International Journal of Advance and Applied Research
www.ijaar.co.in
ISSN – 2347-7075 Impact Factor – 8.141
Peer Reviewed Bi-Monthly
Vol. 6 No. 42 November - December - 2025

Crisis-Ready Workforce: Leveraging Behavioral Analytics for Resilient IT Recruitment

Vaibhav Jain[1] & Dr. Saroj Hiremath[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, Vidya Bhavan College of Commerce, Pune*
[2]*Research Guide, Vidya Bhavan College of Commerce, Pune*
Corresponding Author – Vaibhav Jain
DOI - 10.5281/zenodo.17971114

Abstract:

The Information Technology industry is experiencing unprecedented volatility driven by cyber threats, disruptive technologies, and rapid market shifts. Current recruitment strategies often fail to adequately evaluate candidates' ability to remain effective and lead decisively during crises. This paper introduces a behavioral analytics framework powered by Artificial Intelligence to objectively assess resilience indicators throughout the hiring process. The approach incorporates multimodal behavioral data—such as facial micro-expressions, vocal stress markers, and linguistic cues—to forecast adaptability and crisis management skills. By analyzing existing literature, established methodologies, and hypothetical organizational scenarios, the study illustrates how behavioral analytics can outperform traditional assessment methods in predicting crisis-ready talent. Ethical considerations, including algorithmic bias, data privacy, and the importance of human oversight, are critically addressed. The paper concludes with recommendations for organizational implementation, policy development, and governance structures. This research advances academic discourse on crisis leadership evaluation while offering practical strategies for IT firms aiming to cultivate resilient workforces capable of thriving amid uncertainty and transformation.

Keywords: Crisis-Readiness, Behavioral Analytics, IT Recruitment, Organizational Resilience, Emotion AI, Talent Acquisition, Stress Assessment, Adaptive Leadership.

Introduction:

The Imperative for Crisis-Ready IT Workforces:

The Information Technology industry operates in a landscape marked by constant disruption. Companies face complex challenges such as massive cybersecurity breaches impacting millions of users, infrastructure breakdowns that ripple through global supply chains, and rapid technological changes that render entire business models obsolete (Vogus & Sutcliffe, 2007). Recent global developments—like the shift to remote work during the pandemic and rising cyber threats—have highlighted the critical need for workforce resilience.

Being prepared for crises goes beyond technical expertise. It involves the psychological ability to stay calm, make sound decisions, and maintain organizational unity under pressure. Studies show that organizations with crisis-ready leaders recover more quickly, suffer less reputational harm, and retain stakeholder trust (Kutsyuruba et al., 2021). In contrast, leadership shortcomings during crises—such as poor emotional control or rigid decision-

making—can lead to severe consequences, including executive turnover, financial losses surpassing 213% of executive salary costs, and diminished organizational credibility (Ready & Conger, 2007).

Limitations of Conventional Recruitment Methods:

Conventional hiring practices—such as structured interviews, competency evaluations, and reviews of past performance—primarily assess prior accomplishments and how candidates present themselves, rather than their true resilience under pressure. The presence of social desirability bias greatly undermines the reliability of these assessments; candidates often tailor their responses to match perceived organizational expectations, masking authentic stress reactions and adaptability gaps (Barrick et al., 2014). Even more advanced tools like situational judgment tests remain limited, as they rely on artificial scenarios that lack real emotional intensity.

The Promise of Behavioral Analytics:

Recent advancements in Affective Computing, voice analysis, and Natural Language Processing (NLP) enable real-time evaluation of stress responses, emotional control, and adaptive thinking.

Through behavioral analytics, these technologies can identify subtle physiological and linguistic cues of crisis readiness that go beyond human detection. Such innovations offer objective, standardized, and bias-resistant recruitment methods, improving predictive accuracy while fostering diversity through algorithmic fairness mechanisms (Bartlett et al., 2014).

Research Objectives:

This paper investigates the integration of behavioral analytics into IT recruitment, addressing three primary objectives:

1. Establishing a conceptual framework integrating multimodal behavioral data with established HR practices.
2. Demonstrating through hypothetical scenarios how behavioral analytics predict crisis-readiness more effectively than conventional methods.
3. Identifying ethical safeguards and implementation best practices ensuring equitable, transparent deployment.

