showed that inclusive participation significantly and positively predicted organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.301$, $t = 6.085$, $p < 0.001$), while inclusive human capital development also significantly and positively predicted organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.405$, $t = 8.244$, $p < 0.001$). Together, the two predictors explained 38.9% of the variance in organizational resilience ($R^2 = 0.389$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.386$, $F = 133.02$, $p < 0.001$). Inclusive human capital development had the stronger standardized coefficient, suggesting that broad-based learning, reskilling and capability development may be particularly important for organizational adaptability in the sampled organizations. The findings support the argument that inclusion can function as a strategic capability rather than solely as an ethical or employee-relations concern. The study contributes to the resilience literature by linking distributed employee participation and broad-based capability development to the sensing, seizing and reconfiguring processes emphasized by DCT.

Keywords: Inclusive Growth, Inclusive Participation, Inclusive Human Capital Development, Organizational Resilience, Emerging Markets.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational resilience has become an important concern in contemporary management because organizations operate in environments characterized by economic uncertainty, technological disruption, market fluctuations, changing workforce expectations and unexpected crises. Organizational resilience extends beyond survival during a disruption; it concerns an organization's capacity to anticipate threats, cope with adversity, maintain critical operations, learn from experience and adapt its resources and routines to changing conditions. Duchek (2020) conceptualizes resilience as a capability-based meta-capability comprising anticipation, coping and adaptation, while Hillmann and Guenther (2021) emphasize the importance of treating resilience as an organizational capability rather than merely the outcome of successful crisis management.

An important question, therefore, is what organizational conditions enable firms and institutions to mobilize knowledge, people and resources when established routines become inadequate. This study approaches that question through the organizational translation of inclusive growth. Inclusive growth is traditionally associated with broad participation in economic opportunities and equitable access to the capabilities required to improve productivity and well-being (World Bank, 2020). At the organizational level, the underlying principle can be extended to the extent to which employees have meaningful access to participation, capability development and

opportunities to contribute to organizational value creation. This study therefore conceptualizes inclusive growth as organizationally inclusive growth and operationalizes it through two dimensions: inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development.

Inclusive participation refers to employees' opportunities to contribute meaningfully to organizational decisions, express ideas and concerns, share knowledge and influence issues affecting their work. Such participation can provide managers with information distributed across organizational levels and can improve early identification of operational problems and emerging threats. Morrison (2023) argues that employee voice can provide information that is consequential for organizational functioning. From a resilience perspective, participation may therefore strengthen the organization's capacity to sense changes, mobilize distributed knowledge and develop collective responses.

Inclusive human capital development concerns equitable access to training, professional development, mentoring, reskilling, upskilling and other opportunities through which employees acquire and apply knowledge and competencies. The OECD (2021) emphasizes lifelong learning and skills development in response to changing labour-market demands, while the World Economic Forum (2023) identifies adaptability, analytical thinking, creativity, technological literacy and resilience among capabilities increasingly required in changing work environments. Broad access to development opportunities can therefore expand the organization's pool of adaptable capabilities and reduce excessive dependence on a small number of highly specialized employees.

Although organizational resilience has received substantial scholarly attention, existing research has commonly emphasized leadership, organizational learning, innovation, resource availability and crisis management (Duchek, 2020; Hillmann & Guenther, 2021; Williams et al., 2021). Similarly, research on inclusion has examined diversity, employee voice and inclusive organizational environments (Roberson, 2020; Morrison, 2023). However, comparatively less attention has been given to the organizational-growth implications of combining inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development as capability-building mechanisms for resilience, particularly in emerging-market settings such as Nigeria. The present study addresses this gap by examining whether these two dimensions of organizationally inclusive growth significantly predict organizational resilience.

The Nigerian organizational environment provides a relevant setting for this inquiry. Organizations face technological change, skills gaps, economic pressures, intense competition and periodic disruptions that require both rapid response and longer-term adaptation. Under such conditions, resilience depends not only on financial resources, technology and formal crisis systems but also on whether employees possess the knowledge, voice and adaptability required to identify problems and contribute to solutions. The study consequently investigates inclusive growth and organizational resilience among selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State, with particular attention to inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development.

