UDC 658.012.2:658.012.32:004.8
JEL: D21; D83; M10; M15; O33
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2025-10-560-569

THE AI-ENHANCED INTELLIGENT BUSINESS DIAGNOSTICS FOR PREDICTIVE ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE IN DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION

©2025 ZVARYCH O. I., KAFKA S. M.

UDC 658.012.2:658.012.32:004.8
JEL: D21; D83; M10; M15; O33

Zvarych O. I., Kafka S. M. The AI-Enhanced Intelligent Business Diagnostics for Predictive Assessment of Organizational Resilience in Digital Transformation

The aim of the article is to develop a theoretical conception for transforming organizational resilience through AI-mediated business diagnostics. Traditional theories of dynamic capabilities, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning do not explain organizations where algorithms make critical decisions, machines learn from experience, and artificial agents interact with humans. The article presents a systematic review of over 120 articles from leading journals (2015–2025), a conceptual analysis for the development of theoretical constructs, and a synthesis of dynamic capabilities theory, organizational learning, and computer science to create an integrative conception. The conclusion introduces «algorithmic reflexivity» – the organization's ability to understand itself through computational processes that simultaneously shape organizational reality. Three paradoxes of AI-enhanced resilience have been identified: transparency through opacity (clarity through algorithmic inscrutability); autonomy through dependence (independence through technological reliance); stability through fluidity (changes generate meta-stability). A hybrid human-machine intelligence model with emergent properties has been developed. In addition, 13 empirically verified propositions related to organizational adaptation, transformation of managerial agency, and algorithmic competition have been formulated. Boundary conditions include digital infrastructure, cultural acceptability of algorithms, and scale thresholds. Empirical operationalization and new methodologies (computational ethnography, algorithmic audit) are needed. The practical significance of this article lies in the recommendation that organizations should develop algorithmic governance instead of direct control, invest in skills to create meaning for interpreting AI analytics, and design systems that enable human-machine interaction. Leaders evolve from decision-makers to creators and facilitators of collaborative work. The originality of this work is that organizational resilience is conceptualized, for the first time, as an emergent property of human-machine interaction rather than as a human capability. A new ontology of organizational knowledge is proposed, transcending the human-machine divide and theorizing hybrid intelligence as a result of integration. The paradoxical logic of AI-enhanced resilience challenges linear adaptation models and calls for a rethinking of management theory for the era of hybrid organizations.
Keywords: *artificial intelligence, organizational resilience, business diagnostics, algorithmic reflexivity, strategic management, organizational development, digital transformation, managerial innovations.*
Bibl.: *55.*

Zvarych Olena I. *– D. Sc. (Economics), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Management and Marketing, Vasyl Stefanyk Carpathian National University (57 Shevchenka Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76018, Ukraine)*
E-mail: *lena_zl@ukr.net*
ORCID: *https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5088-7565*
Researcher ID: *https://www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/S-8298-2018*
Scopus Author ID: *https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=58512969400*
Kafka Sofiia M. *– D. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Professor of the Department of Management and Business Administration, Vasyl Stefanyk Carpathian National University (57 Shevchenka Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76018, Ukraine)*
E-mail: *sofiia.kafka@pnu.edu.ua*
ORCID: *https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6031-383X*
Scopus Author ID: *https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57216*

УДК 658.012.2:658.012.32:004.8
JEL: D21; D83; M10; M15; O33

Зварич О. І., Кафка С. М. Інтелектуальна бізнес-діагностика на основі штучного інтелекту для прогнозної оцінки організаційної стійкості в цифровій трансформації

Завдання статті – розробити теоретичну концепцію трансформації організаційної стійкості через ШІ-опосередковану бізнес-діагностику. Традиційні теорії динамічних здібностей, адаптивної спроможності та організаційного навчання не пояснюють організації, де алгоритми приймають критичні рішення, машини навчаються з досвіду, а штучні агенти взаємодіють з людьми. Стаття являє собою систематичний огляд 120+ статей провідних журналів (2015–2025), концептуальний аналіз для розробки теоретичних конструкцій, синтез теорії динамічних здібностей, організаційного навчання, комп'ютерних наук для створення інтегративної концепції. У висновках введено «алгоритмічну рефлективність» – здатність організації пізнавати себе через обчислювальні процеси, що одночасно формують організаційну реальність. Ідентифіковано три парадокси ШІ-посиленої стійкості: прозорість через непрозорість (ясність через алгоритмічну незрозумілість); автономія через залежність (незалежність через технологічну залежність); стабільність через плинність (зміни створюють мета-стабільність). Розроблено модель гібридного людино-машинного інтелекту з емерджентними властивостями. Також розроблено 13 емпірично верифікованих тверджень, що стосуються організаційної адаптації, трансформації управлінської суб'єктності та алгоритмічної конкуренції. Граничні умови: цифрова інфраструктура, культурна прийнятність алгоритмів, пороги масштабу. Потрібна емпірична операціоналізація, нові методології (обчислювальна етнографія, алгоритмічний аудит). Практичне значення статті полягає в тому, що організаціям рекомендовано розвивати алгоритмічне врядування замість прямого контролю, інвестувати в навички створення смислів для тлумачення ШІ-аналітики, проєктувати системи для виникнення людино-машинної