Literature Review:

Crisis Management and Workforce Resilience:

Crisis management research defines organizational resilience as the ability to anticipate disruptions, absorb shocks, and emerge stronger from adversity (Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003). Resilient organizations are led by individuals who demonstrate emotional intelligence, cognitive flexibility, and authentic communication. Kantur and İşeri-Say (2012) outline five key dimensions of resilience: structural, cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and strategic adaptability. Leaders prepared for crises embody these traits through balanced responses to uncertainty, transparent communication with stakeholders, and continuous strategy refinement.

Studies show a strong link between leadership resilience and organizational success during crises. A longitudinal analysis of firms facing technological disruption found that 79% of organizations with highly resilient leadership managed the disruption effectively, compared to just 32% with traditional management approaches (Vogel & Wehner, 2016). These findings underscore that crisis- readiness is a strategic advantage requiring intentional recruitment and development.

Emotional Intelligence and Stress Response:

Emotional intelligence—encompassing self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills—forms the psychological core of effective crisis leadership (Goleman, 1998). In high- pressure situations, leaders with strong self-regulation maintain mental clarity, avoid impulsive decisions, and demonstrate calmness that helps prevent organizational panic. Neuroimaging studies reveal that individuals with higher emotional intelligence show increased activation in the prefrontal cortex—the brain region responsible for executive functions—during stress, whereas those with lower emotional intelligence exhibit heightened amygdala activity, which is associated with threat perception (Schaafsma et al., 2015).

Behavioral Analytics in Human Resource Management:

Behavioral analytics in recruitment mark a significant shift from traditional binary screening to detailed psychological profiling. Modern AI-driven talent acquisition platforms integrate features such as automated video interview scoring, sentiment analysis, and personality prediction based on linguistic patterns. Research by Upadhyay and Khandelwal (2018) reports a 40% decrease in time- to-hire and a 25% increase in retention rates among organizations using AI-enhanced recruitment methods. Nonetheless, widespread adoption faces challenges, particularly concerning algorithmic bias and candidate acceptance (Chaudhuri et al., 2022).

Affective Computing and Micro-Expression Recognition:

Affective Computing—combining computer science with emotional psychology—enables machines to identify, interpret, and respond to human emotions. The Facial Action Coding System (FACS), created by Ekman and Friesen, maps 43 distinct facial movements linked to specific emotional states. Bartlett et al. (2014) found that computer vision systems trained on FACS achieve 96% accuracy in differentiating genuine from posed emotional expressions, outperforming humans, who average 72% accuracy. In recruitment, these technologies are applied to automated video interview analysis, detecting indicators of stress, confidence, and potential deception.

Voice Biomarkers and Vocal Stress Analysis:

Voice analysis—examining prosodic features such as pitch, jitter, shimmer, and speaking rate— offers objective markers of emotional and physiological stress. Orr and Musicant (2015) found that higher vocal pitch and faster speech rates are strongly associated with elevated cortisol levels and increased sympathetic nervous system activity. These stress-related vocal patterns remain detectable even when individuals attempt to mask their emotions, making voice analysis less vulnerable to social desirability bias. In recruitment, this technology is applied to real-time measurement of vocal stress during crisis simulation exercises.

Natural Language Processing and Linguistic Markers of Resilience:

NLP algorithms evaluate both the structural and semantic aspects of language. Indicators of resilience in speech include:

- **Cognitive complexity**—use of subordinating conjunctions (e.g., "however," "although," "whilst") reflecting nuanced reasoning.
- **Agency markers**—preference for active voice ("I will implement") over passive voice ("It will be

implemented"), signaling a sense of control.

- **Temporal flexibility**—references to future contingencies rather than rigid predictions.
- **Emotional vocabulary**—balanced acknowledgment of challenges and opportunities instead of extreme framing (De Choudhury et al., 2014).

Such linguistic analysis helps distinguish reactive individuals, who rely on simplistic, binary language, from adaptive individuals, who use complex and context-rich expressions.

Algorithmic Bias and Fairness in AI Recruitment:

A critical challenge in AI-enhanced recruitment involves algorithmic bias—the perpetuation or amplification of historical discrimination through machine learning models. Amazon's termination of its AI recruiting tool, trained on predominantly male historical hiring data and subsequently penalizing female candidates, exemplifies this risk (Dastin, 2018). Fairness frameworks address bias through: (1) dataset diversification; (2) regularization techniques penalizing disparate impact; (3) explainable AI (XAI) systems enabling transparency; (4) ongoing performance monitoring across demographic groups. Organizations must implement bias audits and multi-stakeholder governance to ensure equitable deployment (Mittelstadt, 2017).

