



Strategic Friction Mapping For Resource Allocation In Volatile Commercial Ecosystem

Dr. Elena M. Crawford

Associate Professor

Department of Commerce and Strategic Management

Northshore Institute of Business Studies, Halifax, Canada

Article Type: Conceptual and Descriptive Research Paper

Abstract

Volatile commercial ecosystems expose organizations to abrupt demand changes, supplier constraints, shifting channel economics, and compressed decision windows. Under such conditions, inadequate resource allocation is not explained solely by limited budgets or poor forecasts; it may also result from friction embedded in information flows, organizational approval systems, operational commitments, and relationships with external partners. This article develops strategic friction mapping as a conceptual approach for identifying such constraints and relating them to resource allocation decisions. The study uses a descriptive synthesis of established scholarship on the resource-based view, transaction cost economics, organizational information processing, dynamic capabilities, resource orchestration, and supply-chain resilience. Friction is defined here as an observable impediment or coordination cost that delays, distorts, or reduces the value of resource redeployment. The discussion distinguishes demand-related, informational, structural, relational, and financial frictions, explains how they may interact, and examines potential opportunities and challenges for commercial organizations. It proposes a staged management approach involving signal detection, friction diagnosis, materiality assessment, selective reallocation, and post-decision evaluation. No primary data, numerical simulations, or causal effect estimates are claimed. The contribution is a theoretically grounded vocabulary and practical diagnostic framework that may assist commercial managers in distinguishing ordinary resource scarcity from avoidable allocation barriers. The article closes by identifying limitations and empirical tests required before the proposed approach can be considered a validated managerial instrument.

Keywords: Strategic Friction Mapping; Resource Allocation; Commercial Volatility; Dynamic Capabilities; Resource Orchestration; Decision Latency; Supply-Chain Resilience; Organizational Coordination

Introduction

Commercial organizations allocate capital, inventory, staff time, managerial attention, and distribution capacity while conditions around them continually change. In relatively predictable environments, periodic budgets and stable operating plans may provide sufficient coordination. Volatile commercial ecosystems, however, are characterized by irregular customer orders, rapid changes in input costs, platform and supplier disruptions, and competitive actions that alter the expected return on existing commitments. Managers must respond before every uncertainty can be fully resolved, yet acting too quickly can also intensify mistakes.

A central difficulty is that available resources are not always deployable resources. A firm may have working capital but lack reliable information about where to invest it; a sales division may identify an opportunity but face a lengthy authorization process; or a purchasing unit may be unable to change suppliers because contracts and specifications make switching costly. These situations illustrate strategic frictions: constraints and coordination burdens that impede the conversion of resource availability into timely commercial action. Transaction cost economics offers one explanation of the costs arising from exchange and governance arrangements (Williamson, 1985), while organizational information-processing theory links uncertainty with coordination requirements (Galbraith, 1974).

Resource-based strategy shows that competitive advantage depends partly on the characteristics and deployment of firm resources (Barney, 1991). In changing markets, however, possession alone is inadequate. Dynamic capabilities research emphasizes processes that reconfigure resources as circumstances evolve (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, 2007). Resource orchestration extends this reasoning by describing how managers structure, bundle, and leverage resources to produce value (Sirmon et al., 2007). Together these traditions motivate a more diagnostic treatment of the barriers encountered between strategy formulation and resource redeployment.

The term strategic friction mapping is used here as a proposed integrative concept rather than as an already standardized measurement technique. Mapping means systematically identifying where a proposed allocation encounters delays, dependence, uncertainty, or misaligned incentives; tracing likely causes; and assessing whether management can reduce those constraints at acceptable cost. The purpose is not to eliminate all friction. Contractual safeguards, financial review, and approval procedures may protect firms from costly errors. The managerial question is which frictions are necessary safeguards and which prevent value-creating adaptation.

Statement of the Problem

Commercial resource allocation is often planned through budgets, forecasts, and departmental targets that assume a level of continuity in demand and operating conditions. When those assumptions weaken, resources may remain committed to declining opportunities while emerging requirements lack funding, personnel, or capacity. Conventional performance reports can identify a gap between planned and achieved outcomes without explaining whether the underlying cause is poor opportunity selection, decision delay, unavailable information, or costly coordination.

A further problem occurs when different units encounter the same disruption but respond independently. Procurement may protect unit costs by concentrating purchases, operations may prioritize capacity utilization, and marketing may seek flexibility through frequent product changes. Each response can be locally reasonable while making organization-wide resource redeployment more difficult. Frictions therefore exist both inside functional boundaries and across the relationships joining suppliers, distributors, customers, and external platforms.

This paper addresses the lack of an integrated conceptual diagnostic that connects categories of friction with commercial resource-allocation choices. It explores how mapping may improve the clarity of managerial decisions while acknowledging that the effectiveness of this approach remains a proposition requiring future testing.

Objectives of the Study

The overarching objective is to analyze how strategic friction mapping can support more informed allocation of scarce and redeployable resources in volatile commercial ecosystems. The research

brings together theoretical insights that are often applied separately to strategy, organization design, and operational resilience.

