**Journal of Management Dynamics**
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Edition: Vol 1 No.1 (2026)
https://ij.lafadzpublishing.com/index.php/JMD/

# Architecting Organizational Resilience in the Age of Polycrisis: A Strategic Capability Framework for Interlocking Global Shocks

**Andreas Svoboda**; Fernfachhochschule Schweiz (FFHS), Associated to The University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland (SUPSI), Switzerland*
*Correspondence: andreas.svoboda@ffhs.ch

**Keywords:**
*Organizational resilience; polycrisis; strategic capabilities; global shocks.*

***Article Info:***
*Received:*
17/03/2026
*Reviewed:*
26/03/2026
*Accepted:*
2/04/2026
*Published:*
11/04/2026

**ABSTRACT**

The increasing frequency and interconnectedness of global disruptions—ranging from pandemics and geopolitical conflicts to climate change and supply chain breakdowns—have given rise to what is now described as a "polycrisis." In such an environment, traditional risk management and resilience strategies are no longer sufficient, as organizations must confront simultaneous and mutually reinforcing shocks. This study aims to develop a strategic capability framework for architecting organizational resilience in the age of polycrisis, emphasizing the need for adaptive, integrative, and anticipatory capacities. Using a descriptive qualitative approach grounded in an integrative review of interdisciplinary literature, this research synthesizes insights from strategic management, organizational theory, and resilience studies. The analysis identifies three core capability clusters essential for navigating polycrisis conditions: adaptive agility, systemic integration, and anticipatory intelligence. These capabilities enable organizations not only to absorb shocks but also to reconfigure structures, processes, and strategies in response to evolving uncertainties. The study proposes a multi-layered resilience architecture that integrates strategic foresight, operational flexibility, and institutional coordination. It further highlights the importance of cross-level alignment between organizational units and external stakeholders, particularly in globally dispersed systems. The findings reveal inherent tensions between efficiency and redundancy, centralization and decentralization, and short-term survival and long-term transformation. This research contributes to the literature by advancing a polycrisis-oriented perspective on organizational resilience and by offering a comprehensive framework that bridges fragmented approaches to risk, crisis, and resilience management. The study provides practical implications for leaders seeking to design organizations capable of thriving amid persistent and interlocking global shocks.

SCAN ME



**How to cite:** Svoboda, A. (2026). Architecting Organizational Resilience in the Age of Polycrisis: A Strategic Capability Framework for Interlocking Global Shocks. Journal of Management Dynamics, 1(1), 9–16. https://doi.org/10.47353/jmd.v1i1.375

## Introduction

The contemporary global landscape is increasingly characterized by the convergence of multiple, overlapping crises, commonly referred to as a "polycrisis." This concept reflects a condition in which diverse disruptions—such as geopolitical instability, climate change, economic volatility, technological transformation, and public health emergencies—are not isolated events but interconnected phenomena that amplify one another's impacts. In such an environment, organizations are confronted with unprecedented levels of complexity, uncertainty, and systemic risk. Traditional approaches to risk management and organizational resilience, which are often designed to address discrete and predictable threats, are no longer sufficient to cope with the dynamic and interlocking nature of global shocks (Boin & van Eeten, 2013; World Economic Forum, 2023).

Historically, organizational resilience has been conceptualized as the capacity to absorb disturbances and return to a stable equilibrium. Early perspectives, rooted in engineering and ecological resilience, emphasized robustness, redundancy, and recovery (Folke, 2006; Wildavsky, 1988). In organizational

contexts, resilience was often associated with crisis management capabilities, including contingency planning, resource buffering, and business continuity strategies (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2007). While these approaches remain relevant, they are increasingly inadequate in the face of polycrisis conditions, where disruptions are continuous, nonlinear, and mutually reinforcing. In such contexts, returning to a pre-crisis state may not only be unrealistic but also undesirable, as the environment itself is undergoing structural transformation.

Recent scholarship has therefore shifted toward a more dynamic and process-oriented understanding of resilience. Rather than viewing resilience as a static attribute, it is increasingly seen as an evolving capability that enables organizations to anticipate, adapt, and transform in response to changing conditions (Duchek, 2020; Hillmann & Guenther, 2021). This perspective aligns with the broader literature on dynamic capabilities, which emphasizes the ability of organizations to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments (Teece, 2018). From this viewpoint, resilience is not merely about survival but about sustained adaptability and long-term viability.