Research Methodology Research Approach:

This paper adopts a conceptual analytical approach that integrates established research, emerging technological capabilities, and hypothetical organizational scenarios. Instead of collecting empirical data, it develops a theoretically grounded framework aimed at guiding practitioners in applying behavioral analytics to IT recruitment. Such a methodology is well-suited for early-stage research domains that require conceptual clarity before moving toward empirical validation.

Behavioral Metrics Framework:

The proposed framework operationalizes crisis-readiness through four categories of behavioral metrics:

Visual Markers (Facial Action Coding System Analysis):

- Frequency and authenticity of micro-expressions (e.g., genuine Duchenne smiles versus socially polite smiles)
- Eye gaze behavior (consistent focus under cognitive load versus avoidance during stress)
- Facial muscle tension and jaw clenching (signals of suppressed stress)
- Response delay when adapting to unexpected scenario changes

Auditory Markers (Vocal Stress Analysis):

- Stability of fundamental frequency (F0) during high-stress situations
- Jitter and shimmer levels as indicators of vocal strain
- Variations in speaking rate when delivering crisis-related responses
- Frequency and length of pauses, which may signal deliberation or cognitive overload

Linguistic Markers (NLP Analysis):

- Cognitive complexity evaluated through subordination ratios
- Agency indicators assessed via pronoun usage (e.g., "I" statements versus passive
- constructions)
- Temporal framing distinguishing future-oriented language from retrospective phrasing

- Balanced emotional vocabulary reflects realistic acknowledgment of challenges rather than exaggerated negativity

Behavioral Markers (Scenario Performance):

- Decision-making speed and flexibility (quick yet measured, avoiding recklessness)
- Quality of stakeholder communication (clear, empathetic, and transparent)
- Information-seeking approach (proactive rather than reactive)
- Alignment of emotional expression (verbal confidence consistent with non-verbal cues)

Analytical Models:

Multimodal Integration Model: Combines visual, auditory, and linguistic data streams using machine learning ensemble techniques. Weighted scoring assigns higher importance to metrics with proven predictive validity. Human recruiters then interpret these composite scores alongside contextual factors such as industry experience and cultural fit.

Stress-Response Calibration Model: Establishes each candidate's baseline stress profile during initial interview segments and then tracks deviations under crisis simulation conditions. This individualized approach accounts for natural emotional variability, minimizing false positives for candidates who are inherently more expressive.

Comparative Benchmarking Model: Compares candidate profiles against established resilience benchmarks derived from incumbent high-performer crisis performance data and crisis leadership literature. Standardized comparison enables objective candidate ranking.

Findings and Analysis:

How Behavioral Analytics Predicts Crisis-Readiness:

Behavioral analytics enhance crisis-readiness prediction through multiple mechanisms:

Authentic Stress Response Detection: Unlike self-reported stress management skills, behavioral analytics reveal authentic physiological reactions during simulated crises. A candidate who claims strong stress management may appear composed in standard interviews but displays vocal strain, micro-expressions of panic, and disorganized thinking when faced with realistic crisis scenarios (e.g., simulated alert of a major security breach). Gaps between verbal confidence and non-verbal cues serve as reliable predictors of actual crisis performance.

Cognitive Flexibility Assessment: Crisis-readiness hinges on cognitive flexibility—the ability to quickly reframe situations and devise innovative solutions. Linguistic analysis measures this through subordination ratios (the proportion of sentences using subordinating conjunctions). For example, a response like "We experienced a server outage; I immediately implemented failover protocols" reflects lower cognitive flexibility compared to "Whilst our primary systems experienced unexpected failures, I recognized that failover protocols could be implemented contingent upon network architecture, though we first needed to verify bandwidth constraints." The latter illustrates advanced reasoning that incorporates multiple contingencies.

Emotional Regulation Measurement: Voice biomarker analysis reveals emotional regulation during crisis-related discussions. A candidate who maintains stable vocal pitch and a moderate speaking rate while recounting a past crisis demonstrates

stronger emotional control than one showing elevated pitch and rapid speech—markers of sympathetic nervous system activation. These vocal patterns remain detectable even when individuals attempt to suppress emotions, making them a reliable indicator.

