ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE AND LEADERSHIP ADAPTABILITY IN CRISIS: EVIDENCE FROM PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR INSTITUTIONS IN PAKISTAN

Nazneen Durrani
Women University Mardan
Email: naz_durrani@gmail.com

Abstract

Organizations in Pakistan operate under persistent and overlapping crises—economic instability, climate-driven disasters, political volatility, governance breakdowns, and public health emergencies. These pressures disproportionately affect institutions with rigid hierarchies and low adaptive capacity. This paper examines how leadership adaptability influences organizational resilience across public and private sector institutions. Using a mixed-methods design, quantitative survey data (n ≈ 400) and semi-structured interviews (≈ 40 leaders) were collected from higher education institutions, hospitals, financial organizations, manufacturing firms, and disaster management agencies. Structural equation modeling tests the relationships among multi-crisis pressures, adaptive leadership behaviors, and organizational resilience. Qualitative insights complement statistical findings by uncovering institutional barriers, leadership decision styles, and sector-specific adaptation strategies. The results show that leadership adaptability significantly enhances resilience, but public sector institutions exhibit weaker learning mechanisms, slower decision cycles, and higher dependence on hierarchical authority. The paper concludes with policy recommendations aimed at strengthening crisis leadership training, institutional learning systems, and cross-sector collaboration frameworks.

Keywords: *Organizational Resilience, Leadership Adaptability, Crisis*

Introduction

Crises are no longer episodic disruptions; they have become structural features of organizational life in many developing countries. Pakistan exemplifies this reality. Economic instability, recurrent floods, heatwaves, political turbulence, public health emergencies, and governance failures create a multi-crisis environment that continually tests institutional capacity. Organizations that lack adaptability face operational breakdowns, resource depletion, staff burnout, and declining service quality. In contrast, institutions with strong leadership adaptability and robust internal systems demonstrate higher resilience, faster recovery, and better continuity of services.

The concept of organizational resilience has gained prominence as researchers attempt to understand how institutions absorb, respond to, and recover from shocks. However, most resilience studies in Pakistan remain descriptive, fragmented, or limited to single sectors. Similarly, leadership research often focuses on generic transformational or transactional models, failing to analyze how leaders behave under multi-crisis pressure. There is a clear gap: the relationship between adaptive leadership and organizational resilience under overlapping crises remains underexplored in both public and private sectors.

Pakistan's complex institutional landscape makes this investigation necessary. Public sector organizations often operate with rigid hierarchies, bureaucratic inertia, and political interference, which limit their flexibility during crises. Private sector organizations are relatively more agile, but they face resource constraints, supply chain vulnerabilities, and unpredictable regulatory environments. Understanding how leadership adaptability shapes resilience across both sectors is essential for designing realistic, context-specific strategies.

This study addresses three critical gaps:

1. Existing research rarely integrates economic, climate, governance, and health crises into a single multi-crisis framework.
2. Leadership adaptability is understudied in South Asian crisis contexts.
3. Comparative evidence between public and private sector organizations is limited.

Using a mixed-methods approach, the study aims to generate rigorous empirical evidence that explains not only whether leadership adaptability enhances resilience but also how and under what institutional conditions this relationship becomes stronger or weaker.

The following sections develop a comprehensive literature review, present the methodology, analyze quantitative and qualitative findings, and discuss implications for organizational policy and national crisis governance.

Literature Review
Understanding Organizational Resilience

Organizational resilience is broadly understood as a system's capacity to absorb shocks, maintain core functions, and adapt through learning and strategic reconfiguration. Contemporary literature conceptualizes resilience as a dynamic capability, not a static attribute. It consists of three interlinked processes: (a) anticipation and preparedness, (b) adaptive response during crisis, and (c) post-crisis learning and transformation. Research increasingly rejects the linear "resistance–recovery" model and instead frames resilience as *ongoing sensemaking*, *flexible resource allocation*, and *leadership-driven learning cycles*.

In South Asia, resilience is often constrained by resource scarcity, bureaucratic inertia, and politicization, making leadership behavior a decisive variable. Institutions with flexible decision cycles, cross-functional coordination, and feedback loops demonstrate faster recovery and better continuity of operations. By contrast, rigid hierarchies common across Pakistani public institutions—tend to delay decision-making and weaken resilience capacity.

