

Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption

Ricky Agusiady (1) and Ir. Nida Garnida Fitrianti, MSI (2) (1) Universitas Sangga Buana Bandung | (2) Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas

ricky.agusiady@usbypkp.ac.id ; NidaFitrianti@gmail.com

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines strategic agility and organizational resilience during market disruption by asking how strategic agility is connected to organizational resilience and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. Evidence associated with Edmondson et al., 2014 and Marler et al., 2017 is read with the wider source set to distinguish formal adoption from effective use, short-term response from durable capability, and observed association from causal interpretation. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for capability building and coaching, team interdependence, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: strategic, agility, organizational, resilience, market, disruption, management, integrative review

Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption addresses a contemporary question in people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems. The title implies a relationship between strategic agility and organizational resilience, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, performance feedback and alignment changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while team interdependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Doz et al., 2010 and Kraus et al., 2022 and is especially relevant during market disruption.

The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence organizational resilience through talent mobility and succession routines. The pathway is conditional on workforce diversity and digital literacy; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce organizational resilience.

From a governance perspective, Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Sensemaking and change communication is most credible when supported by resource slack and workforce diversity. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

A recurring issue in research on Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Strategic Agility may be associated with organizational resilience, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when change fatigue is weak. The mechanism examined here is psychological safety and voice, which connects the focal practice to changes in role clarity.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence organizational resilience through capability building and coaching. The pathway is conditional on leadership credibility and digital literacy; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Kraus et al., 2022 and Doz et al., 2010 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce learning speed.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Talent mobility and succession routines provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on team interdependence,

leadership credibility, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of organizational resilience.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, sensemaking and change communication changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while workforce diversity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Psychological safety and voice is most credible when supported by resource slack and resource slack. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, capability building and coaching changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while change fatigue shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Work design and autonomy is most credible when supported by leadership credibility and team interdependence. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, psychological safety and voice changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while team interdependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Strategic Agility may be associated with organizational resilience, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when workforce diversity is weak. The mechanism examined here is capability building and coaching, which connects the focal practice to changes in learning speed.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Work design and autonomy provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on resource slack, leadership credibility, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Kraus et al., 2022 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of innovation performance.

A recurring issue in research on Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Strategic Agility may be associated with organizational resilience, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when change fatigue is weak. The mechanism examined here is performance feedback and alignment, which connects the focal practice to changes in service quality. Sources such as Edmondson et al., 2014 and Verhoef et al., 2021 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence organizational resilience through talent mobility and succession routines. The pathway is conditional on leadership credibility and resource slack; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Marler et al., 2017 and Edmondson et al., 2014 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For executives, line managers, HR

leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce organizational resilience.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, capability building and coaching changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while team interdependence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Kraus et al., 2022 and Kraus et al., 2022 and is especially relevant during market disruption. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence organizational resilience through work design and autonomy. The pathway is conditional on workforce diversity and change fatigue; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Verhoef et al., 2021 and Verhoef et al., 2021 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce innovation performance.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Performance feedback and alignment provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on resource slack, digital literacy, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Edmondson et al., 2014 and Edmondson et al., 2014 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of service quality.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Talent mobility and succession routines provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on change fatigue, workforce diversity, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Marler et al., 2017 and Marler et al., 2017 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process

integrity with a lagging indicator of organizational resilience.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, sensemaking and change communication changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while leadership credibility shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Doz et al., 2010 and Doz et al., 2010 and is especially relevant during market disruption. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

From a governance perspective, Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Work design and autonomy is most credible when supported by team interdependence and resource slack. The reviewed literature (Verhoef et al., 2021; Edmondson et al., 2014) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

A recurring issue in research on Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Strategic Agility may be associated with

organizational resilience, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when workforce diversity is weak. The mechanism examined here is performance feedback and alignment, which connects the focal practice to changes in service quality. Sources such as Edmondson et al., 2014 and Marler et al., 2017 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, talent mobility and succession routines changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while resource slack shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Marler et al., 2017 and Doz et al., 2010 and is especially relevant during market disruption. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence

organizational resilience through sensemaking and change communication. The pathway is conditional on change fatigue and resource slack; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce employee readiness.

From a governance perspective, Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Psychological safety and voice is most credible when supported by leadership credibility and leadership credibility. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Performance feedback and alignment provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on team interdependence, change fatigue, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Edmondson et al., 2014 and Doz et al., 2010 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of service quality.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, talent mobility and succession routines changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while workforce diversity shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Sensemaking and change communication is most credible when supported by resource slack and workforce diversity. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence organizational resilience through psychological safety and voice. The pathway is conditional

on change fatigue and change fatigue; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders,

team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce role clarity.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence organizational resilience through capability building and coaching. The pathway is conditional on leadership credibility and digital literacy; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce learning speed.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Talent mobility and succession routines provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on team interdependence, leadership credibility, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of organizational resilience.

From a governance perspective, Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Sensemaking and change communication is most credible when supported by workforce diversity and team interdependence. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, psychological safety and voice changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while resource slack shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The synthesis treats strategic agility as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of organizational resilience. In people, leadership, work-design, and organizational change systems, capability building and coaching changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while change

fatigue shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Strategic Agility may be associated with organizational resilience, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when leadership credibility is weak. The mechanism examined here is work design and autonomy, which connects the focal practice to changes in innovation performance.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Sensemaking and change communication provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on team interdependence, digital literacy, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Doz et al., 2010 and Kraus et al., 2022 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging

indicator of employee readiness.

For Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking strategic agility with organizational resilience. Psychological safety and voice provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on workforce diversity, workforce diversity, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of role clarity.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Strategic Agility and Organizational Resilience during Market Disruption, strategic agility can influence organizational resilience through work design and autonomy. The pathway is conditional on change fatigue and digital literacy; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For executives, line managers, HR leaders, team leaders, and employees, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce innovation performance.

Historical source context and interpretation

The Future of Jobs Report 2023 provides pre-cutoff context on employer expectations about changing jobs and skills (World Economic Forum, 2023). Expectations reported in this source are not realized outcomes or causal estimates. The managerial mechanisms discussed here remain propositions that require organization-specific evidence.

References

- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23-43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
- Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR Analytics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244699>
- Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 370-382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.006>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- World Economic Forum. (2023). The Future of Jobs Report 2023. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/>