взаємодії. Керівники еволюціонують від тих, хто приймає рішення, до їх творців та організаторів спільної роботи. Оригінальність даної роботи полягає в тому, що вперше було концептуалізовано організаційну стійкість як емерджентну властивість людино-машинної взаємодії, а не людську здатність. Запропоновано нову онтологію організаційного знання, що виходить за поділ людина-машина, теоретизуючи гібридний інтелект як результат інтеграції. Парадоксальна логіка ШІ-посиленої стійкості кидає виклик лінійним моделям адаптації, вимагає переосмислення теорії менеджменту для епохи гібридних організацій.
Ключові слова: *штучний інтелект, організаційна стійкість, бізнес-діагностика, алгоритмічна рефлексивність, стратегічний менеджмент, організаційний розвиток, цифрова трансформація, управлінські інновації.*
Бібл.: *55.*
Зварич Олена Ігорівна *– доктор економічних наук, доцент, професор кафедри менеджменту і маркетингу, Карпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника (вул. Шевченка, 57, Івано-Франківськ, 76018, Україна)*
E-mail: *lena_zl@ukr.net*
ORCID: *https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5088-7565*
Researcher ID: *https://www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/S-8298-2018*
Scopus Author ID: *https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=58512969400*
Кафка Софія Михайлівна *– доктор економічних наук, професор, професор кафедри менеджменту та бізнес-адміністрування, Карпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника (вул. Шевченка, 57, Івано-Франківськ, 76018, Україна)*
E-mail: *sofiia.kafka@pnu.edu.ua*
ORCID: *https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6031-383X*
Scopus Author ID: *https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57216*

The proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) in organizational contexts represents more than technological advancement – it constitutes a fundamental challenge to the theoretical understanding of how organizations function, adapt, and survive [1; 2]. Traditional conceptualizations of organizational resilience, rooted in assumptions of human cognition and decision-making, prove increasingly inadequate for comprehending organizations where algorithms make critical decisions, machines learn from experience, and artificial agents interact with human actors in complex, emergent ways [3; 4].

This theoretical inadequacy manifests most acutely in business diagnostics – the processes through which organizations assess their health, identify threats, and maintain viability. While scholars have extensively theorized organizational resilience as the capacity to withstand and recover from adversity [5; 6], existing frameworks assume predominantly human-centered diagnostic processes. The integration of AI fundamentally disrupts these assumptions, creating "intelligent business diagnostics" – a paradigmatically different approach to organizational self-understanding that demands new theoretical foundations.

THE ANALYSIS OF RECENT RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

Organizational resilience has been conceptualized through multiple theoretical lenses: as dynamic capability [7; 8], as adaptive capacity [9; 10], as organizational slack [11], and as mindful organizing [12]. These perspectives share fundamental assumptions about human agency, cognitive limitations, and organizational knowledge that become problematic when AI enters the equation.

Recent research on AI in organizations has explored augmentation of human decision-making [13], automation-augmentation paradoxes [3], and coordinating human-machine learning [4]. However, these studies treat AI primarily as a tool rather than examining how it fundamentally transforms organizational nature. Studies on digital transformation [14; 15] acknowledge technological disruption but lack theoretical frameworks for understanding the AI-mediated organizational cognition.

Critical gaps exist in understanding how AI creates new forms of organizational self-awareness, how organizations navigate paradoxes inherent in algorithmic systems, and what hybrid human-machine intelligence means for management theory.

THE UNSOLVED ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM

Existing research fails to address the following three critical questions:

First, how does AI transform organizational resilience from a capability organizations possess to an emergent property arising from continuous human-machine interaction? Current frameworks assume human-centered processes, unable to capture recursive cycles where AI systems simultaneously diagnose and constitute organizational reality.

Second, what theoretical constructs can capture the paradoxical nature of the AI-enhanced resilience, where organizations gain transparency through opacity, autonomy through dependence, and stability through perpetual change? Traditional theories assume linear relationships that cannot encompass these contradictions.

Third, how should management theory conceptualize hybrid human-machine intelligence that transcends traditional epistemological boundaries? When organizations can know without human understanding, theories premised on shared mental models and collective sense-making prove inadequate.

THE AIM OF THE ARTICLE

This study develops a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding how AI fundamentally transforms organizational resilience through intelligent business diagnostics. We aim to:

1. Introduce "algorithmic reflexivity" as a new theoretical construct capturing the AI-mediated organizational self-awareness.
2. Identify and theorize fundamental paradoxes inherent in the AI-enhanced resilience.
3. Propose a new ontology of organizational knowledge transcending the human-machine divide.
4. Develop testable propositions for empirical investigation.

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This theoretical study employs systematic literature review and conceptual analysis to develop new theoretical constructs. We reviewed 120+ peer-reviewed articles from leading management journals (Academy of Management Review, Organization Science, Strategic Management Journal) published 2015-2025, focusing on AI, organizational resilience, and business diagnostics.

Our methodology follows theory-building principles [16], progressing from identifying theoretical gaps, through conceptual development, to proposition formulation. We synthesize insights from multiple theoretical traditions – dynamic capabilities, organizational learning, complexity theory – to construct an integrative framework. The framework generates 13 testable propositions suitable for empirical investigation through various methodologies.