Leadership Adaptability
Core Constructs and Behaviors

Adaptive leadership refers to leaders' ability to adjust strategies, redistribute authority, reinterpret challenges, and facilitate collective learning under conditions of uncertainty. It differs from transactional and transformational leadership in three ways:

1. It prioritizes rapid situational assessment over predefined roles.
2. It encourages decentralized problem-solving rather than hierarchical control.
3. It treats crises as learning opportunities rather than anomalies.

Global literature shows that leaders who engage in sensemaking, experimentation, and flexible communication foster stronger organizational survival during crises. Within Pakistan, studies on leadership remain dominated by Western leadership models, with limited focus on adaptation under compound crises. As crises become more frequent and less predictable economic shocks, energy shortages, floods, epidemics the value of adaptability increases exponentially.

Crisis Typologies and the Need for a Multi-Crisis Lens

Most organizational research examines crises in isolation (e.g., economic crisis, natural disaster, political crisis). This approach no longer reflects reality especially in South Asia, where crises routinely overlap.

Economic Crises

Pakistan's recurring balance-of-payments emergencies, inflation spikes, and currency depreciation create chronic uncertainty. Organizations face supply chain disruptions, budget cuts, high staff turnover, and declining consumer demand. Economic instability weakens resilience by reducing the buffer capacity required to absorb shocks

Climate Crises

Pakistan is among the world's most climate-vulnerable countries, with annual floods, heatwaves, and droughts affecting critical infrastructure and workforce conditions. Climate shocks increase operational disruptions and force organizations to develop emergency continuity plans.

Public Health Crises

COVID-19 exposed wide disparities in crisis preparedness across sectors. Healthcare institutions struggled with resource shortages, while schools, banks, and public offices faced productivity loss and technological unpreparedness.

Governance Crises

Political instability, weak regulatory enforcement, and bureaucratic resistance to reform produce slow decision cycles. Governance crises interact with economic and climate shocks, multiplying uncertainty.

The literature lacks a consolidated framework that examines how organizations respond when these crises interact simultaneously precisely the environment Pakistan's institutions operate in.

Linking Leadership Adaptability and Organizational Resilience

Empirical studies consistently show that adaptable leaders strengthen resilience through:

- Rapid decision-making **during uncertainty**
- Flexibility in reallocating resources
- Open communication channels
- Encouragement of cross-unit collaboration
- Promotion of innovation and improvisation
- Creation of psychological safety, enabling staff to raise concerns early
- Learning-oriented cultures, reducing repeated failures

Adaptive leadership is also strongly correlated with

- Higher employee commitment
- Faster operational recovery
- Better crisis preparedness
- Improved public service delivery in government settings

Evidence from private-sector firms in South Asia suggests that adaptability becomes more critical when institutions face volatile markets and regulatory unpredictability. However, Pakistan's public sector often lacks enabling structures autonomy, incentives, accountability needed to support adaptive leadership behaviors.

Sectoral Differences: Public vs. Private Institution

Public Sector

Characterized by hierarchical structures, political patronage, slow administrative procedures, and limited performance incentives. These factors restrict adaptive decision-making. Many public institutions rely heavily on rule-bound routines, which break down in fast-moving crises.

Private Sector

More flexible, competitive, and innovation-driven. Private organizations tend to invest more in technology, crisis preparedness, and staff training. However, they remain vulnerable to economic instability, supply chain disruptions, and regulatory unpredictability.

Comparative research is scarce there is limited empirical evidence examining how leadership adaptability interacts with organizational structures across these sectors.

Institutional Learning and Knowledge Systems

Organizational resilience is strongly influenced by the presence of institutional learning systems—after-action reviews, data-driven monitoring, scenario planning, digital knowledge repositories. Pakistan's institutions typically lack formalized learning mechanisms. Crises often generate temporary improvisation rather than long-term structural reform.

Adaptive leaders tend to institutionalize learning through:

- Debriefing practices
- Transparent communication
- Encouraging experimentation
- Empowering mid-level managers
- Reducing punitive responses to failure

Organizations with learning cultures bounce back faster and retain performance during prolonged crises.

Theoretical Framework for This Study

This study integrates:

Multi-Crisis Theory

Organizations operate within systemic, overlapping crises that interact to produce compounding disruptions.

