Strategic Resilience Boon or a Bane?

Dr. V. Basil Hans[1*], Chethan Shettigar[2], Roshel Pinto[3]

[1]Research professor at Srinivas University in Mangalore.

[2]Assistant Professor at St. Aloysius Deemed to be University in Mangalore.and PhD student at Mangalore University

[3]Process Associate, Gallagher, Bangalore and a PhD student at Srinivas University in Mangalore.

Abstract: Strategic resilience has become an important idea in organisational theory and practice during a time of uncertainty, turbulence, and rapid change. This article looks at the two sides of strategic resilience and asks if it is a good thing that makes companies more adaptable and gives them a competitive edge, or a bad thing that makes them less flexible and wastes resources. Using case studies from different fields, the essay looks at how companies understand and use resilience tactics, the trade-offs that come with them, and the aspects in their environment that affect whether they succeed or fail. It also talks about the conflict between being flexible in the short term and being ready for the long term. It gives leaders a sophisticated framework to help them deal with resilience as both a strategic need and a possible strategic trap. The essay ends by suggesting ways to build resilience that is both strong and flexible, so you don't make the mistakes of overinvesting or not aligning your goals.

Keywords: Strategic Resilience, Organisational Adaptability, Risk Management, Competitive Advantage, and Strategic Decision-Making.

Cite This Article:

Hans, V. B., Shettigar, C, Pinto, R., (2025). Strategic Resilience Boon or a Bane?. *World Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 2*(6), 17-28

Is strategic resilience a good thing or a bad thing?

1. What is Strategic Resilience?

The COVID pandemic has caused more and more problems, such as more extreme weather because of climate change, more protests and unrest because of growing inequalities, especially those related to wealth, the risk of job losses because of AI displacement, and a new political landscape in some parts of the world and a shift in geopolitical power. These outside variables work together to make the system more unstable. During this time of uncertainty, businesses are encouraged to be more resilient to gain a competitive edge (Stokes et al., 2019). Most of the research that has been done on the link between resilience and organisational performance has a modernistic view (Stokes et al., 1970). So, resilience is the ability to bounce back from hard times and see a better future, either by getting better or by becoming more useful or skilled.

Putting this point of view into practice through built notions like risk culture, resilient organisations, or a failure-safe workplace leads to the search for decision-making rules to make this competitive victory happen. Because of this normative continuity, modernistic paradigms focus on viability and performance while ignoring non-conforming behaviour, complaints, and whistleblowing at the same time. On the other hand, some people see resilience as a bad social phenomenon because they think of power as having many dimensions instead than only being focused on material and resource-based superiority that only a few top executives can access. Also, resilience could show up in rude, unexpected, and antisocial ways to go against hegemony and the common good. This creates a version of common vulnerability that is hard for most people to imagine, while the resistance that some people could show could be seen as a legitimate way to break away from good governance.

2. The Idea of Resilience in Strategy

Strategy is defined as "the reconciliation of the different logics of extant and emergent strategy," and it seems to be more about making strategy here. People think of resilience at the organisational level as agility, which is simply put as "strategic resilience." Dynamic capabilities that bring together techniques for dealing with catastrophic risks and strategies for building resilience. In this case, resilience means a rational unity and harmony that comes from analytic redundancy and integrity self-consistency, which guide strategic responses to systematic risk. Sometimes, getting to resilience might mean going through a "crunch" that isn't too bad or hard to handle. Other times, it could be a disaster, a mess, or something amazing, like a break in the action, a change in the condition of affairs, an annoying interruption, a restoration, or an emergence.

17

Taking a more critical and artistic view of resilience shows and makes clear the scary and unexpected effects of strategic resilience. Pareto once said, "Madmen everywhere act on some hidden urge they can't resist." Strategic resilience is acting like a manager, being reasonable, and using a market-based interpretive framework. Resilience used to control or forecast things can not only be wrong, but it might also be defined as completely systemic, organisationally and managerially unsound, and avoidable. The eco-systemic logic might see resilience as chaos or lack of accuracy, or as events that are unpredictable and disorganised.

The possibility of this organisational chaos could also point to some kind of disaster or madness. It is clear that scholarly advancements of strategic resilience critical viewpoints should give both aesthetic and practical critiques of managerialism that involve organisational instability when looking at different alignments (Stokes et al., 1970). Some people criticise strategic resilience as a managerialistic idea that doesn't explain how this way of thinking might affect organisations on a small scale. The goal is to criticise the idea of "strategic resilience" as used by strategy researchers and look into the problems that come with it, as well as look at critical views on overly simple management. These claims about strategic resilience could have other, less obvious meanings that go beyond just figuring out how to keep a competitive edge or deal with a changing environment. What could these effects mean for businesses and the people who work for them?

3. The historical background of strategic resilience

For decades, researchers have been studying resilience, even before it was a topic in psychotherapy and organisational behaviour. According to the modernist view, resilience is the same as "normality," which is a psychologically stable state that can be seen in certain general behaviours (Stokes et al., 1970). In terms of individuals, this usually means being optimistic even when things are hard. For the organisation, it means having coherence, control, and a structured and disciplined life. The field of strategic HRM has concentrated on a set of managerial strategies that are meant to shape and embed behaviours in the workplace.

As a way to look at the (micro-) dynamics of strategic resilience, organisational ambidexterity is offered. Organisational ambidexterity gives us a way to think about how different normative (habits) and critical (disruptive) processes of resilience function together and affect each other. It does this by focussing on the "lived realities" (lenses) of resilience that are shaped by society and the situation. So, there are a lot of default parts of strategic HRM that are built and regulated "human tissue" that follow the rules of "positive" and "proprocess." On the one hand, resilient people and behaviours could be perceived as more "bland" and compliant, following the norms and acceptable behaviour of the organisation, including continuing to reproduce and support the status quo. Even while they may have some good points in their own way, these views are very different from the idealised standards of resilience that most modern heuristics use. On the other side, resilience may bring out a lot more complex and nuanced responses at many levels. Some examples of this are questioning the organization's overall purpose or why there is so much bureaucratic control, getting angry at the organisation for trying to cut jobs or hire new managers, having disagreements and fights between groups over this cut-off or that playoff loss, and so on.

4. Theoretical Frameworks for Understanding Resilience

What are the theoretical frameworks that will be employed to answer the research question? What important ideas will the literature search look at and explain in more detail? The paper says that we should use two theoretical frameworks to understand strategic resilience: complex adaptive systems (CAS) and organisational competence. These two theories help us understand resilience in a more complex way. The study also needs to help us understand resilience in the context of organisations, between organisations, and at the national level.

What does "resilience" mean? Resilience means being able to bounce back from problems, adjust to new situations, and keep going even when things get tough. The word usually means coming back on track fast, therefore it might mean being able to handle shocks, recovering rapidly from shocks, or changing in a way that makes recovery hard. When organisations are resilient, they can answer questions like "Do organisations bounce back?" and "If so, to what state?" Will organisations go back to how they were before the shock, or will adaptation change that state? And to make things even more complicated, resilience can mean both the quality of the system and the behaviours of the people in it. Because of this, it may be hard to prove the quality of "resilience" after something disruptive has happened (D. Raab et al., 2015). The idea of resilience has similar meanings and roots, but it usually doesn't have the same empirical referents and analytical frames. Resilience might mean strength and adaptability, but it means quite various things that can be achieved through different behavioural methods. There are four levels at which we can look at resilience: (1) the micro or system level; (2) the organisational level; (3) the inter-organizational level; and (4) the firm-ecosystem level or work ecosystem level.