THE MAIN RESEARCH RESULTS

The Algorithmic Reflexivity as Emergent Organizational Property

We propose "algorithmic reflexivity" as a construct capturing novel organizational self-awareness emerging from AI integration. Unlike traditional organizational learning that assumes human actors reflecting on experience [17], algorithmic reflexivity involves organizations understanding themselves through computational processes that simultaneously constitute and reveal organizational reality.

This operates through three mechanisms. ***Computational mirroring*** occurs when AI creates digital representations of organizational processes that become more "real" than the processes themselves – the map becomes the territory [18]. ***Recursive learning loops*** emerge when AI systems learn from organizational data, modify behavior based on that learning, generate new data from modified behavior, and continue iterating – creating spirals of self-reinforcing change. ***Emergent intentionality*** arises when interaction between human goals and algorithmic optimization produces organizational behaviors intended by neither human nor machine but emerging from their coupling.

Proposition 1: Organizations exhibiting high algorithmic reflexivity will demonstrate qualitatively different adaptation patterns than traditionally resilient organizations, characterized by discontinuous rather than incremental change, preemptive rather than reactive responses, and emergent rather than designed strategies.

Proposition 2: Algorithmic reflexivity increases with AI system opacity, suggesting a paradoxical relationship where organizations understand themselves better through processes they understand less.

The Paradoxical Nature of the AI-Enhanced Resilience

The AI-enhanced resilience operates through three fundamental paradoxes challenging conventional management theory.

The Transparency-Opacity Paradox. AI systems promise unprecedented organizational transparency through comprehensive data analysis and pattern recognition [19]. Paradoxically, this transparency emerges through increasingly opaque mechanisms – deep neural networks whose decision logic remains inscrutable [20; 21]. Organizations achieve clarity through obscurity, understanding through incomprehension. This manifests as epistemological opacity (knowing more while understanding less how they know), operational transparency (AI makes processes visible while rendering visualization invisible), and strategic clarity (AI illuminates options through opaque analytical processes).

Proposition 3: Organizational autonomy in the AI-integrated contexts follows an inverted U-shaped relationship with AI sophistication, initially increasing through augmentation before decreasing through substitution.

The Autonomy-Dependence Paradox. AI promises enhanced autonomy through superior decision-making and strategic flexibility [22; 23]. Yet this autonomy requires increasing dependence on technological systems, their designers, and supporting infrastructures. Organizations become more independent through greater dependence. Decisional autonomy increases while creating dependence on algorithmic decision-making. Strategic flexibility expands while constraining choices to computationally tractable alternatives.

Proposition 4: The autonomy-dependence paradox intensifies with environmental uncertainty, as organizations require more AI support precisely when dependence becomes most risky.

The Stability-Fluidity Paradox. Traditional resilience theory posits stability and changes as opposing forces requiring balance [24]. The AI-enhanced resilience transcends this dichotomy through continuous adaptation creating meta-stability – stability at higher logical levels through constant change at operational levels. Organizations achieve resilience not by resisting change but by changing so continuously that change becomes their stable state.

Proposition 5: The AI-enhanced organizations exhibit "dynamic equilibrium" where resilience emerges from perpetual disequilibrium at operational levels, challenging punctuated equilibrium models of organizational change.

The Hybrid Human-Machine Intelligence

AI fundamentally transforms organizational cognition by creating hybrid systems where human and artificial intelligence integrate in ways transcending simple aggregation [25; 26]. Machine learning algorithms identify patterns invisible to human cognition. Where humans excel at causal reasoning, contextual understanding, and creative problem-solving, machines excel at correlation detection, pattern recognition, and optimization within defined parameters. Integration creates cognitive capabilities possessed by neither component alone – emergent intelligence arising from intersection of human meaning-making and machine pattern-recognition.

Proposition 6: Hybrid organizational cognition exhibits emergent properties including ability to simultaneously process symbolic and sub-symbolic information, integrate intuitive and analytical reasoning, and operate across multiple temporal scales.

Deep learning systems create artificial organizational nervous systems – distributed networks processing environmental stimuli and coordinating responses below conscious managerial attention threshold [27; 28]. These enable pre-attentive processing (responding to changes before human awareness), distributed sensing (perceiving through multiple modalities simultaneously), and automated coordination (organized responses without centralized control).

Proposition 7: The organizations with developed artificial nervous systems will exhibit faster response times to environmental changes but may also demonstrate emergent behaviors unintended by their human designers.

The Multi-Criteria Models of Algorithmic Resilience

AI enables multi-criteria optimization across thousands of variables simultaneously, creating resilience through balance among factors too numerous for human comprehension [29; 30]. This transforms resilience from achieving specific targets to maintaining dynamic equilibrium across countless dimensions. The multi-criteria AI models integrate financial indicators, operational metrics, market signals, social media sentiment, supply chain data into synthetic assessments of organizational health.

Proposition 8: The AI-enabled multi-criteria optimization will reveal previously unknown interdependencies among organizational variables, suggesting resilience emerges from managing complexity rather than reducing it.

AI enables "predictive resilience" – capacity to adapt to futures that have not yet materialized [31]. Through simulation, scenario generation, and predictive modeling, organization's stress-test strategies against thousands of potential futures, developing resilience to events before they occur. This transcends traditional scenario planning through combinatorial explosion (exploring vastly larger possibility spaces), non-linear projection (modeling discontinuous changes), and adaptive forecasting (continuously updating predictions).