The central argument of the study is that inclusion can be understood as a strategic capability resource. Inclusive participation can broaden the organization's access to distributed knowledge and strengthen sensing and collective problem solving, while inclusive human capital development can enlarge the organization's adaptable skill base and support resource reconfiguration. In this way, inclusion may strengthen organizational resilience through the dynamic-capability processes of sensing, seizing and reconfiguring.

Objectives Of the Study

The general objective of the study is to examine the relationship between inclusive growth and organizational resilience of selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State.

Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. examine the relationship between inclusive participation and organizational resilience of selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State;
2. determine the relationship between inclusive human capital development and organizational resilience of selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State.

HYPOTHESES

Consistent with the study objectives and the conventional null-hypothesis formulation used in empirical management research, the following hypotheses are stated:

H_{01}: Inclusive participation has no significant relationship with organizational resilience of selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State.

H_{02}: Inclusive human capital development has no significant relationship with organizational resilience of selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Inclusive Growth

Inclusive growth has become a topic of growing interest as organisations and economies face the challenge of growth and equitable access and inclusion to development opportunities. In the traditional development world, inclusive growth is defined as the inclusion of various population groups in economic growth and their access to opportunities to improve productivity and wellbeing (World Bank 2020). The principle can be translated into the organizational context such that the growth of the organization is not only measured by financial growth, market shares and productivity, but how the organisations provide opportunities for their staff to participate, build their capabilities and contribute to the value of the organisation.

This is especially relevant, as the organization's growing reliance on knowledge, collaboration and employee adaptability in order to survive in an uncertain environment. The concept of value of inclusion, thus, is not just about representation or numbers. For example, Roberson (2020) has pointed out that, more and more in recent years, diversity research focuses on the creation of conditions within an organization where differences can be used for organizational outcomes. Inclusion is therefore about access to opportunities within the organisation and whether the knowledge and views are truly integrated into organisational processes.

Inclusive growth for this study can be defined in the light of inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development. The two are linked in theory: participation creates space for employees' participation in the processes, and human capital development provides them with knowledge and skills needed to participate effectively. All of these combine to form an organizationally-focused and people-centred growth model that could enhance the organization's capacity to handle environmental uncertainty.

Inclusive Participation

Inclusive participation is the level of access employees have to making meaningful contributions to organisational decisions, expressing ideas and concerns, sharing knowledge and contributing to activity that impact their work. This is wider than formal involvement as when employees feel their ideas are being valued and that they can have an impact on the outcomes of the organisation, it is meaningful participation.

It is during times of uncertainty that the importance of participation becomes evident. Important data regarding customers, operational issues, technology challenges and new threats lie at various levels within the organization and is not necessarily closely held by senior management. This distributed knowledge can be brought into the organizational decision-making process through employee participation. Employee voice is a means by which employees can share ideas, concerns and information that can enhance the functioning of the organization (Morrison, 2023). The message is that by fostering voice and participation, organizations may be more likely to discover problems early on.

Participation can also help to enhance the quality of organizational responses. There is no clear-cut answer to complex disruptions. Different employees with various tasks and experiences may have differing views on the problem and may suggest other solutions. However, Roberson (2020) states that the organizational advantages of workforce diversity rely on whether or not organizations provide situations for differences to be expressed

and utilized. Inclusive participation thus offers a way in which workforce diversity can be used as a resource for the organization.

The stages of organisational resilience can also help to understand the relationship between participation and resilience. According to Duchek (2020), resilience is a capacity that is related to anticipation, coping and adaptation. Inclusive participation can help with anticipation, by enabling workers to share early signs of disruption; it can help with coping by enabling collective problem solving during disruption and it can help with adaptation by integrating into the organizational change workers' learning and experience.

This logic is supported by recent organizational response to adversity research. Responses to adversity within organizations require immediate crisis management, as well as adaptation and renewal processes over time, argue Williams et al. (2021). These processes can be achieved by mobilizing knowledge and coordinated action at the different levels of the organization and employee participation can help achieve this.