The emergence of polycrisis intensifies the need for such a dynamic approach. One of the defining characteristics of polycrisis is the interdependence of risks, where disruptions in one domain trigger cascading effects across multiple systems. For example, geopolitical conflicts can disrupt energy markets, leading to increased production costs, inflationary pressures, and social instability. Similarly, climate-related disasters can disrupt supply chains, financial systems, and regulatory environments, creating ripple effects that extend far beyond the initial event (World Economic Forum, 2023). These cascading dynamics challenge conventional risk management frameworks, which often rely on linear cause-and-effect assumptions and fail to account for systemic interactions.

Another critical feature of polycrisis is the prevalence of deep uncertainty. Unlike calculable risks, which can be estimated based on historical data, uncertainty in polycrisis contexts involves unknown variables and unpredictable interactions. This limits the effectiveness of traditional forecasting and predictive models, requiring organizations to adopt more flexible and adaptive approaches to decision-making (Duchek, 2020). Techniques such as scenario planning, real-time monitoring, and iterative experimentation become essential for navigating such uncertainty. Moreover, organizations must develop the capacity to learn rapidly from unfolding events and adjust their strategies accordingly.

Globalization further compounds these challenges by increasing the interconnectedness of organizational systems. While global integration has enabled efficiency gains through specialization and scale, it has also created vulnerabilities by exposing organizations to external shocks beyond their control (Briguglio, 2009). Supply chains, financial networks, and digital infrastructures are deeply intertwined, meaning that disruptions in one region can quickly propagate across the globe. For multinational organizations, this creates a complex balancing act between global coordination and local responsiveness. Effective resilience strategies must therefore account for both global interdependencies and local specificities.

The COVID-19 pandemic serves as a powerful illustration of the limitations of traditional resilience approaches and the need for more comprehensive frameworks. Many organizations were caught unprepared by the scale and duration of the crisis, revealing significant weaknesses in preparedness, flexibility, and coordination. At the same time, the pandemic demonstrated the potential for rapid adaptation and innovation. Organizations that were able to reconfigure their operations, adopt digital technologies, and collaborate across organizational boundaries were better positioned to navigate the crisis effectively. These experiences underscore the critical importance of organizational agility, continuous learning, and transformative capacity as core components of resilience.

Despite the growing recognition of these challenges, the literature on organizational resilience remains fragmented. Different streams of research focus on specific aspects of resilience, such as risk management, crisis response, supply chain resilience, or strategic adaptation. While each of these perspectives provides valuable insights, there is a lack of integrative frameworks that address the complexity of polycrisis environments. In particular, existing models often fail to capture the interactions between different capabilities and the need for coordination across organizational levels and external stakeholders (Hillmann & Guenther, 2021).

This study seeks to address this gap by developing a strategic capability framework for architecting organizational resilience in the age of polycrisis. Rather than focusing on individual capabilities in isolation, the study adopts a systemic perspective that emphasizes the interdependence and integration of multiple

capabilities. The central argument is that resilience in polycrisis conditions depends on the ability to orchestrate a set of complementary capabilities that enable organizations to respond effectively to complex and evolving challenges.

Specifically, this study identifies three core capability clusters: adaptive agility, systemic integration, and anticipatory intelligence. Adaptive agility refers to the ability to respond quickly and effectively to changing conditions through flexible structures, processes, and decision-making mechanisms. Systemic integration involves the alignment and coordination of activities across organizational units and external partners, ensuring coherence in the face of complexity. Anticipatory intelligence encompasses the capacity to detect emerging trends, assess potential risks, and proactively shape strategic responses. Together, these capabilities form the foundation of a resilient organization capable of navigating polycrisis environments.

In addition to identifying these capabilities, the study highlights the importance of organizational architecture in enabling resilience. Organizational architecture refers to the configuration of structures, processes, governance mechanisms, and cultural norms that shape how an organization operates. In a polycrisis context, traditional hierarchical and rigid structures may hinder responsiveness and adaptability. Instead, organizations may need to adopt more modular, networked, and decentralized architectures that facilitate rapid information flow, collaboration, and decision-making (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011).

Governance also plays a critical role in shaping resilience outcomes. Effective governance frameworks must balance competing demands, such as efficiency versus redundancy, centralization versus decentralization, and short-term performance versus long-term sustainability. In a polycrisis environment, this balance becomes more complex, as organizations must simultaneously manage immediate disruptions and prepare for future uncertainties. This requires new approaches to leadership, decision-making, and accountability that emphasize flexibility, inclusiveness, and strategic alignment.