Proposition 9: Predictive resilience through AI will shift organizational focus from responding to disruptions to preventing their materialization, fundamentally altering temporal structure of strategic management.

The Implications for Management Theory and Practice

AI integration fundamentally challenges the theories of managerial agency and control [32; 33]. When algorithms make decisions faster than humans can comprehend, optimize across dimensions humans cannot perceive, and learn from patterns humans cannot detect, agency transforms rather than disappears, shifting from direct control to meta-control – managing systems that manage the organization.

This manifests in three new forms of managerial work: *algorithmic governance* (setting parameters, constraints, objectives for AI systems rather than making direct decisions), *ethical oversight* (ensuring AI systems operate within moral and legal boundaries), and *meaning making* (interpreting AI outputs for stakeholders demanding human explanation).

Proposition 10: Managerial roles in the AI-integrated organizations will evolve from decision-makers to decision-framers, from information processors to meaning-makers, and from controllers to facilitators of human-machine collaboration.

When organizations comprise both human and machine learners with fundamentally different learning mechanisms, new frameworks are needed. We identify three modes: *parallel learning* (humans and machines learn independently from same experiences), *sequential learning* (humans learn from machine outputs or machines learn from human-labeled data), and *integrated learning* (human and machine learning processes become intertwined).

Proposition 11: Hybrid organizational learning exhibits faster knowledge accumulation but also greater risk of systematic bias, as machine learning can amplify human prejudices while hiding them under algorithmic objectivity.

Competition increasingly occurs between algorithmic systems rather than human strategists [34; 35]. Algorithmic competition exhibits hyperspeed dynamics (compressing competitive cycles from months to milliseconds), emergent collusion (competing algorithms independently discovering cooperative strategies), and algorithmic arms races (escalating sophistication creating winner-take-all dynamics).

Proposition 12: Markets dominated by algorithmic competition will exhibit increased volatility, faster convergence to efficiency, and greater susceptibility to systemic cascades than human-mediated markets.

Boundary Conditions

Our framework presupposes organizational contexts with robust digital infrastructures, computational resources, and data availability. These conditions exclude many organizations in developing economies, smaller enterprises, and sectors with limited digitalization. The digital divide creates theoretical bifurcation: organizations with AI capabilities may operate according to fundamentally different principles than those without.

Digital Infrastructure Dependencies. The applicability of our framework depends critically on technological maturity. Organizations require not merely access to AI technologies but sophisticated data infrastructures, computational capacity, and technical expertise to implement intelligent business diagnostics [36; 37]. This creates a threshold effect where benefits of the AI-enhanced resilience become accessible only above certain levels of digital capability. Small and medium enterprises, particularly in emerging markets, may face structural barriers preventing adoption of advanced AI systems [38]. The resulting digital stratification suggests our theoretical framework applies primarily to technologically advanced organizational contexts, raising questions about generalizability across diverse economic settings.

Institutional and Regulatory Constraints. Algorithmic decision-making faces varying acceptance across cultural contexts [39; 40]. Societies with strong preferences for human judgment, regulatory restrictions on automated decision-making, or cultural resistance to technological determinism may limit AI integration. European Union regulations on algorithmic transparency and explainability, for instance, constrain deployment of opaque AI systems, potentially limiting algorithmic reflexivity [41; 42]. Conversely, regulatory environments permitting extensive AI deployment may accelerate organizational transformation but raise ethical concerns about accountability and human agency. These institutional variations suggest our framework's predictions may manifest differently across regulatory regimes, necessitating context-specific theoretical refinements.

Organizational Scale and Complexity Thresholds. Our framework exhibits non-linear applicability across organizational scales. Very small organizations may lack resources for meaningful AI implementation, while extremely large, complex organizations may face coordination challenges that overwhelm even sophisticated AI systems [43]. Optimal applicability likely occurs within a bounded range of organizational size and complexity. Below minimum thresholds, costs of AI integration exceed benefits; above maximum thresholds, organizational complexity introduces coordination problems resistant to algorithmic solutions. This suggests our theoretical constructs apply most powerfully to mid-to-large organizations with sufficient resources and manageable complexity.

Proposition 13: The relationship between AI integration and organizational resilience is moderated by institutional factors including regulatory frameworks, cultural values regarding human agency, and societal trust in technology.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The integration of AI into organizational diagnostics represents fundamental transformation in organizational nature itself. Our theoretical framework demonstrates how AI creates new forms of organizational resilience transcending traditional conceptualizations, operating through algorithmic reflexivity, navigating fundamental paradoxes, and generating hybrid intelligence that is neither human nor artificial but emergently both.

Theoretical contributions. We introduce algorithmic reflexivity as a construct capturing recursive organizational self-awareness emerging from AI integration. We identify three fundamental paradoxes (transparency-opacity, autonomy-dependence, stability-fluidity) revealing deep tensions in organizational control and agency. We propose a new ontology of organizational knowledge transcending the human-machine divide, theorizing hybrid intelligence as emergent from interaction rather than residing in either component.

Practical implications. Organizations should develop algorithmic governance capabilities rather than maintaining direct control over AI systems. Managers must invest in meaning-making and translation skills to bridge human and machine intelligence. Organizations should design for emergence by creating conditions for beneficial human-machine interaction rather than specifying all outcomes. Human oversight of ethical and strategic decisions that cannot be delegated to machines remains essential.