Key Idea 2 (Sub-topic), Key Idea 3 (Sub-topic), Key Idea 4 (Sub-topic), and so on. If there is more than one key idea, this should happen again.

5. Boon: Benefits of Strategic Resilience

This article has looked at the literature on resilience and organisational resilience in depth because of the requirement for strategic resilience. But to come up with a good answer to the question, we need to know a lot more than just performance measures and measures of operational resilience. We need to know why some organisations are more resilient than others, how the dynamics of the larger social system can help or hurt organisational resilience, and how to create emotions and understanding that make resilience a part of organisations. To answer the many questions raised in this paper (Stokes et al., 2019), it is important to keep working on these kinds of things. It is important to keep learning about how organisations create and use structures, norms, rituals, and mechanisms that lead to good performance, keep big changes in parameters that are important to stakeholders from happening, and deal with social factors that will make strategic resilience harder. If this basic understanding is to be expanded and "scaled up" to include a description of the larger cultural dynamics and prevailing stakeholder ideologies that determine resilience, we will need to understand even more and map out the mechanisms. Finally, even though resilience is often thought of as a "capacity" and an active effort, there still needs to be work done to create techniques that build trust, understanding, emotions, and a broad understanding between stakeholders at the organisational level. These techniques need to be able to embed resilience in

organisations in a way that makes it legitimate and in line with stakeholder desires. If these kinds of ideas and frameworks are looked at, it may be easier to answer the question of whether organisations' strategic resilience is a good thing or a bad thing.

5.1. Better capacity to adapt

The main argument against strategic resilience is that the companies that support it are naturally slow and bureaucratic, which makes them very flexible but also very risk-averse. In the late 1990s, theorists and consultants came up with the idea of "resilient organisations." These were organisations that were bureaucratic and had a lot of managers and personnel, which made it hard to alter things quickly. In addition to the sector, the organisations' physical locations rendered activities dangerous because of bad weather and a continual stream of outside compliance regimes. But organisations that are more resilient find it harder to make big changes that are too quick or dramatic. Fiona's request, on the other hand, is questioned since organisations may not be able to adapt quickly enough, even if they try big-bang changes and radical change. Researchers and practitioners agreed that if big changes do happen, they usually happen at times that are hard to anticipate and hard to see coming, and they often lead to creative stagnation.

Still, the first allegation was usually based on old mental maps that showed organisations, markets, and their environments as stiff and wooden. Organisations spend time and money creating a shared routine, but what they actually do is so different from what they say they would do that it confuses people who are watching. There are many dynamic qualities that have been linked to how organisations adapt, survive, and succeed when it comes to managing knowledge, knowledge bases, or knowledge networks. "Super-flexible organisations" are those that are more flexible and adaptable than others and do better than expected (Evans & Bahrami, 2020).

5.2. Long-Term Competitive Edge

In light of what has been said thus far, this part talks about how resilience and supply chain performance assessment work together. We talk about how this kind of integration can help a business stay ahead of the competition. The methodology for classifying indicators of supply chain performance measurement that was suggested in Section 4 is improved by using resilience as a starting point. This new way of thinking about the Dynamic Capabilities (DC) view has led to the creation of the firm performance configuration framework. The theoretical connections between the proposed constructs and other assertions are explained in further detail.

Researchers have recognised firm performance as a complex and interconnected idea, and they have also tried to fully explain how to assess it. The supply chain resilience literature focusses on a wider range of internal and external factors that affect resilience. These kinds of variables can help connect a company's strategic goals with its performance, which can help us understand how resilience leads to better performance. The unique relationships and structures of a business can provide it a long-term competitive edge. This point of view makes it possible for future study to look into how this kind of supply chain resilience can also lead to long-term competitive advantage (Yao & Meurier, 2012).

This technique of extending the debate not only identifies the states of supply chain performance, but it also calls attention to how companies may set up their supply chains to work better. There is a

big problem with strategy that needs to be fixed: why is one part of performance given more attention than another? To solve this problem, we need both a theoretical framework and a practical approach. To show the connections between social capital-based innovation ability, outcomes, and sustained competitive advantage, an alternative theory of social-based micro foundation-based sustainable competitive advantage is offered. This configuration paradigm gives us a new way to think about how resiliency leads to a long-term competitive advantage in the supply chain. There is also a chance that future research may look into how to deal with the shifting relationships between sustainability practices, sustainable performance, and competitive advantage as external conditions change beyond the efforts a company takes to be more sustainable.

5.3. Reducing Risk

With this data in hand, we can figure out the next candidates for risk mitigation. Within the scope of measures to stop disruptive events, the risk mitigation candidates are found. Also, past experiences with certain circumstances are taken into account. We find the best people to help us deal with the most important risks by having three brainstorming sessions with personnel from all departments, including operations, sales, and controlling. The risk mitigation possibilities offer a wide range of strategic options that are very important, thus they are not very clear. For a specific proposal of action, more accurate actions need to be worked out. This study doesn't want to give specific steps to take; instead, it wants to suggest a new way to deal with problems in a systematic way.

To emphasise the importance of major disruptions, all candidates are chosen to show high magnitude impact and high relevance of direct potential impacts on the operations of first-tier suppliers. We talk about some interesting scenarios on how competitors might react during the attack. First, all of the risks and cascade consequences of the suppliers are looked at to see whether they could lead to any failures during this time period. To do this, a damages tree is made that shows who the most important providers are. This method is based on how disruption mechanisms affect each level in a chain reaction. We use a number of factors to evaluate each supplier's ability to have effects on a one-on-one basis. The supplier group is chosen depending on how likely single impacts are to happen and how important cascade consequences are. In this case, using automated scouring methods is suggested to have a better look at certain vendors.

5.4. New ideas and growth

The idea of resilience is up for debate. It means being unsure, especially about how stability and change work together. Change is good when it leads to new ideas, but bad when it makes something less effective or capable. When change is necessary, the outcome depends on how flexible the parts of an organisation are and how well they can be rearranged. This concept explains why two firms in the same situation can react in quite different ways. One may start a surge of new ideas that lead to a new path of progress, while the other falls into decline, which is the moment when actions seem to stop success. So, to avoid going down, companies require diverse kinds of success and failure that have different genetic makeups but the same evolutionary contexts. They also need extra pathlengths that make it easier to make big changes, and multiple paths that modify the fitness landscape. Resilience is the ability to create and keep this beneficial give-and-take relationship going.

As businesses grow up, they start to see the difference between growth that is out of control and growth that is strong. A lot of people worry that an organization's ability to change would make things less stable. The conventional advice is to stay away from silly experiments that could lead to disastrous path-dependencies. Business leaders are worried that the future will be a patchwork of decreases that no one can stop, with disparities between regions and types. But if all conceivable "researchers" did strategy trials, cross-firm descent routes would have quite diverse reaction surfaces. For example, a peer group could anticipate to uncover an ingenious rival. There are a lot of ways that resilience can be built up, including co-inventors in an industry or problem-seekers starting a Richardsonian revolution, black swan catches of unique results, or even strategic drift in the nonlinear regime in general.