Authenticity and Integrity Detection: Micro-expression analysis identifies mismatches between verbal statements and non-verbal cues. For instance, a candidate claiming enthusiasm for crisis management while displaying micro-expressions of contempt or fear suggests possible insincerity or hidden ambivalence influenced by social desirability. Such inconsistencies often predict lower organizational commitment and higher turnover, especially when actual crisis situations arise.

Hypothetical Organizational Scenarios:

Scenario 1: Comparative Candidate Assessment—Cybersecurity Crisis Response:

A technology consulting firm recruiting for an IT manager role assesses three finalists—Candidates A, B, and C. Each has comparable technical credentials and performs well in traditional structured interviews. To differentiate them, the firm applies behavioral analytics during a simulated crisis scenario involving a major client data breach impacting thousands of customers.

Candidate A: The candidate delivers an articulate verbal response, correctly outlining crisis protocols. However, voice analysis indicates elevated pitch (a marker of sympathetic nervous system activation), an increased speaking rate compared to baseline, and extended pauses suggesting cognitive strain. Micro-expressions of fear appear briefly when discussing reputational impact. Linguistic analysis shows reliance on simplistic phrasing (e.g., "We must respond quickly," "This is very serious"), reflecting cognitive overload. Assessment: Strong technical expertise but limited emotional regulation and cognitive flexibility under real pressure.

Candidate B: The candidate provides a clear verbal response addressing crisis protocols. Voice analysis shows stable pitch, consistent moderate speaking rate, and short, confident pauses. Micro- expressions reflect focused attention rather than fear. Linguistic analysis indicates advanced reasoning (e.g., "Whilst immediate containment remains critical, we must simultaneously orchestrate stakeholder communication, knowing that transparency paradoxically strengthens customer retention"). Assessment: Exhibits strong emotional regulation, cognitive flexibility, and genuine crisis-readiness.

Candidate C: The candidate's verbal response is somewhat vague (e.g., "We'll need to figure out what happened and let people know"). Voice analysis shows stable pitch but a slower speaking rate, indicating possible difficulty with linguistic retrieval. Micro-expressions reveal mild anxiety and disengagement. Linguistic analysis highlights passive voice and generalized phrasing. Assessment: Likely lacks technical depth and prior crisis experience but demonstrates emotional composure without signs of panic.

Traditional interviews would likely rate Candidates A and B similarly or even slightly favor A due to more polished responses. However, behavioral analytics reveal clear distinctions—identifying Candidate B as the strongest fit for high-pressure crisis leadership roles, while Candidate C is better suited for technical implementation positions that require consistent, steady-state performance.

Scenario 2: Prediction of Crisis Performance—Longitudinal Outcome:

Six months after hiring based on behavioral analytics, the organization faces a real cybersecurity crisis. Candidate-B previously identified as crisis-ready—demonstrates genuine resilience by maintaining team composure through clear, transparent communication, making iterative decisions that balance containment with stakeholder management, and swiftly pivoting strategy when initial measures fall short. In contrast, Candidate A, despite strong technical skills, experiences decision paralysis when unexpected complications arise, communicates poorly with stakeholders— intensifying panic—and suffers stress-related performance decline. Candidate C delivers competent technical execution but lacks the strategic leadership required in crisis situations.

Post-crisis performance data validates the behavioral analytics approach, confirming that multimodal assessment predicted true crisis-readiness more accurately than conventional interviews alone.

Discussion:

Implications for IT Recruitment Strategies:

Integrating behavioral analytics fundamentally reshapes recruitment strategy for IT organizations:

Enhanced Predictive Validity: Traditional assessment methods offer only limited accuracy in predicting leadership performance during crises. Behavioral analytics significantly improve predictive validity by using multimodal analysis to capture genuine stress responses, emotional regulation, and adaptive thinking. Organizations adopting these methods report a 35–40% reduction in leadership-related failures during crisis situations (Ready & Conger, 2007).

Diversity and Inclusion Advancement: Behavioral analytics, when thoroughly checked for algorithmic bias, can foster diversity by assessing resilience without considering demographic factors. Traditional interviews often reinforce unconscious bias, as recruiters tend to favor candidates who resemble current top performers or leaders. Using objective behavioral metrics helps minimize this bias, allowing organizations to identify crisis-ready talent across all demographic groups.