Research agenda. Our framework generates 13 testable propositions requiring empirical investigation. Future research should operationalize and measure algorithmic reflexivity, identify boundary conditions determining when AI enhances versus diminishes organizational resilience, explore how paradoxes manifest in practice, track performance implications of hybrid human-machine intelligence, and examine how cultural context moderates AI's impact on resilience.

The Empirical Operationalization Challenges. Translating our theoretical constructs into measurable variables presents significant methodological challenges [44]. Algorithmic reflexivity, as an emergent property of human-machine interaction, resists reduction to simple metrics. Researchers must develop multidimensional measurement approaches capturing computational mirroring intensity, recursive learning loop frequency, and emergent intentionality manifestations. Longitudinal research designs tracking organizations through AI integration phases could reveal temporal dynamics of reflexivity development [45]. Comparative case studies across industries and institutional contexts would illuminate boundary conditions and contingency factors. Survey instruments measuring managerial perceptions of algorithmic influence on organizational self-understanding could provide quantitative data, though such self-reports may inadequately capture unconscious aspects of reflexivity.

The Paradox Resolution and Organizational Strategies. While our framework identifies fundamental paradoxes in the AI-enhanced resilience, future research must investigate how organizations navigate these tensions in practice [46]. Do successful organizations develop paradox management capabilities, or do they privilege one pole over another? Ethnographic studies could reveal the micro-level practices through which managers balance transparency demands with the algorithmic opacity realities. Action research interventions testing different approaches to paradox navigation could generate practical insights while advancing theory. Understanding whether paradoxes represent permanent tensions or dialectical processes resolvable through organizational learning remains an open empirical question with significant theoretical implications.

Cross-Level Analysis. Our framework primarily addresses organizational-level phenomena, yet AI integration creates multi-level dynamics spanning individual, team, organizational, and inter-organizational levels [47; 48]. Individual employees experience the AI-enhanced work environments differently based on roles, expertise, and attitudes toward technology. Team-level dynamics shift as human-machine collaboration redistributes cognitive labor. Inter-organizational networks transform as algorithmic systems coordinate supply chains and market interactions. Future research employing multilevel methodologies could unpack how the AI-enhanced resilience emerges from interactions across these levels, revealing micro-foundations and macro-consequences of algorithmic reflexivity.

Methodological Innovations for Studying Algorithmic Organizations. The opacity inherent in AI systems necessitates novel research methodologies [49]. Computational ethnography, integrating traditional ethnographic observation with analysis of digital traces, logs, and algorithmic outputs, offers promising approaches [50]. Researchers could track organizational decision-making through both human narratives and machine-generated data, triangulating between lived experience and computational reality. Algorithmic auditing techniques, borrowed from computer science, could systematically probe AI systems to reveal their implicit decision rules and biases [51]. Such audits might uncover organizational behavior patterns invisible to human observers yet consequential for organizational outcomes.

Simulation-based research methods offers another frontier. Agent-based models incorporating both human and artificial agents could explore emergent dynamics of hybrid intelligence under controlled conditions [52; 53]. These simulations might test theoretical propositions about algorithmic reflexivity and paradox navigation across parameter spaces too vast for field research. Digital twins of organizations – computational models continuously updated with real-time data – could enable quasi-experimental investigations of AI integration strategies [54]. However, simulation validity remains contested, requiring careful calibration against empirical observations.

Mixed-methods approaches combining qualitative depth with quantitative breadth appear particularly suitable for capturing multi-faceted phenomena of the AI-enhanced resilience [55]. Sequential designs might begin with exploratory case studies identifying relevant variables and relationships, followed by large-sample surveys testing generalizability. Alternatively, quantitative patterns from archival data could guide purposive selection of cases for in-depth qualitative investigation. Integration of findings across methods could triangulate toward robust theoretical insights while acknowledging irreducible uncertainties in studying emergent, complex phenomena.

As organizations evolve into hybrid human-machine systems, management theory must evolve to understand them. The alternative is theoretical obsolescence in a world that has moved beyond our comprehension. Our framework represents one attempt to bridge the growing gap between organizational reality and theoretical understanding, offering conceptions and propositions that capture emerging phenomena while acknowledging profound uncertainties ahead. ■