Innovation is the process of coming up with and putting into action new ideas for products, services, processes, and ways of doing things. It comprises moving ideas from one service or procedure to another or from one form to another. This means that innovation can represent both a new idea or combination of technologies and the complete chain of actions and tasks that make the new ideas happen. People typically call this process the "innovation system." There are many ways to grow, and they all come from different professional points of view. One way to look at growth is as the increase in size of something, like the company's most important products, from 5 million pieces produced to 8 million pieces, in profit, cash flow, customers, and so on. Another way to look at it is as something that grows up in a more qualitative way, like the company's revenue is still going up but in a less efficient way, like 60 cents of profit for every euro of revenue instead of 70 cents (Brito Fernandes & Liebenstein, 2011).

6. Bane: Problems with Strategic Resilience

Some people have called this approach a "mobility trap" for the United States that threatens long-term strategic resilience (Parker, 2015). Policymakers face a lot of problems when it comes to bringing together military innovation and adaptation efforts. These problems include the technical and operational issues that come with distributed lethality, anti-access/area denial environments, increased cyber competition, and the problems of keeping global supply chains safe. In general, long-term strategic resilience seems to make U.S. policy stronger in this deep, complicated, and unpredictable structural environment. However, it often leads to tactical and bilateral considerations that are at odds with longer-term strategic goals and end up causing problems. More particular, there are problems with how competitive adaptation affects nations with little capabilities. This might make superior force structure less effective or allow them to take advantage of narrow markets through innovative synthesis. Other countries' uses of or reactions to strategic competition may be very different. For example, an internal focus may make any responses that are received or copied weak, or in geopolitically complex areas, higher-order strategic resilience may fully counter broader adaptations.

Military-strategic agencies may also look again at the links in their adaptation assessment chain that need ongoing deep engagement or reform, and think about how to effectively communicate and interact with important allies and partners who may need to share more of the load. To make use of larger networks to make up for less stable defence ecosystems, bureaucratically precise measures may be taken, axioms may be re-examined, or organisational barriers may be crossed. One situation is that non-state actors who don't have national interests may be able to get around bureaucratic

logic or procedural transparency. Many more groups think they can't challenge state power, while certain groups are naturally apart from statehood. If you only use rigid means-ends assessments to decide how to participate, you lose the ability to set norms compared to networks of thousands of agents that self-organise around exploitative goals and knowledge-related goals, to the point of being silly.

6.1. Problems with allocating resources

To be more resilient, you need to understand the linkages and relationships that exist inside and between systems. Decision-makers' resource allocation is based on a lower level of understanding, which can lead to new problems (Parker, 2015). To build resilience together, we need to understand the trade-offs between strengths and weaknesses in a wide range of systems. We also need to understand how these systems affect those that are outside of the decision-makers' control and how they can handle complicated relationships between systems. This information alone is not enough if political factors affect how resources are allocated or if decisions are made based only on technical factors. Decision-makers at all levels of government under a lot of pressure, including the need to respond to short-term economic and social challenges by providing infrastructure and services instead of making long-term changes and building resilience. This calls for a broader look at the current and potential performance of the motion in place at different levels of government. There is little chance of success if decision-makers at the local and national levels can't find a strategy to balance competing pressures that builds resilience instead of tearing it down. To assist people understand the varied degrees of resilience and the activities that can support or hurt it, we need to create ways to increase capacity. Systems mapping workshops could be a good place to start since they help people who make decisions learn about the systems around them and how they can affect others and be affected by them.

6.2. Too Much Dependence on Resilience

The 21st century is a time where resilience is an overly important issue because of the interconnected problems of climate change, overconsumption of resources, changing demographics, economic polarisation, and faster technology. It is also clear that resilience is a valid way to look at how the hotel industry has reacted to the COVID-19 outbreak. But it's also evident that resilience isn't always a good thing, and one of the points made in the study above is that the existing definition of resilience needs to be looked at more closely by scholars. People now think of resilience as the best kind of "good." Some people say that resilience shouldn't just be seen as a good thing. Resilience can make people too reliant on systems that aren't working well, even when things are uncertain, which can lead to disappointment, dysfunction, fragmentation, and disaster. As a result, it makes sense that resilience can be harmful (O'Hare et al., 2015). Even after the unpleasant COVID-19 shock that upset what was formerly stable, some areas of the hotel industry have been strong and even relatively unaffected by the pandemic's effects. They are open for business, and the streets are lit up with a dazzling "business as usual." But that "complacent bliss" hasn't gone unnoticed. Forget that festival capitalism might be replaced by too much monitoring with anti-social tendencies (D. Raab et al., 2015) or that new technology could be used to combine old-world concerns to smother the undesirable.

Resilience is also a popular field of study in school. It is the basis for many articles about how fractal complexity reacts to shocks, and it is studied in many fields, including ecology, sociology,

economics, management, computer, and communication. But when there are a lot of outcomes with multiple meanings, it signifies either nothing or too much. Good synthesis and tidy synthesis are unusual, and definitions don't often help straighten out academic subjects. The criticism would be a little less harsh if the results didn't make people confused about the injunction and effect, and if the claims that were so muddled by it had lost some of their power. People are being urged to make their societies and organisations around the world more resilient, and they are getting money to do it. Resilience could help people become more conscious of uncertainty and divergence, find resources in terms of both stocks and flows, and provide them chances to improve themselves and make their own decisions. It may be a sign of an unwillingness to question adaptive action, made stronger by a mix of entrenched interests that benefit from mostly unregulated responses to uncertainty. Resilience can make people too dependent on systems that are, at best, not working well. It means having a reductionist view: more chained systems where good faith optimism keeps an unconditional hope for stability and balance even when things go wrong.

6.3. The possibility of being too comfortable

One possible problem with resilience is that it can lead to complacency and comfort with the way things are right now, which means that organisations play it safe on purpose. Resilient strategies that deal with moderate volatility may not take into account big occurrences that don't fit within that strategy. This could happen because most decisions are based on a mix of heuristic and analytical thinking. Also, a decision scheme that uses cognitive shortcuts works better for smaller, local decisions where it's easy to find the right information. In the same way, as organisations get used to a certain condition, they start to ignore information that doesn't fit with it (C. Stark, 2014). Organisations that do well may get complacent and comfortable because their success would support their ideas about how well their approach works. So, organisations that are too comfortable think they have "figured it all out" and don't do much to change their status.

The problem comes up when activities that help people be strong stop them from thinking about the worst things that could happen. The "elephant" that fits this idea is usually a tail-event that is outside of the right-hand tail of a normal statistical distribution. Tail events would usually be thought of as very unlikely, and organisations that are based on experience don't make many changes to the usual tallies. On the other hand, the elephant is not something that would dissipate as more data comes in, since it is easy to visualise it beyond the plaintiffs' experience. Most companies don't make big changes in how they do business since the way they do business now has been proved to be pretty defensible. Still, a question that comes up is whether it makes sense to get ready for "nobody knows what."