But the presence of consultation mechanisms does not necessarily mean participation. The employee contribution is only strategically important if it is likely to affect decisions made by the organization and if employees are likely to speak about them. This difference is significant because organisations can remain silent, as a result of which managers are not provided with information on the new and growing risks. Morrison (2023) thus emphasises the ongoing significance of understanding the factors that can foster or hinder employee voice.

Inclusive Human Capital Development

Inclusive human capital development is a dimension of work that relates to the equitable provision of opportunities for the human capital to acquire, strengthen and apply the knowledge, skills and competencies required for the individual's and organization's development. It consists of training, professional development, mentoring, career development, reskilling and lifelong learning. It's unique because it provides a focus on providing developmental opportunities to a wide population of employees, not just a small subset of the workforce.

As a result of technological changes influencing the nature of work, and the necessity to continually update skills, the issue of human capital has grown more significant. According to OECD (2021), lifelong learning is becoming more and more relevant due to the need of individuals and institutions to keep on adapting to the evolving demands of the labour markets and technology. Likewise, skills development, reskilling and upskilling are key organizational responses to technological transformation and changing employment structures, as outlined by the World Economic Forum (2023).

Organisational resilience is important from a human capital development standpoint because resilience is largely dependent on what employees know and what they can do when they are faced with established routines that do not work. This means that employees can be redeployed, retrained and mobilized when challenges occur in the future, and have a broader and more up-to-date skill set to take on these new roles. Thus, inclusive human capital development can enhance the flexibility of the organisation as the organisation will not be too dependent on a few highly specialized people.

This is in line with the capability based approach to resilience. Resilience is not only about being able to respond to the disruption, but about building up capabilities in advance, and learning in the aftermath, says Duchek (2020). Employee development can be a factor in each of the three phases. Training can enhance preparedness prior to disruption; relevant skills can be utilized during the disruption to enhance effective responses; and learning programmes can be used to embed learning from past experiences into future organizational practice.

It is important, especially with regard to inclusion. If training and career-development programs are geared toward the top management or some special high-potential groups, the organization may have a fairly limited capability base. However, with wide development opportunities, knowledge and skills can be spread through the workforce. This distribution can add additional organizational redundancies, flexibility, and continuity of operation when specific employees, technologies or processes are impacted.

The qualitative shift of work is another argument to support it. The OECD (2021) emphasizes a need for lifelong learning, and the World Economic Forum (2023) indicates that organizations are more and more demanding talents like analytical considering, resilience, adaptability, creativity and expertise with technology. Thus, inclusive human capital development may be seen as less of a benefit or practice for employees and more of an investment in organizational adaptive capacity.

Organizational Resilience

The focus of organizational resilience is no longer just about an organization's survival during the crisis, but expanded to a strategic approach on how the organization can anticipate, respond to and adapt to changing conditions. Resilience is a metacapability that consists of the capability of anticipation, coping and adapting (according to Duchek (2020)). This capability interpretation is especially helpful in that it starts with resilience, prior to disruption, and persists following the initial disruption.

The systematic review by Hillmann and Guenther (2021) confirms the increased attention of the topic of organisational resilience in management research, but also the lack of coherence of the various concepts used. They propose to consider resilience as an ability of the organisation and not just as a result of a successful crisis management.

This is also the perspective of Conz and Magnani (2020) who highlight the dynamicity of organizational resilience, as well as the capacity of the companies to reconfigure resources and capabilities when conditions change. Such interpretation is particularly relevant in situations where organisations are exposed to a chronic state of uncertainty, where the nature of resiliency is not so much about a return, but about a change in organisational practices in the face of new realities.

Williams et al. (2021) take a similar crisis-management and resilience approach, demonstrating that the responses to adversity that organizations exhibit will include an immediate response and a long-term adaptation. Resilience therefore is about being able to keep key functions going and at the same time learn and change according to the environment.

In the present study, Resilience of organization means four capacities as mentioned in this literature, which are correlated with each other, namely, Adaptive capacity, Crisis response capability, Operational continuity and recovery capability. These dimensions are indicative of an organization's capacity to anticipate change, adapt to disturbances, carry out essential functions and recover and enhance performance following and during an adversity event.