Objective Standardization: In globally distributed IT organizations, behavioral analytics enable standardized assessments that eliminate interviewer variability. Candidates in India, Singapore, and Canada are evaluated using identical analytical criteria, ensuring fairness and consistency across regions.

Risk Mitigation: Hiring mistakes in senior IT roles can be extremely costly. A failed CIO or CTO during a crisis may lead to strategic setbacks, security breaches, and financial losses in the millions. Behavioral analytics help mitigate this risk by improving predictive accuracy in leadership selection.

Ethical and Privacy Considerations:

Implementation of behavioral analytics raises significant ethical concerns requiring robust governance:

Algorithmic Bias and Fairness: AI models trained on biased historical data can reinforce past discrimination. For instance, if crisis-ready performance data primarily reflects male leaders— historically dominant in crisis roles—the model may capture gender-related patterns instead of true crisis competence. To address this, organizations should adopt strategies such as: (a) using diverse training datasets; (b) applying fairness metrics to monitor disparate impact;

(c) leveraging explainable AI for bias detection; and (d) conducting independent bias audits.

Candidate Acceptability and Transparency: Many candidates express concerns about AI-driven evaluations. To build trust, organizations should maintain transparency on: (a) what data is collected; (b) how that data influences decisions; (c) candidates' rights to challenge outcomes; and (d) assurance that biometric data is not permanently stored. Clear communication fosters candidate confidence and strengthens organizational reputation.

Human-in-the-Loop Decision-Making: Behavioral analytics should guide, not replace, hiring decisions. Human recruiters must interpret AI-driven insights in light of contextual factors, individual circumstances, and organizational values. Preserving human oversight ensures ethical decision-making and maintains organizational accountability.

Recommendations:

Best Practices for Implementing Behavioral Analytics:

Pilot Programmer Development: Organizations should adopt a phased approach by launching pilot programs to assess the effectiveness of behavioral analytics before full-scale deployment. These pilots should: (a) focus on specific roles, such as crisis leadership positions; (b) implement performance validation by comparing predicted crisis-readiness with actual outcomes; and (c) iteratively refine models based on pilot results.

Algorithmic Bias Auditing: Conduct comprehensive bias audits to determine whether models disproportionately affect specific demographic groups. These audits should: (a) analyze selection rates across gender, ethnicity, age, and other protected attributes; (b) detect proxy discrimination, such as voice analysis penalizing accents; (c) apply fairness metrics like demographic parity and equalized odds; and (d) implement quarterly review cycles to maintain ongoing fairness.

Transparency and Explainability: Deploy explainable AI (XAI) systems that convert model decisions into clear, interpretable factors. Candidates should receive feedback detailing: (a) which behavioral attributes influenced the decision; (b) how their performance compares to benchmarks; and (c) available options for reconsideration or appeal. XAI strengthens candidate trust and reinforces organizational credibility.

Data Governance and Privacy: Implement strong data governance practices that include: (a) obtaining explicit informed consent outlining data usage; (b) enforcing limited retention periods (e.g., 12 months after the hiring decision); (c) applying secure encryption and strict access controls; (d) conducting regular data protection audits; and (e) defining clear incident response protocols for potential breaches.

Human-Centered Decision Framework: Design recruitment processes that prioritize human-centric decision-making. Recruiters should: (a) interpret AI recommendations in the context of each candidate; (b) account for factors AI may overlook, such as cultural fit and mentorship potential; (c) retain discretion to advance candidates despite lower AI scores; and (d) provide clear feedback explaining hiring decisions.

Candidate Communication Strategy: Create transparent communication strategies that clarify the use of behavioral analytics. These should: (a) explain the assessment rationale, emphasizing its link to crisis-readiness; (b) detail how data is used and retained; (c) outline candidates' rights regarding their data; and (d) provide resources to address candidate concerns.

Organizational Guidelines:

For Senior Leadership: Ensure executive accountability for the ethical and equitable implementation of behavioral analytics. Chief Human Resource Officers should provide quarterly reports covering bias metrics, candidate acceptance levels, and validation of hiring outcomes.

For HR Departments: Deliver comprehensive training programs focused on interpreting behavioral analytics, mitigating bias, and ensuring ethical decision-making. HR professionals should develop a clear understanding of AI's capabilities and limitations, avoiding blind reliance on algorithmic recommendations.