6.4. Difficulties in Putting into Practice

Strategic resilience is a hot topic in industry and a topic of continual apologies in academics. In both business and academic settings, it has become an oxymoron that is debated, debated, and overused. Its many meanings and situations make it hard to pin down, and its meaning is still mostly unclear. A lot of the time, people say, "If you can't define it, how can you do it?"" This shroud of complexity is bad and makes it harder to see resilience as a value-added concept." Still, the locks of complexity can be either addresses that get in the way or addresses that could start anything.

To get this business idea off the cultural level of oxymoron, we need to define the substance in its many forms.

Strategic resilience isn't a new idea, yet a lot of people understand it, even though it can seem abstract and unclear. There are numerous ways to look at resilience, and as was said before, these can add to diverse definitions of resilience in their own way. There are a few main ideas that people often talk about when they talk about it as a concept. If necessary, people can also talk about the several ways it can be understood in different contexts. After a quick look, it seems that complexity, adaptability, change, and the ability to respond to a shock are all common ideas of resilience in the academic literature. Putting these ideas into a story about resilience in terms of environmental dynamics, strategic context, organisational fitness, institutional changes, and coevolutionary process helps to explain and show how it shows itself in different ways and how it develops.

7. Successful strategic resilience case studies

There are various methods to show how a business may build resilience into its strategic readiness. The Boeing Company and McDonald's Corporation are two examples of companies that reach their strategic goals by making a commitment to constant and frequently transformational change. To really appreciate how these two firms may be outstanding examples of resilience, you need to know what they're like, what problems they face, and how they deal with problems.

The Boeing firm is a multinational aerospace firm and the biggest maker of commercial jetliners and military planes. Boeing quickly changed its plans and carefully examined them in order to stay on top of the aerospace business, which has a lot of room for expansion, despite the pandemic's unexpected and widespread effects on all air travel. Boeing decided to invest in its ongoing engagement in the speed train industry in China instead of the usual way of first cutting costs and controlling cash flows. Boeing is fighting against the unprecedented challenge of losing its top spot in the aeronautics market, which has shrunk a lot because of the pandemic. It does this by investing in research on new generation commercial aeronautics systems and products in sustainable aviation fuels, as well as providing whole life cycle support and service. In such most dangerous situation, quick change would usually keep big expenditures away from the foundations. So, Boeing's plan is a perfect example of a manifesto on resilience and a manifesto on change.

In a normal atmosphere of high growth, franchisees "invade" a market with their large selection of unique brands and incentives. In a highly competitive environment, it's normal for one franchise to become the best and for most others to stagnate or fall. However, franchises that are stagnant or losing money could still survive or even turn things around by focussing on shutting down the worst-performing units and investing heavily in new brands to reach new markets and segments. These methods show that there is a very different kind of corporate agility between resilient and non-resilient franchisees, with very different effects on the long-term interests of franchisors and stakeholders. Resilient franchises are always changing and often making big changes, while non-resilient franchises have a strong incentive to do so. (Stokes et al., 1970)

7.1. Examples from the tech industry

The internet's entrance changed more than just the newspaper business. Where were newspapers ten years later?

Unceremoniously run over from behind by social media, which thought that telling news stories was a great way to start taking over the world of entertainment. The tech giants who keep the social media giants going and who were supposed to get the news industry's commercials, contracts, and creative ideas rolled off of the newly paved highways. The broadcast and cable businesses are also in trouble since they are also controlled by the tech giants, whose ownership is still a mystery. The upshot is that in a culture concerned with expanding technological skills, there is a countertrend to seek downscaling, which causes confusion and worry over what can now seem like arms races. The IT elites, who are no longer connected to the huge media companies and news organisations that sprang from them, want to join in the fun. People were so happy about changes brought forth by technology that they thought the Renaissance will come again (Verissimo et al., 2017). Also, after four years of making up to ten billion U.S. dollars from in-market broadcasting, the companies' predictions of a much better, more valuable, and transferable golden age for their business, in which they hoped to become a tech giant like they were in the past when they rode the wave of the internet boom, turned out to be wrong and ended up being a disaster like a Terminator movie. Who and what were hurt badly? There is no doubt about resilience or its connection to the idea of vulnerability. It has been suggested that it is an all-encompassing or unified idea made up of a group of smaller ideas. There has also been research on the fractal structure of resilience, which raises the question of whether the same deep views are needed to look at the same systems at different levels of abstraction. It has a similar division mode character when it comes to discrete modelling, however it missed a subclass of NPPs. With a spontaneously produced transient node count that isn't limited by predefined positional layouts, naturally occurring flaws in the spread of synchronous events will lead to global damages happening much faster than normal. Would the European competitors need to be sacrificed if the bad situation were to be fixed? They are like hobbled horses that can't aspire for strategic resilience. Or is the problem that the firms that aren't right for the job don't even care about being responsive? When you explore and test using numerical simulations, you need to basin-hop to see how opacities and technical expertise saturate node capabilities. They keep trying to ride the galloping like in Half-Life 3, but instead they break open. One has run away to competitors who can offer a better response. Would a unified idea for some social concern at least suggest itself—success?

7.2. Resilience in the Healthcare Sector

The health care system is the most important part of the health sector for studying the idea of resilience. It is responsible for protecting people's lives and health by making sure that everyone has access to clean water, hygienic conditions, and health services at all times. The idea of resilience has changed over time. It was first made for things like rivers, systems, and organisms that act according to what they learn from the calculations of cold, normal, and hot (A. Behrens et al., 2022). Resilient city planning may be able to stop floods from killing people on a larger scale.

7.3. Strategies for Making Manufacturing More Resilient

Supply chains have to be very efficient and successful in today's global marketplaces. They confront a lot of problems, like not having enough resources, environmental issues, and relying more and more on multinational manufacturing networks. At the same time, new technologies are coming out at a faster and faster rate.

More precisely, turning global supply networks into digital ones would save a lot of money for both workers and employers, but companies and society are becoming more worried about the risks and weaknesses that are coming to light. When trying to make supply networks more resilient, flexible, adaptable, and redundant, there are problems and trade-offs to deal with. This is because using different alternatives to fix vulnerabilities can have detrimental impacts on the performance of the whole system. The COVID-19 pandemic and the recent focus on how important it is for supply chains to be able to handle shocks are other reasons for this effort. From a systems point of view, the effects of the disease's spread on supply chains and how automobile makers are trying to lessen those effects, as well as how this research adds to the argument between resilience and efficiency. (Pinkwart et al., 2022) When numerous car companies buy battery raw materials together, it's a great value for customers. When you make thorough models of both the supply network and the battery raw materials marketplaces, the viable transaction designs change depending on how much information is shared and whether or not people cooperate together. When vehicle companies work together, they may get battery raw materials for less than if they bought them on their own. However, this could lead to the loss of long-term contracts if the technology fails. It affects other suppliers in the supply chain before the fact, making it more likely that they will work together upstream. Based on research in institutional, behavioural, and market economics, the unique focus on the relentless price-hunting per-search level shows how the architecture of the transaction itself can raise risks because of mismatched incentives and let cooperative partnerships last longer than intended. Investing in backward integration gives you flexibility and redundancy while keeping your efficiency. The e-commerce and automobile sectors are very different in terms of structure and behaviour, but they both show strategic resilience. greater collaboration in organisations that are behind in terms of structure and behaviour, and greater rivalry in enterprises that are ahead. Behavioural rigidity is still a problem after the pandemic, but the path-dependence of strategic preference—either mimetic or imitative—can help make offence resilience methods work. Cultural and behavioural differences lead to uneven resilience tactics in the supply networks of joint enterprises. enterprises with more control, market share, and capital choose greater rigidity, whereas firms with more mergers and acquisitions prefer more flexibility and bilateral solutions.