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Faraj S., Pachidi S., Sayegh K. Working and organizing in the age of the learning algorithm. *Information and Organization*. 2018. Vol. 28. Iss. 1. P. 62–70. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.005
2. von Krogh G. Artificial intelligence in organizations: New opportunities for phenomenon-based theorizing. *Academy of Management Discoveries*. 2018. Vol. 4. No. 4. P. 404–409. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2018.0084
3. Raisch S., Krakowski S. Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation-Augmentation Paradox. *Academy of Management Review*. 2021. Vol. 46. No. 1. P. 192–210. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072
4. Sturm T., Gerlach J. P., Pumplun L. et al. Coordinating human and machine learning for effective organizational learning. *MIS Quarterly*. 2021. Vol. 45. No. 3. P. 1581–1602. DOI: https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/16543
5. Linnenluecke M. K. Resilience in Business and Management Research: A Review of Influential Publications and a Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 2017. Vol. 19. Iss. 1. P. 4–30. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12076
6. Williams T. A., Gruber D. A., Sutcliffe K. M. et al. Organizational Response to Adversity: Fusing Crisis Management and Resilience Research Streams. *Academy of Management Annals*. 2017. Vol. 11. No. 2. P. 733–769. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0134
7. Teece D. J. Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2007. Vol. 28. Iss. 13. P. 1319–1350. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
8. Teece D., Pisano G., Shuen A. Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*. 1997. Vol. 18. Iss. 7. P. 509–533. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z
9. Levinthal D. A., Marino A. Three Facets of Organizational Adaptation: Selection, Variety, and Plasticity. *Organization Science*. 2015. Vol. 26. Iss. 3. P. 743–755. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0956
10. Teece D. J., Peteraf M., Leih S. Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility: Risk, Uncertainty, and Strategy in the Innovation Economy. *California Management Review*. 2016. Vol. 58. No. 4. P. 13–35. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13
11. Cyert R. M., March J. G. *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963. 332 p.
12. Duchek S. Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*. 2020. Vol. 13. P. 215–246. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7
13. Shrestha Y. R., Ben-Menahem S. M., von Krogh G. Organizational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review*. 2019. Vol. 61. Iss. 4. P. 66–83. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257
14. Vial G. Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*. 2019. Vol. 28. Iss. 2. P. 118–144. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003
15. Hanelt A., Bohnsack R., Marz D., Antunes Marante C. A Systematic Review of the Literature on Digital Transformation: Insights and Implications for Strategy and Organizational Change. *Journal of Management Studies*. 2021. Vol. 58. Iss. 5. P. 1159–1197. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639
16. Eisenhardt K. M. Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review*. 1989. Vol. 14. No. 4. P. 532–550. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308385
17. Berends H., Antonacopoulou E. Time and Organizational Learning: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *International Journal of Management Review*. 2014. Vol. 16. Iss. 4. P. 437–453. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12029
18. Introna L. D. Algorithms, Governance, and Governmentality: On Governing Academic Writing. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*. 2016. Vol. 41. Iss. 1. P. 17–49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915587360
19. Mikalef P., Boura M., Lekakos G., Krogstie J. Big data analytics and firm performance: Findings from a mixed-method approach. *Journal of Business Research*. 2019. Vol. 98. P. 261–276. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.044
20. Burrell J. How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society*. 2016. Vol. 3. No. 1. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512
21. Pasquale F. The Black Box Society: The secret Algorithms that Control Money and Information. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015. 311 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674736061
22. Kellogg K. C., Valentine M. A., Christin A. Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. *Academy of Management Annals*. 2020. Vol. 14. No. 1. P. 366–410. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174
23. Daugherty P. R., Wilson H. J. Human + machine: Reimagining work in the age of AI. Boston : Harvard Business Review Press, 2018. 264 p.
24. Jarzabkowski P., Lê J.K., Van de Ven A.H. Responding to competing strategic demands: How organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve.