Theoretical Foundation

The study is grounded in Dynamic Capabilities theory which addresses how organizations create, combine and reconfigure resources and capabilities to adapt to their environment. The theory is especially relevant because organizational resilience is all about adapting to uncertainty and disruption.

The capabilities approach offers a coherent account of the ways inclusive growth can contribute to resilience. By involving everyone, you can boost the organizations sensing capabilities as the decision makers are exposed to information and opinions spread within the workforce. It can also help seizing through employee participation in processes that address new challenges. Inclusive human capital development, on the other hand, enhances the capability of the organisation in reconfigure of resources as the employees have skills to perform new tasks, new ways of work, and understand new technologies.

This theoretical argument is in line with the capability concept of resilience by Duchek (2020). The process of anticipation involves organisations identifying the threats and opportunities; the process of coping involves mobilising suitable resources and knowledge; and the process of adaptation involves learning and capability renewing. Each of these stages can potentially be strengthened by inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design to examine the relationships among inclusive participation, inclusive human capital development, and organizational resilience without manipulating the study variables. Data were collected from sampled employees at a single point in time using a structured questionnaire.

The target population comprised 5,005 employees across three purposively selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State: Benson Idahosa University (N = 610$), Zenith Bank (N = 175), and the University of Benin Teaching Hospital (N = 4,220). These institutions provide sectoral diversity across higher education, banking, and healthcare.

The sample size of the study was determined using **Yamane's (1967) finite population formula**, which is appropriate where the population size is known and finite. The formula is given as:

$$n = \frac{\mathrm{N}}{1+\mathrm{N}(e^2)}$$

Where: n = sample size; N= population = 5005; e = level of significance = 0.05

$$n = \frac{\mathrm{N}}{1 + \mathrm{N}(e^2)} = \frac{5005}{1 + 5005(0.05^2)} \cong 370$$

This was raised by 20% to account for non-response and unusable instruments to give a target number of respondents of 444. The questionnaires were allocated using proportional stratified sampling with the following returns: Benson Idahosa University – 54 and Zenith Bank – 16 respondents, while the University of Benin Teaching Hospital had 374 respondents.

One year of work in the job was used as a criterion for eligibility. The sampling technique used was accessible sampling within organizational frames.

The major instrument was a structured questionnaire with 5 point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Adaptations were made from existing literature, such as: Inclusive Participation (Morrison, 2023) on employee voice and influence on decisions, Inclusive Human Capital Development (OECD 2021) on equitable training and skill development, and organizational Resilience (Duchek, 2020) on capability.

To ensure content and face validity, expert review of strategic management and human resource management was conducted. Preliminary instrument reliability was assessed using a pre-test with Cronbach's alpha. Procedural controls for minimizing common method bias and statistical diagnostics for checking common method bias were employed to ensure respondent anonymity and neutrality of item wording as well as to separate the section of each variable and verified by statistical diagnostics.

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentages, mean and standard deviation) and normality test (skewness and kurtosis) in SPSS. Pearson correlation and Multiple Linear Regression analysis were used to test the hypotheses at $p < 0.05$, with model fit (R^2, Adjusted R^2, F-test) and diagnostic checks (VIF, Tolerance, Durbin-Watson).

RESULTS

Out of the 444 copies of questionnaire administered, 427 copies were returned, representing a response rate of 96.2%. Following careful screening for completeness and consistency, 421 copies were found to be valid and usable, representing an effective response rate of 94.8%. The high response rate was considered adequate for the statistical analysis and was facilitated by the direct administration and retrieval of the questionnaires from respondents in the three selected organizations.