8. Examples of Strategic Resilience That Didn't Work

Researchers and practitioners have been closely watching how organisations are starting to use Strategic Resilience (SR) as a way to deal with uncertainty in the environment. But companies need to make sure that SR is put into place in a way that doesn't hurt their long-term viability, which is the goal. Here are three strong systems to think about. The Beachy Head Lighthouse in England, which was built in 1830, started to wobble in 2000. This lighthouse was built with both solid engineering and nature's most dangerous environment in mind. This includes pliable chalk cliffs, extreme weather, constantly changing ground surfaces, and more. The original builders correctly made sure that the lowland home and the lighthouse pillar could move around easily. Instead of being completely stuck to the lighthouse, the builders ingeniously put in a wedge so that the bend can move a little bit without breaking the joint (Morales Allende et al., 2017). But in 2000, the upkeep that was supposed to replace it turned out to be too severe or too ambitious. It didn't remember the memories of the building

process. Also, the builders that came after didn't look into the new environment or any changes. The historical asset started to fall apart steadily when the imbedded union wedge was taken out. The lighthouse is no longer in favour of the SR hardware's safety; it has become as solid as a rock. But the new and strict rules have completely ruined the sustainability. The Beachy Head scenario brings up the idea of practical SR: making the system resistant to complexity, deviational entropy, and anti-rigidness and anti-fragility (which can be seen in the most flexible or unsettled state) so that its main feature is kept. Megiddo, a town in Israel, had advanced government for cities in the early Iron Age. Megiddo thrived for hundreds of years, even after being destroyed and abandoned, since it was on major roads and had access to water. In the end, defensive strategies turned out to be too stiff for Urban Regeneration, and the prospects were lost. The system fell apart in a huge disaster like Beachy Head because the strategic inflexibility was a mistake in the boundary condition.

8.1. Failures in the Financial Sector

There are four main types of failures in the financial sector: bank failures, stock market crashes, insurance business failures, and crises that only affect a small number of organisations, like mortgage lenders. They can be very big, last for years, and keep happening on their own. Some things that people don't usually think of as being part of the financial sector, including wars and disease, can also trigger financial crises. Also, a financial shock can happen at a time when the government doesn't want to get involved, as during an election year, especially in democracies. Most people agree that these kinds of shocks will happen in the future, but many also think that economies can be ready for them so that they don't cause too much damage (Dowell-Jones & Ross Buckley, 2017). Also, they think that these kinds of preparedness will help governments respond better after a crisis and go back on the road of historical growth. Some people think that some sudden shocks, like stock market crashes, can be predicted and that studies that look at crises that are only predictable after they happen are not very useful. But these studies still look at what may be called "predictive" characteristics, and they probably don't include some of the most obvious ones, such high inflation and big current account deficits. They also don't think about the fact that a shock could show widespread systemic risk because, in addition to the loss of value in the individual assets, such shocks often cause panic at the financial institutions that hold them and quickly spread to other institutions. When we talk more about these challenges, we have to ask basic questions about how strong financial services are that are meant to maximise return on assets, what role they play in growth, and whether society can afford them.

8.2. Problems in the Retail Industry

Retailers in the UK have had record sales and profits in the past few years, but the COVID-19 lockdowns and the present cost-of-living crisis have hit them hard. The first big shock was the pandemic lockdowns, which caused a lot of stores to close. Most grocery stores were able to stay open by offering online deliveries, click-and-collect services, and flexible ways to restock their shelves. The second blow was the huge rise in prices for basic products and electricity, which made consumers lose faith and sales plummet.

Many of the changes that grocery stores in the UK made to boost sales during the pandemic lockdown didn't last long. The online share of the biggest companies went down a little, and the new way that light and medium out-of-stock items act after the epidemic is not likely to last in the long term. All of these data point to a general move away from the retail techniques used during the epidemic, which included more promotions, more frequent orders with smaller order amounts, and less non-food goods on shelves.

But a lot of the planning problems that came up in 2020 are likely to last longer because some of the changes that happened during the lockdowns are likely to be permanent, especially the rise of internet businesses. It is envisaged that bigger businesses will set aside some of their floor space for online orders. Dark stores should either be slowly embraced or run alongside regular stores. In either instance, this means that the logistics network needs to be redesigned and that we need to know how it works when things go wrong (Pahwa & Jaller, 2023).

9. What leaders can do to help people be more resilient

Researchers have different ideas on what resilience means. According to Ledesma (2014), resilience is the ability to get back up after something bad happens. She says that resilience is an important trait for leaders who want to be successful. Research shows that resilient people have supportive connections and external support systems that are important. Making sure that a leader has a social network of support when they need it is an important part of improving their resilience. It is also important to think about the protective elements that make it more likely that a leader will be able to get through tough times. These outside factors are typically things that the leader can't control. Along with the previous research on how resilient people are, we added organisational and career resilience to the mix, as adversity can make leaders weak. So, resilience and thriving are really important ideas to look into while training leaders. For leaders to be resilient, companies need to make sure they have the right conditions.

Resilience in organisations. There are tens of thousands such groups. Their missions, how long they've been around, their visions, their structures, and their purposes are all very different. Their leadership styles, resources, and ideologies are also important parts of who they are. All organisations, whether private or public, have things that could jeopardise their capacity to stay in business. Organisations are complicated systems that effect a network of people, institutions, governments, and communities. They depend on feedback loops to make changes to the system (Pfaff, 2022). These threats happen across time at the micro, meso, and macro levels and can be roughly grouped under environmental, economic, political, demographic, competitive, market, technical, and/or social categories. For example, three well-known but different companies: Enron went bankrupt after its bad behaviour was discovered; Lehman Brothers failed partly because of bigger problems in the mortgage-backed securities market; and Ford Motor Company's problems were caused by its inability to compete with Honda cars.

10. What does strategic resilience mean for culture?

People have often talked about resilience in general terms, using systems theory as a guide. They have also talked about it in terms of specific types of resilience, such as national resilience, urban resilience, community resilience, organisational resilience, or social resilience, to name a few. The essay goes even farther with the dimensionalization of resilience by focussing on the organisational level and exploring the hitherto uncharted area of the variability of organisational resilience as experienced in public sector organisations. Specifically, the study looks at the attitudes, behaviours, leadership styles, types of leadership, and

organisational climate that support, encourage, or undermine resilience at more micro-political levels of analysis. There have been many theoretical discussions about resilience. A lot of the material that is already out there talks about resilience on a larger political scale. However, there hasn't been much research on how resilience works and is used in organisations at lower levels of politics. The organisational resilience literature defines resilience as a construct that could have a lot of different aspects.