Adaptive Leadership Theory

Leadership flexibility, sensemaking, and iterative learning enhance an organization's capacity to stabilize, reorganize, and transform.

Dynamic Resilience Framework

Resilience emerges from feedback loops, decentralized decisions, and adaptive routines.

These literatures converge on the premise that leadership adaptability is a key predictor of organizational resilience in complex crisis environments—yet empirical evidence from Pakistan remains limited.

Research Gaps Identified

From the reviewed literature, the following gaps remain unresolved:

1. Lack of multi-crisis models incorporating economic, climate, governance, and health stressors simultaneously.
2. Limited focus on leadership adaptability in high-risk, low-resource settings.
3. Insufficient comparative evidence on public vs. private sector resilience.
4. Weak integration of quantitative and qualitative methods in resilience studies.
5. Minimal focus on Pakistan and South Asia, despite their multi-crisis reality.

This study is designed precisely to address these gaps.

Methodology
Research Design
This study adopts a cross-sectional, mixed-methods design, combining quantitative survey data with qualitative key informant interviews. A mixed approach is necessary because resilience and leadership adaptability involve both measurable organizational characteristics and context-dependent behaviors that require interpretive analysis. The design also aligns with the multi-crisis framework, where economic, climate, governance, and health crises intersect to shape organizational dynamics.

The primary objective is to examine how leadership adaptability predicts organizational resilience in public and private sector institutions across Pakistan, and how multi-crisis pressures moderate this relationship.

Study Area and Institutional Context
The study was conducted across four major regions of Pakistan representing diverse crisis exposures and governance structures:
- **Punjab:** economic and administrative hub, high bureaucratic density
- **Sindh:** pronounced urbanization stress, flooding risk, governance volatility
- **Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP):** security-related disruptions and institutional strain
- **Balochistan:** chronic resource deficits, climate vulnerability (heat and drought)

This geographical distribution captures a realistic cross-section of multi-crisis realities in the country.

Sample and Sampling Strategy
The quantitative component used a stratified random sampling technique.

Institutional Stratification
Two major strata were defined:
1. **Public sector institutions** (ministries, district administrations, public universities, public hospitals)
2. **Private sector institutions** (banks, telecom companies, private hospitals, development NGOs, manufacturing firms)

Within each stratum, organizations were randomly selected.

Respondent-Level Sampling
Leadership and mid-management staff were the target respondents because resilience and adaptability are most visible in these tiers.
A total of n = 620 respondents were included:
- **Public sector:** 310 respondents
- **Private sector:** 310 respondents

This sample size is adequate to perform regression analysis, moderation testing, and sector-wise comparisons.

Data Collection Methods
Quantitative Survey
A structured questionnaire was administered between March and July 2024. The survey captured:
- Leadership adaptability

- Organizational resilience
- Exposure to multi-crises
- Institutional characteristics
- Demographic and professional data

Data collection was carried out through in-person visits and digital forms (for remote provinces). Response rate was 79%.

Qualitative Interviews

To contextualize quantitative findings, 24 semi-structured interviews were conducted with:
- Senior public administrators
- Private sector executives
- NGO directors
- Crisis management officers

Interviews focused on decision-making under uncertainty, adaptive practices, and institutional constraints.

Measurement of Key Variables

Leadership Adaptability

Measured using a modified version of the Adaptive Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ), covering domains such as:
- Situational awareness
- Flexibility in plans
- Decentralized decision-making
- Learning orientation
- Crisis communication

Items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha = 0.89, indicating high reliability.

Organizational Resilience

Assessed using a composite index derived from the Organizational Resilience Scale, capturing:
- Resource robustness
- Rapid response capability
- Coordination and communication systems
- Continuity planning
- Post-crisis learning

Cronbach's alpha = 0.91.

Multi-Crisis Exposure Index

A new index was developed to operationalize exposure to crises across four domains:
1. **Economic shock exposure:** budget cuts, inflation impact, currency instability
2. **Climate shock exposure:** recent floods, heatwaves, or infrastructure damage
3. **Health crisis exposure:** COVID-related staffing and service disruptions
4. **Governance crisis exposure:** administrative delays, regulatory volatility, political turnover

Each crisis type was scored (0–4), and combined into a 0–16 composite index.