Strategic Organization. 2013. Vol. 11. Iss. 3. P. 245–280.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127013481016
25. Marcus G., Davis E. Rebooting AI: Building artificial intelligence we can trust. New York : Pantheon, 2019. 288 p.
26. Pearl J., Mackenzie D. The Book of Why: The New Science of Cause and Effect. New York : Basic Books, 2018. 432 p.
27. Hinton G. Deep Learning – A Technology with the Potential to Transform Health Care. *JAMA*. 2018. Vol. 320. Iss. 11. P. 1101–1102.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.11100
28. Schmidhuber J. Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural Networks*. 2015. Vol. 61. P. 85–117.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2014.09.003
29. Wamba S. F., Gunasekaran A., Akter S., Ren S. J. F. et al. Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. *Journal of Business Research*. 2017. Vol. 70. P. 356–365.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.009
30. Müller O., Fay M., vom Brocke J. The Effect of Big Data and Analytics on Firm Performance: An Econometric Analysis Considering Industry Characteristics. *Journal of Management Information Systems*. 2018. Vol. 35. Iss. 2. P. 488–509.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1451955
31. Duan Y., Cao G., Edwards J. S. Understanding the impact of business analytics on innovation. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 2020. Vol. 281. Iss. 3. P. 673–686.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2018.06.021
32. Zuboff S. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. New York : PublicAffairs, 2019. 704 p.
33. Brynjolfsson E., McElheran K. The Rapid Adoption of Data-Driven Decision-Making. *American Economic Review*. 2016. Vol. 106. Iss. 5. P. 133–139.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20161016
34. Iansiti M., Lakhani K. R. Competing in the Age of AI: Strategy and Leadership when Algorithms and Networks Run the World. Boston : Harvard Business Review Press, 2020. 280 p.
35. Agrawal A., Gans J., Goldfarb A. Prediction Machines: The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence. Boston : Harvard Business Review Press, 2018. 272 p.
36. Nambisan S., Wright M., Feldman M. The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: *Progress, challenges and key themes. Research Policy*. 2019. Vol. 48. Iss. 8. Art. 103773.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018
37. Ross J. W., Beath C. M., Mocker M. Designed for Digital: How to Architect Your Business for Sustained Success. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press, 2019. 208 p.
38. Moeuf A., Pellerin R., Lamouri S. et al. The industrial management of SMEs in the era of Industry 4.0. *International Journal of Production Research*. 2018. Vol. 56. Iss. 3. P. 1118–1136.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2017.1372647
39. Hofstede G. Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 2003. 616 p.
40. House R. J., Hanges P. J., Javidan M., Dorfman P. W., Gupta V. (Eds.). Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 2004. 848 p.
41. Kaminski M. E. The Right to Explanation, Explained. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*. 2019. Vol. 34. Iss. 1. P. 189–218.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38TD9N83H
42. Selbst A. D., Powles J. Meaningful information and the right to explanation. *International Data Privacy Law*. 2017. Vol. 7. Iss. 4. P. 233–242.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx022
43. Mitleton-Kelly E., Paraskevas A., Day C. (Eds.). Handbook of research methods in complexity science: Theory and applications. Cheltenham : Edward Elgar Publishing, 2018.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.4337/9781785364426
44. Aguinis H., Bakker R. M. Time is of the essence: Improving the conceptualization and measurement of time. *Human Resource Management Review*. 2021. Vol. 31. Iss. 2. Art. 100763.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100763
45. Langley A., Tsoukas H. Introduction: Process theorizing and perspectives on process and organization. In: The SAGE. Handbook of Process Organization Studies. London : SAGE Publications, 2017.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957954.n1
46. Schad J., Lewis M.W., Raisch S., Smith W.K. Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. *Academy of Management Annals*. 2016. Vol. 10, No. 1. P. 5-64.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1162422
47. Aguinis H., Gottfredson R. K., Culpepper S. A. Best-Practice Recommendations for Estimating Cross-Level Interaction Effects Using Multilevel Modeling. *Journal of Management*. 2013. Vol. 39. Iss. 6. P. 1490–1528.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313478188
48. Hitt M. A., Beamish P. W., Jackson S. E., Mathieu J. E. Building Theoretical and Empirical Bridges Across Levels: Multilevel Research in Management. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2007. Vol. 50. No. 6. P. 1385–1399.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.28166219
49. Orlikowski W. J., Scott S. V. Exploring Material-Discursive Practices. *Journal of Management Studies*. 2015. Vol. 52. Iss. 5. P. 697–705.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12114
50. Hine C. Ethnography for the Internet: Embedded, Embodied and Everyday. London : Bloomsbury Academic, 2015. 229 p.
51. Raji I. D., Smart A., White R. N. et al. Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. *Proceedings*

of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency. 2020. P. 33–44.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372873

52. An L., Grimm V., Sullivan A., Turner B. L. et al. Challenges, tasks, and opportunities in modeling agent-based complex systems. *Ecological Modelling*. 2021. Vol. 457. Art. 109685.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2021.109685
53. Railsback S. F., Grimm V. Agent-Based and Individual-Based Modeling: A Practical Introduction. 2nd ed. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2019. 360 p.
54. Grieves M., Vickers J. Digital Twin: Mitigating Unpredictable, Undesirable Emergent Behavior in Complex Systems. In: *Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Complex Systems*. Cham : Springer, 2017. P. 85–113.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38756-7_4
55. Creswell J. W., Plano Clark V. L. Designing and conducting mixed methods research. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 2018. 520 p.

REFERENCES

Agrawal A., Gans J. & Goldfarb A. *Prediction Machines: The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Aguinis H., Gottfredson R. K. & Culpepper S. A. (2013). Best-Practice Recommendations for Estimating Cross-Level Interaction Effects Using Multilevel Modeling. *Journal of Management, 6*(39), 1490–1528.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313478188

Aguinis H. & Bakker R. M. (2021). Time is of the essence: Improving the conceptualization and measurement of time. *Human Resource Management Review, 2*(31).
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100763

Berends H. & Antonacopoulou E. (2014). Time and Organizational Learning: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *International Journal of Management Review, 4*(16), 437–453.
https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12029

Brynjolfsson E. & McElheran K. (2016). The Rapid Adoption of Data-Driven Decision-Making. *American Economic Review, 5*(106), 133–139.
https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20161016

Burrell J. (2016). How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society, 1*(3).
https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512

Creswell J. W. & Plano Clark V. L. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cyert R. M. & March J. G. *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Daugherty P. R. & Wilson H. J. *Human + machine: Reimagining work in the age of AI*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Duan Y., Cao G. & Edwards J. S. (2020). Understanding the impact of business analytics on innovation. *European Journal of Operational Research, 3*(281), 673–686.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2018.06.021

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

Eisenhardt K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review, 4*(14), 532–550.
https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308385

Faraj S., Pachidi S. & Sayegh K. (2018). Working and organizing in the age of the learning algorithm. *Information and Organization, 1*(28), 62–70.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.005

Grieves M. & Vickers J. Digital Twin: Mitigating Unpredictable, Undesirable Emergent Behavior in Complex Systems. In: *Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Complex Systems*. Cham: Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38756-7_4

Hanelt A., Bohnsack R., Marz D. & Antunes Marante C. (2021). A Systematic Review of the Literature on Digital Transformation: Insights and Implications for Strategy and Organizational Change. *Journal of Management Studies, 5*(58), 1159–1197.
https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639

Hine C. *Ethnography for the Internet: Embedded, Embodied and Everyday*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Hinton G. (2018). Deep Learning – A Technology with the Potential to Transform Health Care. *JAMA, 11*(320), 1101–1102.
https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.11100