Still, it may be seen as simply reducing risks and weaknesses and making unanticipated shocks, losses, and failures easier to handle. People frequently think about this in terms of "preparation," or "hoping for the best," versus "limitation," or "hoping for the worst." On the other hand, these kinds of overly simple dichotomies make it hard to pay attention to how different types of resilience interact with each other, feed off each other, and develop into each other, or to how resilience may be seen and acted out in an organisation. Performativity means both the way that speech acts or language produce reality and the way that this language has particular consequences on people, such as through procedures, habits, conventions, authority, and expectations. In general, people experience resilience in complicated ways, with specific evaluations and traits, and in performative ways, through the attitudes and actions that support or make resilience possible.

11. New technologies that help people be more resilient

The current economic climate, which is marked by competitiveness, volatility, and extreme unpredictability, has made it even more important for businesses to come up with new ideas. Some companies suggest innovation techniques such creating a culture of innovation, making informal networks easier to understand, integrating innovative activities, and making sure that governing structures and mechanisms are in line with each other. Researchers have come up with ways to sort strategies into groups based on whether they are technological, operational, organisational, financial, market, or social. This work tries to add to both fields of research: the consequences of big uncertainty on businesses and the ways businesses come up with new ideas to deal with uncertainties. It gives managers a way to make sense of things so they can figure out which new technologies could be used to make their businesses more resilient in the face of different kinds of uncertainty.

Strategic Resilience is the ability to be resilient in the face of uncertainty by having strong governance structures, policies, and practices that allow companies to be innovative. Resilience capacity has two types of sub-capacities: genotypical resilience capacity, which is made up of governance structures, policies, and practices; and phenotypical resilience capacity, which is made up of behaviours and activities that help people be resilient when things are uncertain. These can be seen in real-life situations in companies. There are a lot of different technology advances and tactics in the literature that companies can use to deal with different kinds of uncertainty (Brito Fernandes & Liebenstein, 2011). But managers could have trouble understanding and picking out new technology among the many types of innovations that are accessible in the market. Also, experts haven't looked at a lot of new technical developments that help businesses build their resilience. So, it could be hard for managers to have a complete view of all the many technical strategies and products that are out there. A typology of technological advances shows how these new technologies might be used as tactics to help businesses become more resilient.

12. How to Measure Strategic Resilience

Companies are putting money into making themselves better able to handle uncertainty, even if the future looks bleak for them. This is because the number of options they have grows exponentially. Being able to quickly adjust by being flexible, working smarter, and coming up with new ideas can be important meta-resources for success in the future. Resilience involves having built-in resources for sourcing, supply chain, customer care, and establishing relationships, among other things. These are resources that can be developed through adaptive problem-solving efforts in an organisation. Resilience gives scholars and practitioners more chances to think and talk about it on both a conceptual and practical level. Academics should include the new career in their research plans, and business leaders should use credible measurements of current performance and benchmarking approaches to build and manage long-term strategic resilience capabilities (L. J. Ferris, 2019). In physics, "resilience" means the ability to bounce back rapidly from problems, adapt to progressive change, or the ability of a substance or object to return to its original shape; elasticity. The idea of resilience capabilities as "Water Hammer," which means changes in flow and pressure at the point of sudden change, could be brought down to a negative or post-poneable investment edge. So, from a psychological point of view, resilience could imply giving in after something bad happens. From the point of view of organisational behaviour and management, resilience might be seen as an ability that develops over time or temporarily through trial-and-error attempts to solve problems that come up outside of the organisation (Morales Allende et al., 2017). At this point, resilience could also indicate "Fuzzy" parameters, which we can use to think about and look into its fuzzy edges. On the other side, you may use the traits of beam experiences as a nine-element technique to quantify retrospective resilience. As far as security goes, people's perceptions and attitudes about strange disturbances that happen in a short amount of time on a regional level could be used to test resilience capability, which is a measure of how well someone can handle disasters.

12.1. Key Performance Indicators

There are still a lot of problems to solve with resilience assessment tools, however it is possible to find a small number of performance indicators that can be used to measure resilience. These metrics can then be used to compare the resilience of different cities before and after they spend a lot of money on initiatives to make them more resilient. The performance indicators need to cover all of the resilience indicators, the people who are involved, the resources that are available, and the data that is easy to get. The performance indicators that have been found can be added to global urban impact and/or benchmarking networks to help with benchmarking and capacity building. This is because many of these networks are already focused on measuring and reporting on different aspects of urban performance. Global volunteer networks can help with providing services, sharing knowledge and experiences, and building capacity.

One strategy to get more people to use a resilience assessment tool is to make it a part of normal city business procedures. Many cities need to keep track of their public service assets that are worth a lot of money for budgeting and reporting purposes. These regular reviews could include ways to do loss provision and/or risk assessments on these assets. Cities need to know how their assets are doing right now and what dangers they face in order to

successfully plan and carry out changes that will make them more resilient. These usual evaluations involve a number of parties, which is important for credibility and will eventually make the resilience assessment more popular (Morales Allende et al., 2017).

12.2. Tools and frameworks for assessment

The ability of organisations to stay strong during times of trouble and crisis has become more important, although most studies have looked at it from a sociotechnical and structural point of view. A lot of studies have used a lot of different markers and scales to measure resilience, however they have been criticised. So, the goal of this work is to come up with measures of organisational resilience, create measuring scales for them, and use factor analysis to look at their dimensionality and construct validity. The results can assist professionals figure out how resilient organisations are when things go wrong and put the idea of resilience into practice, which has been unclear and foggy until now (Morales Allende et al., 2017).

People have become more interested in how resilient organisations are over the past few decades. Researchers have looked at a lot of major crisis situations, such as the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the collapse of the World Trade Centre, earthquakes, volcano eruptions, financial crises, and terrorism, from a resilience point of view. But most of the research has been done from sociotechnical and structural points of view. There has been a lot of research on sociotechnical systems and systemic systems, but not much on organisations during catastrophes and other problems. There have been surveys to test indicators and scales to see how resilient organisations are, but all of them have been criticised.

More and more studies are being done on signs of resilience. Most studies look at how well communities can handle disasters, but not many look at how well organisations can handle bad situations. There is no way to measure how resilient organisations are when things like earthquakes, cyclones, or terrorism strike. This is because there have only been a few catastrophes in the country, but they have had terrible effects. To fill in the research gap mentioned above, this paper uses a lot of literature and expert interviews to come up with indicators of organisational resilience. It then creates measurement scales for these indicators and uses factor analysis to look at the scales' dimensionality and construct validity.

13. Trends in Strategic Resilience for the Future

In addition to the fact that resilience is already a topic of discussion, there is a dispute concerning whether resilient societies are, on the whole, better or worse than those that are not. It's interesting to see that people on both sides of many political issues, such as pro- and anti-globalization, technical advances in genomics and surveillance, and keeping public services or adding them to market-economy constraints, employ resilience thinking. So, resilience, whether in human or societal systems, is political in the way Foucault describes it: it shapes things, separates and controls people, sets rules for areas, and creates study goals. To understand these politics of resilience, we need to be more precise about ideas like vulnerability and exposure than they have been in the literature. But first, let's look at another aspect mentioned in the last paragraph: in certain civilisations, vulnerability and exposure are not only defined, but also felt differently by different people in the same situation. To sum up, the ability to think about the future and change it are two ways to judge actor strategies. What about being strong? Being resilient means being conscious that the future you think you see may not happen. Some civilisations not only

have strategic flexibility, but they also feel vulnerable and take steps to protect themselves from it.