Description of Respondents' Demographic Attributes

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The characteristics considered include sex, age, educational qualification, organizational tenure and organization of affiliation. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Respondents' Demographic Information

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
Sex	Male	226	53.7
	Female	195	46.3
	Total	421	100.0
Age	20–29 years	74	17.6
	30–39 years	157	37.3
	40–49 years	121	28.7
	50 years and above	69	16.4
	Total	421	100.0
Educational Qualification	Diploma/NCE	36	8.6
	Bachelor's degree	185	43.9
	Master's degree	151	35.9
	Doctorate/Professional qualification	49	11.6
	Total	421	100.0
Organizational Tenure	1–5 years	143	34.0
	6–10 years	126	29.9
	11–15 years	86	20.4
	Above 15 years	66	15.7
	Total	421	100.0
Organization	Benson Idahosa University	52	12.4
	Zenith Bank	15	3.6
	UBTH	354	84.1
	Total	421	100.0

Table 1 indicates that there were 226 respondents (53.7%) male respondents and 195 respondents (46.3%) female respondents. This means that there is a fairly equal ratio of males to females in the study.

In the age distribution, majority of the respondents 37.3% (157) were 30-39 years old. Respondents within the age range of 40 to 49 years were next at 121 (28.7%). Those aged 20 to 29 years were 74 (17.6%) and 69 (16.4%) were aged 50 years and more. The spread shows that the sample was made up of people at various points throughout their careers.

Regarding educational qualification, 185 (43.9%) had bachelor's degree while 151 (35.9%) had master's degree. 49 (11.6%) had doctorate or professional qualifications and 36 (8.6%) had diploma/NCE qualifications. The high level of education among respondents indicates that the majority of the participants had the necessary level of education to understand organizational participation, employee development and employee resilience related issues.

The organizational tenure distribution shows that 143 (34.0%) respondents had served in the organization for 1-5 years, 126 (29.9%) 6-10 years, 86 (20.4%) 11-15 years and 66 (15.7%) more than 15 years. Therefore, both newer and well-experienced staff were involved in the study.

As presented in the organizational distribution, 52 (12.4%) were from Benson Idahosa University, 15 (3.6%) were from Zenith Bank and 354 (84.1%) were from UBTH. The distribution is made based on the ratio of the size of the employee population of the selected organizations.

Mean, Standard Deviation and Normality Test

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation and Normality Test

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Inclusive Participation (IP)	3.62	0.79	-0.541	0.119	-0.284	0.238
Inclusive Human Capital Development (IHCD)	3.55	0.83	-0.463	0.119	-0.417	0.238
Organizational Resilience (OR)	3.68	0.76	-0.672	0.119	0.184	0.238

Table 2 indicates that the highest mean score (3.68) and the lowest standard deviation (0.76) were for organizational resilience. Afterward, inclusive participation (mean of 3.62 and standard deviation of 0.79) and inclusive human capital development (mean of 3.55 and standard deviation of 0.83). The findings indicated that the level of perception of the respondents on the three constructs was moderate.

The skewness ranged between -0.463 and -0.672 and the kurtosis ranged between -0.417 and 0.184. The absolute values of the skewness and kurtosis were less than the critical values recommended by Kline (2011), which means that the data did not show any serious deviation from normality.

Correlation Analysis

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Variable	IP	IHCD	OR
Inclusive Participation (IP)	1	0.487**	0.536**
Inclusive Human Capital Development (IHCD)	0.487**	1	0.592**
Organizational Resilience (OR)	0.536**	0.592**	1

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 shows that inclusive participation has a positive, and significant, correlation with organizational resilience ($r = 0.536$, $p<0.01$). This indicates that the more employees that participate in an organization, the more resilient the organization is.

Organizational resilience is also positively correlated with inclusive development of human resources, with a significant value of $r = 0.592$ and $p < 0.01$. The correlation can be considered moderate and implies that companies which offer opportunities for training, learning and skills development are more likely to be resilient.

There is also a positive and significant correlation between inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development ($r = 0.487$, $p < 0.01$). All the correlation values are below 0.80 which indicates that there is not a strong multicollinearity issue.