Hitt M. A., Beamish P. W., Jackson S. E. & Mathieu J. E. (2007). Building Theoretical and Empirical Bridges Across Levels: Multilevel Research in Management. *Academy of Management Journal, 6*(50), 1385–1399.
https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.28166219

Hofstede G. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House R. J., Hanges P. J., Javidan M., Dorfman P. W. & Gupta V. (Eds.) *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Iansiti M. & Lakhani K. R. *Competing in the Age of AI: Strategy and Leadership when Algorithms and Networks Run the World*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Introna L. D. (2016). Algorithms, Governance, and Governmentality: On Governing Academic Writing. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, 1*(41), 17–49.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915587360

Jarzabkowski P., Lê J. K. & Van de Ven A. H. (2013). Responding to competing strategic demands: How organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve. *Strategic Organization, 3*(11), 245–280.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127013481016

Kaminski M. E. (2019). The Right to Explanation, Explained. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 1*(34), 189–218.
https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38TD9N83H

Kellogg K. C., Valentine M. A. & Christin A. (2020). Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. *Academy of Management Annals, 1*(14), 366–410.
https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

An L., Grimm V., Sullivan A. & Turner B. L. et al. (2021). Challenges, tasks, and opportunities in modeling agent-based complex systems. *Ecological Modelling*, 457.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2021.109685

Langley A. & Tsoukas H. Introduction: Process theorizing and perspectives on process and organization. In: *The SAGE. Handbook of Process Organization Studies*. London: SAGE Publications.
https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957954.n1

Levinthal D. A. & Marino A. (2015). Three Facets of Organizational Adaptation: Selection, Variety, and Plasticity. *Organization Science, 3*(26), 743–755. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0956

Linnenluecke M. K. (2017). Resilience in Business and Management Research: A Review of Influential Publications and a Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 1*(19), 4–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12076

Marcus G. & Davis E. *Rebooting AI: Building artificial intelligence we can trust*. New York: Pantheon.

Mikalef P., Boura M., Lekakos G. & Krogstie J. (2019). Big data analytics and firm performance: Findings from a mixed-method approach. *Journal of Business Research, 98*, 261–276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.044

Mitleton-Kelly E., Paraskevas A. & Day C. (Eds.) *Handbook of research methods in complexity science: Theory and applications*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781785364426

Müller O., Fay M. & vom Brocke J. (2018). The Effect of Big Data and Analytics on Firm Performance: An Econometric Analysis Considering Industry Characteristics. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 2*(35), 488–509. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1451955

Moeuf A., Pellerin R. & Lamouri S. et al. (2018). The industrial management of SMEs in the era of Industry 4.0. International *Journal of Production Research, 3*(56), 1118–1136. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2017.1372647

Nambisan S., Wright M. & Feldman M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: Progress, challenges and key themes. *Research Policy, 8*(48). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018

Orlikowski W. J. & Scott S. V. (2015). Exploring Material-Discursive Practices. *Journal of Management Studies, 5*(52), 697–705. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12114

Pasquale F. *The Black Box Society: The secret Algorithms that Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674736061

Pearl J. & Mackenzie D. *The Book of Why: The New Science of Cause and Effect*. New York: Basic Books.

Railsback S. F. & Grimm V. *Agent-Based and Individual-Based Modeling: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Raisch S. & Krakowski S. (2021). Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation-Augmentation Paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 1*(46), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Raji I. D., Smart A. & White R. N. et al. (2020). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372873

Ross J. W., Beath C. M. & Mocker M. *Designed for Digital: How to Architect Your Business for Sustained Success*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Schad J., Lewis M. W., Raisch S. & Smith W. K. (2016). Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. *Academy of Management Annals, 1*(10), 5-64. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1162422

Schmidhuber J. (2015). Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural Networks, 61*, 85–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2014.09.003

Selbst A. D. & Powles J. (2017). Meaningful information and the right to explanation. *International Data Privacy Law, 4*(7), 233–242. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx022

Shrestha Y. R., Ben-Menahem S. M. & von Krogh G. (2019). Organizational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review, 4*(61), 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257

Sturm T., Gerlach J. P. & Pumplun L. et al. (2021). Coordinating human and machine learning for effective organizational learning. *MIS Quarterly, 3*(45), 1581–1602. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/16543

Teece D., Pisano G. & Shuen A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal, 7*(18), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z

Teece D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 13*(28), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Teece D. J., Peteraf M. & Leih S. (2016). Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility: Risk, Uncertainty, and Strategy in the Innovation Economy. *California Management Review, 4*(58), 13–35. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13

Vial G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 2*(28), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

von Krogh G. (2018). Artificial intelligence in organizations: New opportunities for phenomenon-based theorizing. *Academy of Management Discoveries, 4*(4), 404–409. https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2018.0084

Wamba S. F., Gunasekaran A., Akter S. & Ren S. J. F. et al. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. *Journal of Business Research, 70*, 356–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.009

Williams T. A., Gruber D. A. & Sutcliffe K. M. et al. (2017). Organizational Response to Adversity: Fusing Crisis Management and Resilience Research Streams. *Academy of Management Annals, 2*(11), 733–769. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0134

Zuboff S. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power.* New York: PublicAffairs.