13.1. What globalisation does

There is no doubt that the world is more connected than ever before. Globalisation is transforming the way people think and act, the resources that people and communities use, and the relationships that academics may make and keep. In the context of globalisation, we need to be clear about questions of scale. What scale is ideal for answering what question? How do different scales connect to each other? What kinds of localisation processes might globalisation speed up? Recognising globalisation can help us look for early-warning signs, such changes to property rights or major cultural shifts that could make social-ecological systems less stable. It is hard to find these early-warning signs before they come together and weaken the ways that people may be strong and help the environment (Armitage & Johnson, 2006).

Globalisation makes social, economic, and environmental change happen more faster. The main sign of that transition is that interactions between different scales are becoming more common. Globalisation, which has roots in colonial and post-colonial processes, is marked by an increase in two aspects of the global landscape. One is the rise of new types of organisation, like "governance" institutions at the regional, continental, and global levels. The other is a clear speeding up of changes that are already happening on a large scale, such the breakup of governments and the privatisation of access to natural resources. People say that globalisation makes things more unclear and surprising since interactions on a local level are becoming more connected to processes and forces on a larger scale. Globalisation is a set of processes and factors that breaks with and changes processes that have been around for a long time. Because of this, micro-histories have different meanings and results.

These two case studies, Junagadh, India and Banawa, Indonesia, highlight how globalisation can hurt resilience. In Junagadh, the ecological background and local constraints on access didn't help the fisheries become more resilient since outside factors made fishing more intense, which led to overexploitation. In Banawa, strong outside groups quickly weakened local property rights and access systems, which harmed the resilience of the mangrove environment. The research has two big effects on policy that focusses on resilience.

13.2. The changing dynamics of emerging markets

The dynamics of emerging markets are different from those of established markets, mostly because of the national and institutional framework. Companies with solid governance make smart strategic choices, and these companies are leaders who take the lead. There is a good reason for hierarchies, and devoted subordinates operate like a shield for supervisors. Fear-based culture is shallow and mostly found in new organisations, at least for the time being. The Cinsambu culture treats its leaders and teams the same way. In short, the firm's resilience is growing because of better companies, better governance, higher levels of trust, securities, and creativity. Companies do well with small gains in their resilience levels until they encounter big risks.

On the other hand, it's not clear how bad governance affects the firm's resilience. Companies, whether they are leaders, followers, or new businesses, are more likely to make opportunistic strategic decisions quickly. Top-tier enterprises and firms with higher governance only want to keep an opportunistic market exploration

strategy. Instead, followers and companies with poor governance seek incremental experience generating innovation in market exploration. Because of the fear-filled culture, the managers give in to honesty and believe that innovation will die. If they get the chance, they will ignore all business models that go against their principles. This short path of innovation will make companies' positions more important, giving them chances to escape but also putting them at risk of stagnation. Leadership helps companies quickly take advantage of market opportunities and try out new, riskier ideas. They put money into technology and are able to successfully sell new ideas in a variety of industries. Good governance gives companies access to dense markets for corporate control (Pinkwart et al., 2022), which makes them more careful about how they use the company's inventions. But the rise of inefficient companies makes people less trusting of the company's governance, which turns it into a banana republic.

14. Useful Tips for Businesses

Top management is really worried about how resilient their businesses are. The research suggests different paths in times of crisis. Some people think that resilience is a significant strategic asset, while others talk about repressive behaviour in organisations that hurts personnel and even performance. That's why the idea of organisational resilience needs to be put in the context of other ideas about what organisational resilience is. Talking about the idea makes it possible to figure out its basic and specific parts, which are necessary for measuring resilience and performance. The resilience analysis grid is chosen to measure resilience, coupled with the evaluation of pathologies, as needed reports that make sure the resilience initiatives are successful (Morales Allende et al., 2017). There are several definitions and points of view on corporate resilience, which shows that it is a complex idea.

The paradox approach says that depending on the situation, both resilience and rigidity can be important ways for an organisation to work (Galy et al., 2023). An organisation may still be vulnerable to problems in a new environment if it prepares too much. This view indicates that conflicting processes need to be balanced and makes the case for resilience thinking as a helpful way to lead real-world initiatives connected to resilience. Organisational characteristics that help people be more resilient also recommend that emergency resilience goals should be related to the environments that need to be prepared for, in addition to choosing a toolbox of processes and planning for side effects. Resilience can have two opposite and contradictory effects on how well an organisation works, or it can have both effects at the same time and in a hierarchical way. This creates an integrated framework for comparable types of effects. Resilience performance means that a company does well by staying in business or doing well while avoiding failure and focussing on business continuity.

Top managers are very worried about the resilience of their companies. Businesses are at risk because disruptions and crises are happening more often, more severely, and in more places. Every day, there are news stories about corporate disasters that have terrible effects on personnel or the firm. After a crisis, some businesses get through it and become more efficient and successful throughout the recovery, while others are left with permanent scars or go out of business completely. There have been two stages in explaining the diverse outcomes: the creation of several viewpoints on resilience, each with its own suggested path to it, some of which are in conflict with each other, and the reprocessing of the notion of organisational resilience in research on organisational resilience.

14.1. Making a plan for resilience

It is now very important to think about resilience. The latest pandemic reveals that neither plans nor money can guarantee safety and security. In many aspects, focussing on systemised digitisation along with a lot of money didn't work to make the economy more resilient on a global or economy-wide scale. To fully understand the demands and problems, the focus on resilience must be raised. A heuristic idea explains the focus on resilience as the ability to prepare for and adjust to shocks of different levels of intensity. We need to look at one or more situations to figure out how strategic resilience works. This includes figuring out why shock shifts happen, where learning experiences happen (if they do), and how people readjust.

A digital boost is a change that happened because of the pandemic that might be used to make things better in business, school, and government. Because it speeds up progress, it is safe to say that the worldwide pool of shocks that have been adopted is not yet visible. Resilience is more than just the ability to bounce back; it also means being able to adapt to change and make the most of it by converting problems into chances (Stokes et al., 1970). Resilience leads to the future since no crisis has only one effect, and it won't be the last one. Resilient businesses and economies are being pushed to come up with plans and ways to deal with shocks and crises. The discussion around resilience is about whether businesses can recover from disasters and get back to where they were before. There are two main areas of strategic resilience concerns that need to be looked at. The first is about how the environment, systems, and businesses react to shocks, what they learn, why they learn it, what goes wrong, and how to fix it. The second talks about how the structure or logic of an environment changes so that expectations and operational parameters alter completely.