For Legal and Compliance: Engage legal counsel to ensure compliance with employment laws, data protection regulations, and anti-discrimination statutes. Develop clear policies covering candidate rights, data retention practices, and incident response procedures.

Policy Recommendations:

Regulatory Framework: Industry bodies should establish behavioral analytics standards that define baseline requirements for bias audits, transparency, data protection, and human oversight. These standards would encourage responsible innovation while preventing competitive pressures that lead to compromised ethics.

Certification Programme: Establish certification for organizations implementing behavioral analytics ethically and effectively. Certification would encompass bias audit passage, privacy compliance, transparency practices, and third-party validation of hiring outcome improvements.

Conclusion:

Crisis-readiness is emerging as a strategic asset essential for competitiveness in the IT sector. Traditional recruitment methods often fail to accurately assess critical attributes such as authentic stress responses, emotional regulation, and adaptive thinking—skills indispensable during real crises. Behavioral analytics, powered by advances in Affective Computing, voice analysis, and Natural Language Processing, offer a transformative approach by enabling multimodal assessments of genuine behavioral indicators.

The proposed framework integrates visual, auditory, and linguistic markers of crisis competence into standardized, objective evaluation processes. Hypothetical scenarios illustrate how behavioral analytics can distinguish between candidates who appear similar in conventional interviews, identifying those truly equipped for crisis leadership. Implementing this approach across IT organizations promises improved predictive validity, reduced hiring risk, and enhanced organizational resilience amid inevitable disruptions.

However, ethical deployment is critical. Issues such as algorithmic bias, privacy concerns, and candidate acceptance must be addressed through rigorous bias audits, robust data governance, transparency measures, and sustained human oversight. Organizations that successfully balance predictive accuracy with ethical implementation will gain a competitive edge through resilient, adaptable leadership capable of navigating the uncertainty inherent in modern IT environments.

References:

1. Barrick, M. R., Patton, G. K., & Huff, S. N. (2014). Personality and performance at the beginning of a new organizational tenure. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 116(2), 352–361. https://doi.org/10.

2. Bartlett, M. S., Littlewort, G. C., Frank, M. G., & Lee, K. (2014). Automatic decoding of facial movements reveals deceptive pain expressions. Current Biology, 24(7), 738–743. https://doi.org/10.
3. Chaudhuri, S., Chopra, N., & Jain, S. (2022). Adopting artificial intelligence in recruitment: An exploratory study. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33(4), 758–781. https://doi.org/10.
4. Dastin, J. (2018, October 10). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-ai-idUSKCN1MK08G
5. De Choudhury, M., Counts, S., & Horvitz, E. (2014). Predicting depression via social media. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, 128–137.
6. Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (2003). Unmasking the face: A guide to recognizing emotions from facial expressions. Malor Books.
7. Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. Bantam Books.
8. Kantur, D., & İşeri-Say, A. (2012). Organisational resilience: A conceptual integrative framework. Journal of Management & Organization, 18(6), 762–773. https://doi.org/10.
9. Kutsyuruba, B., Walker, K. D., & Matheson, I. A. (2021). Crisis leadership: Strategies for school leaders in turbulent times. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 20(4), 582–596. https://doi.org/10.
10. Mittelstadt, B. (2017). From individual to group privacy in big data analytics. Philosophy & Technology, 30(4), 475–494. https://doi.org/10.
11. Orr, E. S., & Musicant, D. R. (2015). Vocal stress indicators of deception via affective speech features. IEEE Access, 3, 2248–2262. https://doi.org/10.
12. Ready, D. A., & Conger, J. A. (2007). Make your company a talent factory. Harvard Business Review, 85(6), 68–77.
13. Schaafsma, S. M., Pfaff, D. W., Spunt, R. P., & Adolphs, R. (2015). Deconstructing and reconstructing theory of mind. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 19(2), 65–72. https://doi.org/10.
14. Sutcliffe, K. M., & Vogus, T. J. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline (pp. 94–110). Berrett-Koehler.
15. Upadhyay, A. K., & Khandelwal, K. (2018). Applying artificial intelligence: Implications for recruitment. Strategic HR Review, 17(5), 255–258. https://doi.org/10.
16. Vogel, R., & Wehner, M. C. (2016). Uncertainty in technology leadership: The role of organisational resilience and individual adaptability. Journal of Technology Transfer, 41(3), 675–694. https://doi.org/10.
17. Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Organisational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda. 2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 3418–3422. https://doi.org/10.