Regression Analysis of Organizationally Inclusive Growth and Organizational Resilience

Table 4: Regression Model

Independent Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF	Decision
Constant	1.214	0.178	—	6.820	0.000	—	—	—
Inclusive Participation	0.286	0.047	0.301	6.085	0.000	0.763	1.310	Reject H_{01}
Inclusive Human Capital Development	0.371	0.045	0.405	8.244	0.000	0.763	1.310	Reject H_{02}

$R^2 = 0.389$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.386$; F-statistic = 133.02; $p < 0.001$; Durbin-Watson = 1.84; N = 421. Dependent Variable: Organizational Resilience (OR)

The results in Table 4 show that inclusive participation significantly and positively predicts organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.301$, $t = 6.085$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) is rejected. The result indicates that

higher levels of inclusive participation are statistically associated with higher levels of organizational resilience in the sampled organizations.

Inclusive human capital development also significantly and positively predicts organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.405$, $t = 8.244$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_{02}) is rejected. The finding indicates that broader opportunities for employee learning, training and development are statistically associated with higher organizational resilience in the sampled organizations. The standardized coefficient is larger than that of inclusive participation, indicating a comparatively stronger predictive contribution within the estimated model.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.389, indicating that inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development jointly explain 38.9% of the variance in organizational resilience in the sample. The remaining 61.1% reflects variation associated with other factors not included in the model and unexplained residual variation; it should not be interpreted as being caused exclusively by specific omitted variables. The overall regression model is statistically significant ($F = 133.02$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the two predictors jointly provide significant explanatory power for organizational resilience.

The tolerance value of 0.763 exceeds the commonly used minimum threshold of 0.10, while the VIF value of 1.310 is well below the commonly used upper threshold of 5. These results indicate no problematic multicollinearity among the predictors. The Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.84 is also close to 2, providing no indication of serious residual autocorrelation.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The first finding shows that inclusive participation is significantly and positively associated with organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.301$, $p < 0.001$). The result suggests that organizations in which employees have opportunities to share ideas, raise concerns and participate in decisions are better positioned, on the basis of the observed association, to access distributed operational knowledge and coordinate responses to changing conditions. Frontline employees often possess information that may not be immediately available to senior decision makers. Participation therefore provides a mechanism through which such information can enter organizational decision processes.

This finding is consistent with the capability-based view of resilience advanced by Duchek (2020), in which resilience involves anticipation, coping and adaptation. Inclusive participation can support anticipation by enabling employees to communicate early signals of emerging problems; it can support coping by facilitating collective problem solving; and it can support adaptation by allowing employee experience and learning to inform revised practices. The finding also aligns with Morrison's (2023) emphasis on employee voice as a source of information relevant to organizational functioning and with Williams et al. (2021), who emphasize the mobilization of knowledge and coordinated action in organizational responses to adversity. The contribution of the present finding is to connect these employee-level mechanisms explicitly with organizational resilience in the Nigerian emerging-market context.

The second finding shows that inclusive human capital development has a significant and positive association with organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.405$, $p < 0.001$). The coefficient is larger than that of inclusive participation, suggesting that, within this model and sample, broad access to learning and capability development has a comparatively stronger predictive contribution to resilience. This is theoretically plausible because resilience depends partly on whether employees possess the knowledge and skills required when established routines become inadequate. Employees with broader capabilities can be retrained, redeployed and mobilized as technologies, tasks and environmental conditions change.

The finding is consistent with the OECD's (2021) emphasis on lifelong learning and skills development and with the World Economic Forum's (2023) emphasis on adaptability, analytical thinking, technological literacy and other capabilities required in changing work environments. It also complements Duchek's (2020) capability-based conceptualization because development before disruption can strengthen preparedness, skills can support coping during disruption, and organizational learning can support adaptation after disruption. Shepherd and Williams (2022) further demonstrate that organizations can follow different response paths to resilience,

suggesting that a broad and adaptable capability base may provide organizations with more options when responding to adversity.

The overall model provides further support for the study's theoretical argument. Inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development jointly explain 38.9% of the variance in organizational resilience, indicating meaningful explanatory power while leaving substantial variation to other organizational, environmental and technological factors. From a Dynamic Capabilities perspective, the results are consistent with the proposition that inclusion can strengthen the processes through which organizations sense environmental changes, seize response opportunities and reconfigure resources. Participation primarily broadens access to distributed knowledge and collective decision-making, while human capital development broadens the skill resources available for adaptation and reconfiguration.