14.2. Initiatives for Training and Development

Organisations should learn about the elements that make groups resilient and provide them the ability to handle shocks to the norm and stay essentially intact (Stokes et al., 2019). So, the collective resilience lens looks at exposures, shocks, and moral and ethical problems, and leaders need to be aware of the factors that make people more resilient. This includes microsecond behavioural responses that help people become ready and the cultural factors that drive big changes in norms, values, resources, and practices. These behaviours and circumstances show themselves in stories and conversations, or in organisational artefacts that have meaning. In this way, collective resilience is like a micro-macro continuum where many small moments (such those that happen between people, teams, groups, or organisations) build, maintain, or break down collective resilience. After looking at the significance of story and micro-moments in group resilience, these ideas were seen as very important for keeping the basic integrity of an organisation. It was thought that combining a staff resilience lens with a focus on group resilience was crucial since it allowed for a new look at the phenomena through difference and the blending of different strands. Additionally, the natural gathering of literature from related fields that deal with the micro-macro continuum also supported this goal. So, it was agreed that these kinds of researchers might be called "participatory action researchers" in the broadest sense, and their function as co-researchers in communities of practice that are involved is in line with the ideas of affinity, adjacent continuity, and "niche." People thought that flexibility and adaptability were either adaptive (i.e., changing expectations and

attitudes) or transformative (i.e., making new choices, processes, and products). These are considered as significant resources for organisational resilience. Universities need to make changes to their teaching methods to help students get ready for life after bankruptcy (Rowe et al., 2019).

15. Final Thoughts

Discussions about organisations and their strategic priorities during and after "extraordinary" events like "disruptive" technological advances, natural disasters, terrorist attacks, and more recently, the COVID-19 pandemic have focused on hegemonic narratives about resilience and the need to build such a capacity. These kinds of stories are common in many different situations, regardless of sector or business. They see this ability to absorb and adapt as a cure-all for these and other recurring uncertainties and complexities (Stokes et al., 2019).

That being said, there are other points of view that doubt the universality of these kinds of stories. More recently, designers of "resilient" buildings and transportation systems have been accused of "maladaptive" behaviour in neighbourhoods that are becoming more upscale, putting the stability of the region's social and spatial structures ahead of the needs of low-income groups. Other groups, such governments, businesses, and colleges and universities, have also been criticised for "decapitating" permanent positions, blocking union representation, or making sure that workers may work from home and stay alert during and after COVID-19.

Finding a balance between the different story perspectives on resilience is a big problem for both theoretical and practical stakeholders. The goal of this article was to add to the fields of HRM, CDS, and O.I. affordances to look at stories of how organisations can be resilient and the situations in which they are used. The study looked at both macro and micro resourcing factors that could help an organisation stay strong during times of hiring, onboarding, and induction. It was thought that different stories about resilience come to the surface during times of crisis and recovery throughout HRM and HRD. Putting these stories in the context of opposing hyperframes of CDS could help us understand better how resilience and extremity are thought about and acted on across organisational borders. This kind of creative thinking could be the basis for future research and other academic work.

References

1. Stokes, P., Smith, S., Wall, T., Moore, N., Rowland, C., Ward, T., & Cronshaw, S. (2019). Resilience and the (micro-) dynamics of organizational ambidexterity: Implications for strategic HRM. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 30(8), 1287–1322. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1474939

2. Stokes, P., Smith, S., Wall, T., Moore, N., Rowland, C., Ward, T., & Cronshaw, S., 1970. Resilience and the (micro-) dynamics of organizational ambidexterity: implications for strategic HRM. This paper was published in LJMU Research Online (Liverpool John Moores University).

3. D. Raab, C., Jones, R., & Székely, I., 2015. Surveillance and Resilience in Theory and Practice. Media and Communication, Vol 3, No 2 (Special Issue on Surveillance), Oct 2015

4. Evans, S. & Bahrami, H., 2020. Super-Flexibility in Practice: Insights from a Crisis. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

5. Yao, Y. & Meurier, B., 2012. Understanding the supply chain resilience: a Dynamic Capabilities approach. Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/58124/ MPRA Paper No. 58124, posted 28 Aug 2014 04:45 UTC

6. Brito Fernandes, S. & Liebenstein, A., 2011. How economic crisis is affecting firms? Building resilience capacity through innovation. https://sapientia.ualg.pt/login

7. Parker, R., 2015. Lessons Learned on Resilience. refubium.fu-berlin.de NFG Policy Paper No. 11/2015 NFG Publications: NFG Policy Paper Series Series Editor: May-Britt U. Stumbaum

8. O'Hare, P., White, I., & Connelly, A. (2015). Insurance as maladaptation: Resilience and the 'business as usual' paradox. Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, 34(6), 1175-1193. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263774X15602022 (Original work published 2016)

9. C. Stark, D., 2014. On Resilience. Soc. Sci. 2014, 3(1), 60-70; https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci3010060

10. Verissimo, P., Volp, M., Decouchant, J., & Rocha, F., 2017. Meeting the Challenges of Critical and Extreme Dependability and Security. 22nd Pacific Rim International Symposium on Dependable Computing Event date : 22-01-2017 to 25-01-2017 Main work title : Proceedings of the 22nd Pacific Rim International Symposium on Dependable Computing

11. Behrens, D., S. Rauner, M., & Sommersguter-Reichmann, M., 2022. Why Resilience in Health Care Systems is More than Coping with Disasters: Implications for Health Care Policy. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

12. Pinkwart, A., Schingen, G., Pannes, A. T., & Schlotböller, D., 2022. Improving Resilience in Times of Multiple Crisis: Commentary from a German Economic Policy Point of View. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

13. Morales Allende, M., Ruiz-Martin, C., Lopez-Paredes, A., & Manuel Perez Ríos, J., 2017. Aligning Organizational Pathologies and Organizational Resilience Indicators. International Journal of Production Management and Engineering Vol. 5 No. 2 (2017) DOI: https://doi.org/10.4995/ijpme.2017.7423

14. Mary Dowell-Jones & Ross Buckley, Reconceiving Resilience: A New Guiding Principle for Financial Regulation?, 37 Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus. 1 (2017). https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/njilb/vol37/iss1/1

15. Pahwa, A. & Jaller, M., 2023. Assessing last-mile distribution resilience under demand disruptions. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

16. Ledesma, J., 2014. Conceptual Frameworks and Research Models on Resilience in Leadership. journals.sagepub.com

17. Pfaff, H., 2022. The Social Infrastructure of Organizational Resilience, Agency Capacity and Resilience Spirals: Starting Points for Resilient Leadership. DOI:10.5772/intechopen.101786

18. L. J. Ferris, T., 2019. A resilience measure to guide system design and management. IEEE Systems Journal PP (99):1-8. DOI:10.1109/JSYST.2019.2901174

19. Armitage, D. & Johnson, D. S., 2006. Can resilience be reconciled with globalization and the increasingly complex conditions of resource degradation in Asian coastal regions?. Ecology and Society 11(1). DOI:10.5751/ES-01485-110102

20. Galy, A., Chênevert, D., Fouquereau, E., & Groulx, P., 2023. Toward a new conceptualization of resilience at work as a meta-construct?. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

21. Rowe, L., Wall, T., Cregan, K., Evans, V. & Hindley, A. (2019). Pedagogies for resilience in business schools: Exploring strategies and tactics. In Research in Management Learning and Education (RMLE) Unconference Proceedings (p. 52). Dubrovnik, Croatia: Research in Management Learning and Education (RMLE).