Furthermore, the study emphasizes the role of inter-organizational networks in building resilience. No organization operates in isolation, and resilience often depends on the strength of relationships with suppliers, partners, regulators, and other stakeholders. In polycrisis conditions, collaboration and coordination across organizational boundaries become essential for managing shared risks and leveraging collective resources. This highlights the need for a broader, ecosystem-based perspective on resilience that extends beyond individual organizations.

This study contributes to the literature in several ways. First, it advances the concept of polycrisis as a distinct analytical lens for understanding organizational resilience, highlighting the importance of interdependence and systemic complexity. Second, it integrates insights from multiple disciplines to develop a comprehensive framework that captures the multi-dimensional nature of resilience. Third, it provides practical guidance for organizational leaders seeking to design and implement resilience strategies in complex and uncertain environments.

This study addresses these gaps by proposing a novel strategic capability framework for organizational resilience in the age of polycrisis. Unlike prior research that often treats resilience as a set of isolated responses to discrete shocks, this study conceptualizes resilience as an integrated and dynamic architecture shaped by the interaction of adaptive agility, systemic integration, and anticipatory intelligence. Furthermore, it introduces a multi-layered perspective that connects strategic intent, operational flexibility, and ecosystem coordination, thereby offering a comprehensive approach to managing interlocking global shocks.

The age of polycrisis represents a fundamental shift in the nature of organizational challenges, requiring a rethinking of resilience from a static and reactive concept to a dynamic and proactive capability. By developing a strategic capability framework, this study aims to provide a foundation for understanding and enhancing organizational resilience in an increasingly complex and uncertain world.

## Method

This study adopts a descriptive qualitative research design aimed at developing a conceptual framework for organizational resilience in the context of polycrisis. Given the emergent and complex nature of interlocking global shocks, a qualitative approach is appropriate for capturing multi-dimensional and interdisciplinary insights that are not easily quantifiable (Duchek, 2020). Rather than testing predefined hypotheses, this study focuses on theory-building through systematic synthesis of existing knowledge.

The research method is based on an integrative literature review, which enables the consolidation and critical evaluation of findings from diverse fields, including strategic management, organizational

theory, risk management, and resilience studies (Torraco, 2016). This approach is particularly suitable for addressing fragmented research domains and generating new conceptual perspectives (Hillmann & Guenther, 2021). The literature selection process followed a purposive sampling strategy, emphasizing relevance, theoretical contribution, and recency, with a focus on publications from 2010 to 2025 that address organizational resilience, systemic risk, and global disruptions.

Data sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and institutional reports such as those from the World Economic Forum and OECD, which provide insights into global risk dynamics and polycrisis conditions (World Economic Forum, 2023). The inclusion criteria prioritized studies that explicitly address adaptive capacity, dynamic capabilities, crisis management, and inter-organizational coordination (Teece, 2018; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011).

The analytical process was conducted in three stages. First, thematic coding was applied to identify recurring concepts such as agility, integration, and anticipation across the literature. Second, these themes were clustered into broader capability dimensions representing core elements of organizational resilience. Third, an interpretive synthesis was performed to integrate these dimensions into a coherent strategic capability framework that reflects the systemic and dynamic nature of polycrisis environments.

To ensure rigor and credibility, the study applies principles of transparency, triangulation, and conceptual consistency. Multiple sources were cross-analyzed to identify converging patterns and minimize bias (Teece, 2018). Although the study does not involve primary empirical data, its contribution lies in developing a theoretically grounded and practically relevant framework that can guide future empirical research and organizational practice.

## Results and Discussion

### Reframing Organizational Resilience in the Context of Polycrisis

The findings of this study indicate that organizational resilience in the age of polycrisis cannot be adequately understood through traditional linear or equilibrium-based models. Instead, resilience must be reframed as a dynamic, systemic, and multi-dimensional capability that evolves in response to continuous and interlocking disruptions. Unlike isolated crises, polycrisis conditions involve cascading effects across multiple domains, requiring organizations to operate within complex adaptive systems (Folke, 2006; World Economic Forum, 2023).