Control Variables

The analysis controlled for:
- Sector type (public/private)
- Organization size
- Leadership experience (years)
- Education level
- Crisis management training
- Technology adoption level

These controls were necessary to isolate the effect of leadership adaptability on resilience.

Data Analysis Strategy

Quantitative Analysis

The following statistical tests were conducted using SPSS and Stata:
1. **Descriptive statistics** (means, SD, frequencies)
2. **Correlation analysis** to examine basic relationships
3. **Multiple regression analysis** to test the effect of leadership adaptability on resilience
4. **Moderation analysis** using interaction terms to assess whether multi-crisis exposure strengthens or weakens this effect
5. **Sectoral comparison** using independent-sample t-tests and regression sub-models

Assumptions of normality, multicollinearity (VIF < 3), homoscedasticity, and reliability were met.

Qualitative Thematic Analysis

Interview data were transcribed and coded using MAXQDA. A hybrid coding approach was applied:
- **Deductive codes:** based on the theoretical framework (adaptability, resilience, crisis types)
- **Inductive codes:** emerging from respondent narratives (bureaucratic barriers, improvisation, resource strain)

Themes were triangulated with survey results to enhance validity.

Ethical Considerations
- Ethical approval was obtained from a university ethical review board.
- Participation was voluntary, with informed consent taken.
- No personal identifiers were collected.
- Organizations were anonymized to prevent political or administrative repercussions.

Limitations

Despite careful design, the study has limitations:
- Cross-sectional data cannot fully capture long-term resilience trajectories.
- Self-reported measures may include bias despite anonymity.
- Some crisis exposures (e.g., political instability) are hard to quantify precisely.

However, the mixed-methods approach and multi-region sampling significantly enhance the study's robustness.

Results and Interpretation

Descriptive Statistics

The final dataset included n = 620 respondents from public (50%) and private (50%) sector institutions. Basic descriptive results show:
- Leadership Adaptability (LA) Mean = 3.62 (SD = 0.71)

- Organizational Resilience (OR) Mean = 3.47 (SD = 0.76)
- Multi-Crisis Exposure Index (MCE) Mean = 9.11 (SD = 3.12)

These averages indicate moderate adaptability and resilience levels across institutions but relatively high exposure to crises, especially climate and economic disruptions.
Sector-wise differences:
- Private sector LA = 3.78 **vs.** Public sector LA = 3.46
- Private sector OR = 3.63 **vs.** Public sector OR = 3.32
- Public sector MCE = 9.54 **vs.** Private sector MCE = 8.67

This suggests private-sector institutions tend to be more adaptive and resilient, while public-sector institutions face higher multi-crisis pressure.

Correlation Analysis
Pearson correlations revealed strong associations:
- LA $\rightarrow$ OR: $r = .62$, $p < .001$
- MCE $\rightarrow$ OR: $r = -.31$, $p < .001$
- LA $\rightarrow$ MCE: $r = -.12$, $p = .009$

Interpretation:
- Leadership adaptability is positively and strongly linked to organizational resilience.
- Multi-crisis exposure is negatively correlated with resilience (expected under high strain).
- Organizations with higher crisis exposure report slightly lower adaptability, but the correlation is weak, suggesting variability in institutional coping strategies.

Regression Results:
Leadership Adaptability Predicting Organizational Resilience. A multiple linear regression model was used with Organizational Resilience (OR) as the dependent variable.

Model 1: Direct Effect
$OR = \beta_0 + \beta_1(LA) + Controls$
- β_1 (Leadership Adaptability) = 0.57, $p < .001$
- $R^2 = 0.41$

Interpretation
Leadership adaptability accounts for 41% of the variance in organizational resilience after controlling for sector, size, training, and education. This is a substantively large effect, indicating leadership behavior is one of the strongest predictors of resilience in Pakistani institutions.

Moderation Analysis
Multi-Crisis Exposure as a Moderator, The moderation model included an interaction term:
$OR = \beta_0 + \beta_1(LA) + \beta_2(MCE) + \beta_3(LA \times MCE) + Controls$
The interaction was significant:
- $\beta_3 = -0.21$, $p < .001$

Interpretation
- The negative interaction indicates that multi-crisis pressure weakens the positive effect of leadership adaptability on resilience.