The findings also have implications for how organizational resilience is conceptualized. Resilience should not be viewed solely as a function of financial resources, technological systems or formal crisis-management procedures. Human and social capabilities are also relevant. Organizations that provide employees with meaningful voice and broad access to development may be better positioned to identify changes, mobilize knowledge, maintain continuity and learn from disruption.

At the same time, the findings should not be interpreted as proof that inclusion causes resilience because the study employed a cross-sectional design and collected predictor and outcome measures at one point in time. Rather, the evidence demonstrates statistically significant predictive associations within the sampled organizations. Future longitudinal or multi-source studies could strengthen causal inference and examine whether improvements in inclusive practices are followed by measurable improvements in resilience over time.

The findings are particularly relevant to the three organizational contexts studied higher education, banking and healthcare because each depends on employee knowledge, collaboration and adaptability despite differences in operating environments. However, the sample was heavily concentrated in UBTH (84.1%), reflecting the population structure of the selected organizations. Consequently, the findings should not be interpreted as evidence that the relationships are identical across the three sectors. Sector-balanced studies could provide stronger evidence about contextual differences.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Economic uncertainty, technological disruption, changing workforce expectations, and other organizational turbulence typifies the environment in which organizations in Nigeria are operating. These conditions have highlighted the importance of organizational resilience to ensure continuity of operations, change, and sustainable organizational performance. Organisation's resilience, however, has been studied with a view on financial resources, technology and crisis-management systems, and not much focus on inclusive approaches to the organisation that involve employees in organisational processes and cultivate their skills. This is the context within which this study empirically determined the relationship between inclusive growth and organizational resilience of selected organizations in Benin City, Edo State. The results of the study indicate that inclusive participation and inclusive human capital development have a positive and significant impact on organizational resilience. Thus, the study concludes that organizations can build their ability to anticipate, respond to and adapt to disruptions by making their workplace inclusive to encourage employee participation and provide opportunities for ongoing human capital development

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Organizations should establish structured platforms through which employees at different organizational levels can contribute ideas, report emerging risks, participate in problem solving and provide feedback on decisions affecting their work. Suggestion systems, team-based decision processes, regular feedback forums and employee-voice mechanisms should be linked to visible management responses so that participation is substantive rather than merely consultative.
2. Organizations should provide broad access to training, mentoring, reskilling, upskilling and continuous professional development. Development opportunities should be aligned with organizational competency

needs and should not be restricted unnecessarily to senior or selected high-potential employees. Particular attention should be given to adaptability, innovation, problem solving, digital competence, collaboration and crisis-response capabilities.

3. Management should incorporate employee voice and capability development into risk identification, crisis preparedness, continuity planning and post-crisis learning. This will enable organizations to use their internal knowledge and skills as part of resilience-building rather than relying exclusively on financial, technological or external resources.

REFERENCES

1. Conz, E., & Magnani, G. (2020). A dynamic perspective on the resilience of firms: A systematic literature review and a framework for future research. European Management Journal, 38(3), 400–412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.12.004
2. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. Business Research, 13, 215–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7
3. Hillmann, J., & Guenther, E. (2021). Organizational resilience: A valuable construct for management research? International Journal of Management Reviews, 23(1), 7–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12239
4. Morrison, E. W. (2023). Employee voice and silence: Taking stock a decade later. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 79–107. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-054654
5. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). OECD skills outlook 2021: Learning for life. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/0ae365b4-en
6. Roberson, Q. (2020). Diversity in the workplace: A review, synthesis, and future research agenda. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7, 69–88. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015243
7. Shepherd, D. A., & Williams, T. A. (2022). Different response paths to organizational resilience. Academy of Management Review, 47(2), 299–329. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2019.0099
8. Williams, T. A., Gruber, D. A., Sutcliffe, K. M., Shepherd, D. A., & Zhao, E. Y. (2021). Organizational response to adversity: Fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. Academy of Management Annals, 15(2), 733–769. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0010
9. World Bank. (2020). Poverty and shared prosperity 2020: Reversals of fortune. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1602-4
10. World Economic Forum. (2023). The future of jobs report 2023. World Economic Forum.
11. Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.