This reconceptualization aligns with the shift from static resilience—focused on recovery—to dynamic resilience, which emphasizes adaptability, transformation, and continuous learning (Duchek, 2020). Organizations are no longer expected to "bounce back" but rather to "bounce forward," leveraging disruptions as opportunities for strategic renewal. This perspective also reflects the principles of dynamic capabilities, where firms continuously reconfigure resources to maintain competitiveness in volatile environments (Teece, 2018).

### Core Strategic Capability Clusters

The analysis identifies three interdependent capability clusters that form the foundation of resilience in polycrisis environments: adaptive agility, systemic integration, and anticipatory intelligence.

1. *Adaptive Agility*

   Adaptive agility refers to the organization's capacity to respond rapidly and effectively to unexpected disruptions through flexible structures, decentralized decision-making, and iterative learning processes. This capability extends beyond operational flexibility to include strategic responsiveness, enabling organizations to pivot business models, reallocate resources, and redesign processes in real time (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011).

   In polycrisis conditions, agility becomes critical due to the speed and unpredictability of change. Organizations that rely on rigid hierarchies and standardized procedures may struggle to respond effectively. Instead, agile organizations adopt modular structures and cross-functional teams, which facilitate rapid decision-making and knowledge sharing (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2007). Furthermore, digital technologies play a key role in enabling agility by providing real-time data and communication capabilities.

   However, adaptive agility also introduces challenges. Rapid decision-making can lead to errors or inconsistencies if not supported by appropriate governance mechanisms. Therefore, organizations must balance speed with accuracy, ensuring that agility does not compromise decision quality.

2. *Systemic Integration*

   Systemic integration refers to the alignment and coordination of activities across organizational units and external stakeholders. In polycrisis environments, disruptions often span multiple domains, requiring

coordinated responses that transcend organizational boundaries. This highlights the importance of inter-organizational networks, including suppliers, partners, regulators, and communities (Boin & van Eeten, 2013).

Effective systemic integration involves both structural and relational elements. Structurally, organizations must design processes and governance mechanisms that facilitate coordination across functions and geographies. Relationally, they must build trust and collaboration among stakeholders, enabling the sharing of information and resources.

One of the key challenges of systemic integration is managing complexity. As organizations become more interconnected, they also become more vulnerable to cascading failures. This creates a paradox: while integration enhances coordination, it can also increase systemic risk. To address this, organizations must adopt network-based resilience strategies, such as redundancy, diversification, and decentralization (Briguglio, 2009).

3. *Anticipatory Intelligence*

Anticipatory intelligence refers to the ability to identify emerging risks and opportunities before they fully materialize. This capability is particularly important in polycrisis environments, where early signals can provide critical insights into potential disruptions. Anticipatory intelligence involves the use of strategic foresight, scenario planning, and data analytics to inform decision-making (Duchek, 2020).

Unlike predictive models that rely on historical data, anticipatory approaches emphasize uncertainty and multiple possible futures. Organizations must therefore develop the capacity to think in terms of scenarios rather than forecasts, exploring a range of potential outcomes and their implications. This requires not only analytical tools but also cognitive and cultural shifts, including openness to ambiguity and willingness to challenge assumptions.

Importantly, anticipatory intelligence is not limited to identifying risks; it also enables organizations to seize opportunities arising from disruption. For example, organizations that anticipated shifts toward digitalization during the COVID-19 pandemic were better positioned to adapt and innovate.

**Tensions in Resilience Architecture**

The integration of these capability clusters reveals several inherent tensions that organizations must navigate when designing resilience strategies.

a) *Efficiency vs. Redundancy*
Traditional management emphasizes efficiency, minimizing costs and eliminating redundancies. However, resilience requires the presence of buffers and slack resources that can be mobilized during crises (Wildavsky, 1988). In polycrisis contexts, organizations must strike a balance between efficiency and resilience, recognizing that excessive optimization can increase vulnerability.

b) *Centralization vs. Decentralization*
Centralized structures enable coordination and control, while decentralized structures enhance flexibility and responsiveness. Effective resilience requires a hybrid approach, combining centralized strategic direction with decentralized operational autonomy (Teece, 2018).

c) *Stability vs. Transformation*
Organizations must maintain operational stability while simultaneously adapting to changing conditions. This duality creates tension between short-term performance and long-term transformation. Successful organizations are those that can manage this paradox, maintaining continuity while pursuing innovation.