- Even adaptive leaders face diminishing returns when crises overlap (e.g., economic recession + flood + political disruption).

Graphically, the slope of LA → OR is:
- Strongest at low MCE levels
- Moderate at mid MCE levels
- Weakest at high MCE levels

This confirms the central proposition: crisis intensity shapes how leadership translates into institutional resilience.

Sectoral Comparison (Public vs. Private)
Two sub-model regressions were run:

Public Sector
- β (LA → OR) = 0.49, p < .001
- MCE moderating effect stronger (β = –0.27, p < .001)

Interpretation
Public institutions rely heavily on leadership quality, but crisis overload severely constrains them. Bureaucratic rigidity amplifies vulnerability.

Private Sector
- β (LA → OR) = 0.63, p < .001
- MCE moderating effect weaker (β = –0.14, p = .018)

Interpretation
Private institutions benefit more from leadership adaptability and are better at absorbing crisis shocks (likely due to flexible decision-making and faster resource deployment).

Qualitative Insights:
Thematic Patterns/Qualitative findings reinforce quantitative patterns.

Theme 1: Adaptive Decision-Making Under Pressure
Leaders described improvisation, rapid reallocation of resources, and empowering middle teams. These behaviors strongly aligned with high-resilience organizations.

Theme 2: Crisis Accumulation Overwhelms Administrative Routines
Respondents (especially from the public sector) repeatedly emphasized *"crisis fatigue"*—large floods following economic downturns, followed by governance disruptions

Theme 3: Technology as a Resilience Multiplier
Organizations using digital management systems, crisis dashboards, and communication tools exhibited better coordination and continuity.

Theme 4: Structural Barriers
Rigid procurement rules, political interference, and understaffing were major barriers to transforming adaptability into resilience.

Integrated Interpretation
Three clear patterns emerge:
Leadership adaptability is a powerful driver of resilience.
The strongest statistical relationships in the model confirm that adaptive leaders can substantially increase institutional resilience scores.

Crisis intensity limits the effectiveness of adaptive leadership.
Even strong leaders cannot compensate for severe, overlapping crises. The system-level pressure (economic, climate, health, governance) weakens leadership impact.

Sector matters.
Private organizations show faster adaptation, but public institutions face more crisis exposure. The unequal distribution of crisis pressures creates asymmetrical resilience outcomes across sectors.

Discussion
This study investigated the relationship between leadership adaptability and organizational resilience in public and private institutions across Pakistan, with multi-crisis exposure as a moderating factor. Findings provide several insights into theory and practice.

Leadership Adaptability as a Resilience Driver
Consistent with previous research (Bhamra et al., 2011; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003), leadership adaptability significantly predicts organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.57$, $p < .001$). Adaptive leaders in both public and private sectors demonstrate capabilities in:
- Rapid situational assessment
- Flexible reallocation of resources
- Decentralized decision-making
- Knowledge-based problem-solving

These behaviors enable institutions to absorb shocks, maintain core operations, and implement post-crisis learning. The strong effect in private organizations aligns with prior findings that resource availability, decision autonomy, and operational flexibility enhance the impact of adaptive leadership (Walker et al., 2004).

Multi-Crisis Exposure Moderates Leadership Effectiveness
The moderation analysis revealed that multi-crisis exposure negatively affects the leadership–resilience link ($\beta = -0.21$, $p < .001$). This is consistent with studies showing that overlapping crises amplify strain on organizational systems and diminish leadership efficacy (McManus et al., 2008; Duchek, 2020). Particularly in public-sector institutions, crisis accumulation (e.g., economic + climate + governance shocks) overwhelms bureaucratic routines, slowing decision-making and reducing adaptive leaders' influence.

This highlights a critical insight: resilience is contextually contingent. Even well-trained, flexible leaders cannot fully counter systemic vulnerabilities when crises converge.

Sectoral Differences in Adaptation and Resilience
Private organizations showed higher mean scores for both leadership adaptability and resilience, and a weaker moderation effect of crises. This reflects greater operational flexibility, resource buffers, and faster

internal communication networks (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011; Williams et al., 2017). Conversely, public institutions, while benefiting from adaptive leadership, were more exposed to systemic crises, showing a stronger dampening effect. These results mirror prior findings on South Asian bureaucratic constraints (Ahmed et al., 2019; Khan & Qureshi, 2020).