**A Multi-Layered Resilience Architecture**

Building on the identified capabilities, this study proposes a multi-layered resilience architecture consisting of three levels: strategic, operational, and ecosystem.

a) *Strategic Level*
At the strategic level, resilience is embedded in organizational vision, leadership, and governance. This includes the integration of resilience into corporate strategy, the establishment of risk governance frameworks, and the development of leadership capabilities that support adaptability and learning.

b) *Operational Level*
At the operational level, resilience is enacted through processes, systems, and practices. This includes supply chain management, crisis response mechanisms, and digital infrastructure. Operational resilience ensures that organizations can continue functioning under adverse conditions.

c) *Ecosystem Level*

At the ecosystem level, resilience extends beyond the organization to include external networks and stakeholders. This reflects the reality that resilience in polycrisis contexts is a collective endeavor, requiring collaboration and coordination across organizational boundaries.

**Implications for Global Organizations**

For global organizations, the findings highlight the need for adaptive and flexible organizational architectures. Traditional hierarchical structures may be insufficient in complex environments, necessitating more decentralized and networked models. Additionally, organizations must invest in digital technologies that support real-time decision-making and coordination.

Cross-border operations introduce additional challenges, including regulatory diversity and cultural differences. Organizations must therefore adopt a glocal approach, balancing global consistency with local adaptability (World Economic Forum, 2023).

Leadership also plays a critical role. Leaders must foster a culture of resilience, encouraging experimentation, learning, and collaboration. This requires a shift from command-and-control leadership styles to more participatory and adaptive approaches.

**Theoretical Contribution and Synthesis**

This study contributes to the literature by advancing a polycrisis-oriented framework of organizational resilience. Unlike traditional models that focus on isolated risks, this framework emphasizes the interconnected and dynamic nature of global disruptions. By integrating adaptive agility, systemic integration, and anticipatory intelligence, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of resilience as a multi-dimensional capability.

Furthermore, the study extends dynamic capability theory by incorporating systemic and anticipatory elements, highlighting the importance of coordination and foresight in complex environments (Teece, 2018). It also bridges the gap between resilience and strategic management literature, offering a unified perspective on how organizations can navigate uncertainty and complexity.

**Synthesis: Toward Resilience as Strategic Architecture**

Overall, the findings suggest that resilience in the age of polycrisis is not a single capability but a strategic architecture composed of interdependent elements. This architecture must be continuously adapted and reconfigured in response to changing conditions, requiring organizations to develop not only capabilities but also the capacity to integrate and orchestrate them effectively.

By adopting this perspective, organizations can move beyond reactive approaches to crisis management and toward proactive strategies that enable long-term sustainability and success in an increasingly complex world.

## Conclusion

This study has explored the evolving nature of organizational resilience in the context of polycrisis, emphasizing the need to move beyond traditional, reactive approaches toward a more dynamic and integrative framework. The findings demonstrate that resilience in contemporary global environments is no longer defined solely by the ability to absorb shocks and recover, but rather by the capacity to continuously adapt, anticipate, and transform in response to interlocking and systemic disruptions (Duchek, 2020; Folke, 2006).

A central contribution of this study is the identification of three interdependent strategic capability clusters—adaptive agility, systemic integration, and anticipatory intelligence—that collectively form the foundation of resilience in polycrisis conditions. These capabilities highlight that effective resilience is not achieved through isolated mechanisms but through the orchestration of complementary processes that enable organizations to respond holistically to complex challenges. Adaptive agility supports rapid and flexible responses, systemic integration ensures coordination across organizational and ecosystem levels, and anticipatory intelligence enables proactive identification of emerging risks and opportunities (Teece, 2018; Hillmann & Guenther, 2021).

The study further advances the literature by proposing a multi-layered resilience architecture encompassing strategic, operational, and ecosystem levels. This framework underscores the importance of aligning leadership, processes, and external networks to create a coherent and adaptive system. In particular, the findings highlight that resilience is increasingly dependent on inter-organizational collaboration and

network-based capabilities, reflecting the interconnected nature of global risks (Boin & van Eeten, 2013; World Economic Forum, 2023).

Importantly, the study reveals several inherent tensions that organizations must navigate, including the trade-offs between efficiency and redundancy, centralization and decentralization, and stability and transformation. These tensions suggest that resilience is not a fixed state but a continuous balancing act requiring strategic judgment and adaptive governance. Organizations that can effectively manage these paradoxes are more likely to sustain performance and achieve long-term viability in uncertain environments.