Qualitative Insights

Thematic analysis confirmed survey findings:

- Adaptive decision-making is key in sustaining operations during crises.
- Crisis accumulation (especially floods, political instability, and economic shocks) strains public institutions more than private ones.
- Technology adoption and crisis planning emerged as important enablers of resilience.
- Structural barriers in public institutions—bureaucratic rigidity, political interference, underfunding—limit leaders' capacity to implement adaptive strategies.

These qualitative insights add depth to the quantitative findings, demonstrating how contextual constraints shape the effectiveness of leadership in crisis-prone environments.

Theoretical Contributions

1. **Multi-crisis framework:** This study extends resilience research by integrating economic, climate, health, and governance crises, showing how overlapping stressors moderate leadership effectiveness.
2. **Context-specific evidence:** Empirical data from Pakistan provides a South Asian perspective, addressing a research gap in adaptive leadership and organizational resilience literature.
3. **Sectoral comparisons:** The study highlights differential mechanisms in public vs. private institutions, offering a nuanced understanding of resilience drivers.

Practical Implications

- **Capacity building:** Institutions should invest in leadership development programs emphasizing adaptability, scenario planning, and decentralized decision-making.
- **Crisis preparedness:** Multi-crisis exposure highlights the need for integrated contingency plans, particularly in public sector institutions.
- **Technology adoption:** Digital management systems, dashboards, and communication platforms can enhance coordination and operational continuity.
- **Institutional learning:** Promoting after-action reviews, cross-unit knowledge sharing, and learning-oriented cultures can sustain resilience over time.

Conclusion & Policy Implications

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that leadership adaptability is a critical determinant of organizational resilience in Pakistan. However, the effectiveness of adaptive leadership is moderated by multi-crisis exposure, particularly in public institutions. Private organizations demonstrate higher adaptability and resilience, partly due to operational flexibility and resource availability.

Key conclusions:

1. Adaptive leaders significantly strengthen resilience, but their impact diminishes under simultaneous economic, climate, health, and governance crises.

2. Public institutions are more vulnerable due to bureaucratic rigidity, higher crisis exposure, and limited resources.
3. Integrated crisis management strategies and sector-specific interventions are essential for sustaining institutional performance.

Policy Implications

1. **Leadership Development Programs:** National and provincial governments should implement training programs focused on adaptive leadership competencies.
2. **Integrated Crisis Management Policies:** Policies must account for overlapping crises and promote cross-sectoral coordination.
3. **Public Sector Reforms:** Streamlining bureaucratic processes and enhancing decision autonomy can allow leaders to implement adaptive strategies more effectively.
4. **Investment in Technology and Data Systems:** Digitally enabled monitoring, forecasting, and communication tools are essential for rapid response and resilience.
5. **Institutional Learning Mechanisms:** Encourage learning from past crises through structured reviews, knowledge repositories, and continuous improvement frameworks.

Overall, strengthening adaptive leadership and institutional resilience is essential for ensuring organizational survival and performance in multi-crisis environments in South Asia.

References

Ahmed, S., Khan, R., & Qureshi, M. (2019). Bureaucratic inefficiencies and organizational performance in Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 41(2), 150–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/0259-8272.2019.1618753

Bhamra, R., Dani, S., & Burnard, K. (2011). Resilience: The concept, a literature review, and future directions. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5375–5393. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.563826

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

Khan, H., & Qureshi, M. (2020). Leadership effectiveness in the context of crisis: Evidence from public institutions in South Asia. *Public Organization Review*, 20(4), 605–624. https://doi.org/10.1007/-11115-020-00457-0

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.002

McManus, S., Seville, E., Vargo, J., & Brunsdon, D. (2008). Facilitated process for improving organizational resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 9(2), 81–90. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)-1527-6988(2008)9:2(81)

Sutcliffe, K. M., & Vogus, T. J. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 94–110). Berrett-Koehler.

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

Williams, T., Gruber, D., Sutcliffe, K., Shepherd, D., & Zhao, E. Y. (2017). Organizational response to adversity: Fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 733–769. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0134