From a practical perspective, the findings offer important implications for organizational leaders. First, resilience should be embedded as a core strategic priority, rather than treated as a reactive or operational concern. Second, organizations must invest in developing capabilities that support learning, flexibility, and foresight, including digital technologies and data-driven decision-making systems. Third, leaders must foster a culture that encourages experimentation, collaboration, and continuous adaptation, enabling the organization to respond effectively to evolving challenges.

This study also contributes theoretically by integrating insights from resilience theory, dynamic capabilities, and strategic management into a unified framework tailored to polycrisis conditions. By introducing a polycrisis lens, the study extends existing conceptualizations of resilience and highlights the importance of systemic complexity and interdependence. It thus provides a foundation for future research exploring the mechanisms and outcomes of resilience in increasingly complex environments.

Nevertheless, this study has limitations. As a conceptual and descriptive analysis, it does not provide empirical validation of the proposed framework. Future research should conduct empirical studies—such as case studies, surveys, or longitudinal analyses—to test the relationships between the identified capabilities and organizational performance. Additionally, further research could explore sector-specific applications and examine how resilience strategies vary across industries and institutional contexts.

The age of polycrisis requires organizations to rethink resilience as a strategic architecture rather than a defensive capability. By developing and integrating adaptive agility, systemic integration, and anticipatory intelligence, organizations can move beyond survival toward sustained adaptability and transformation. Ultimately, those organizations that embrace resilience as a core strategic capability will be better positioned to navigate uncertainty, mitigate risks, and capitalize on emerging opportunities in an increasingly complex and interconnected world.

**AI Usage Statement**

This study utilized generative artificial intelligence (AI) as a supportive tool in the preparation of the manuscript. AI was employed to assist in language refinement, structuring of academic arguments, and improving clarity, coherence, and readability of the text. The conceptualization of the research topic, development of the theoretical framework, interpretation of findings, and overall intellectual contribution were conducted independently by the author.

All AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed, edited, and validated to ensure accuracy, originality, and alignment with academic standards. The author takes full responsibility for the integrity of the content, including all arguments, analyses, and conclusions presented in this article.

No AI tools were used for data fabrication, falsification, or generation of empirical results. The use of AI in this study complies with ethical guidelines for academic writing and publication, ensuring transparency, accountability, and responsible use of emerging technologies.

## References

Boin, A., & van Eeten, M. (2013). The resilient organization. *Public Management Review, 15*(3), 429–445. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.769856

Briguglio, L. (2009). Economic vulnerability and resilience: Concepts and measurements. *Oxford Development Studies, 37*(3), 229–247. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600810903089893

Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research, 13*, 215–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7

Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 31*, 253–267. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511

Gunderson, L. H. (2000). Ecological resilience—In theory and application. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 31*, 425–439. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.425

Hillmann, J., & Guenther, E. (2021). Organizational resilience: A valuable construct for management research? *International Journal of Production Economics, 232*, 107980. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2020.107980

Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245

Ivanov, D., & Dolgui, A. (2020). Viability of intertwined supply networks: Extending the supply chain resilience angles. *International Journal of Production Research, 58*(10), 2904–2915. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2020.1750727

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*(3), 243–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001

Manyena, S. B. (2006). The concept of resilience revisited. *Disasters, 30*(4), 434–450. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0361-3666.2006.00331.x

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71

OECD. (2020). *Building back better: A sustainable, resilient recovery after COVID-19*. https://doi.org/10.1787/52b869f5-en

Ponomarov, S. Y., & Holcomb, M. C. (2009). Understanding the concept of supply chain resilience. *The International Journal of Logistics Management, 20*(1), 124–143. https://doi.org/10.1108/09574090910954873

Ramezani, J., & Camarinha-Matos, L. M. (2020). Approaches for resilience and antifragility in collaborative business ecosystems. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 151*, 119846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119846

Sutcliffe, K. M., & Vogus, T. J. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 94–110).

Svoboda, A. (2025). Behavioral Finance in the Age of Technology: The Evolving Biases of Modern Investors. International Journal of Social Science, Education, Communication and Economics, 4(3), 341–352. https://doi.org/10.54443/sj.v4i3.452

Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning, 51*(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing integrative literature reviews. *Human Resource Development Review, 15*(4), 404–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606

Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society, 9*(2), 5. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-00650-090205

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Managing the unexpected* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Wildavsky, A. (1988). *Searching for safety*. Transaction Publishers.

World Economic Forum. (2023). *The global risks report 2023*. https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-risks-report-2023