A second objective is to distinguish useful control mechanisms from avoidable coordination burdens. This distinction matters because uncritical acceleration of decisions can undermine governance, whereas rigid procedures may leave valuable opportunities unmet.

- To establish a clear conceptual meaning of strategic friction in commercial resource allocation.
- To identify organizational and external sources of allocation friction under volatile market conditions.
- To examine the potential benefits and practical limitations of diagnosing such frictions.
- To propose a structured sequence for prioritizing and responding to resource-allocation constraints.
- To identify empirical indicators and research designs suitable for future validation.

Research Methodology

The study follows a conceptual-descriptive design based on secondary literature. Its analytical foundation comprises established academic work on firm resources, economic governance, organizational learning, information processing, dynamic capabilities, risk, and resource orchestration. These streams were selected for their conceptual relevance to the question of why commercially useful resources can be difficult to redirect under uncertainty. The manuscript does not report an exhaustive systematic search or a fixed sample of screened articles.

The synthesis proceeded by identifying concepts that explain a gap between resource potential and resource deployment: information-processing burden, contracting and switching costs, path dependence, routines, managerial attention, and interorganizational dependencies. These concepts were grouped into five analytical categories: demand, information, structure, relationships, and finance. The categories are organizing propositions, not latent factors established through statistical validation.

A diagnostic sequence was then derived by connecting each category to managerial decisions about monitoring, prioritization, and redeployment. This approach is useful for developing a coherent conceptual framework but does not establish causal links or predict allocation performance.

No interviews, questionnaires, firm records, simulations, numerical survey findings, or impact estimates were used. Statements about managerial advantages must accordingly be interpreted as reasoned possibilities rather than demonstrated effects.

Conceptual Basis and Principles of Strategic Friction Mapping

Strategic friction is defined as a condition that increases the time, cost, uncertainty, or organizational effort required to shift resources toward a potentially valuable use. It can arise when decision-makers disagree about priorities, data arrive too late, contractual obligations limit substitution, or specialized resources cannot easily be repurposed. Friction is distinct from scarcity: a resource may be genuinely unavailable even when coordination is excellent, while abundant resources may remain idle because allocation processes are ineffective.

An effective map specifies the decision under consideration, the resources implicated, the relevant commercial time horizon, and the pathway through which approval or execution must occur. It then identifies observable obstacles. Examples include the number of handoffs before approval, lead-time variability, duplicated reporting, concentration of supplier dependence, or costly reversibility. These signals can guide inquiry, but they should not be combined into an overall score without transparent definitions, appropriate weighting, and validation.

1. Economic Materiality

Friction deserves management attention when its expected commercial consequences are substantial relative to the resources required to address it. A brief approval delay may be immaterial for a routine purchase but significant when an opportunity is short-lived. Managers should therefore compare potential value loss with the cost of process change.

Materiality assessments should avoid pretending that uncertain costs are precise. Qualitative ranges, scenario assumptions, and explicit confidence levels can be more useful than unsupported numerical rankings.

2. Decision Traceability

A friction map should show where a decision originates, which units contribute information, who has authority, and where execution becomes dependent on another party. Traceability helps separate ambiguous responsibility from legitimate risk review.

Mapping is most useful when it captures the actual decision pathway rather than merely reproducing an organizational chart. Managers should examine how tasks are performed during disruptions, not only how formal procedures describe them.

3. Reversibility and Flexibility

Some resource commitments are easy to modify, while others require substantial switching costs, retraining, or renegotiation. Reversibility should inform the willingness to experiment and the size of commitments made under uncertainty.

Flexible decisions may be staged instead of executed as one irreversible allocation. Such staging can preserve options without demanding that all uncertainty be resolved before action.

4. Coordination Rather Than Local Optimization

Reducing friction in one department may shift costs to another. An accelerated procurement decision might create inventory congestion, while inventory reduction might increase customer-service risk. Mapping should therefore consider the system-wide consequences of proposed improvements. Shared decision criteria can reduce conflicts among functional targets. Resource allocation should reflect commercial value, service reliability, and financial sustainability together rather than one isolated departmental metric.

Opportunities for Strategic Friction Mapping in Volatile Commercial Ecosystems

A friction-oriented perspective creates opportunities to improve the explanation, rather than merely the measurement, of resource-allocation outcomes. It encourages managers to ask why identified commercial opportunities cannot be acted upon and whether the obstacle concerns information, authority, contracts, or capacity. This orientation may be especially relevant where demand and supply conditions change faster than formal planning cycles.

The following opportunities are theoretical management applications. Their value depends on organizational context, the quality of the available evidence, and the ability to implement changes without weakening accountability.

1. Faster Recognition of Decision Bottlenecks

Mapping decision pathways can reveal repeated handoffs, unclear mandates, and delays that would remain hidden within aggregate performance reports. Galbraith (1974) relates organizational design to the information-processing demands produced by uncertainty, suggesting that firms must align coordination capacity with their operational environment.

When a time-sensitive allocation is delayed, tracing its approvals and dependencies may identify a specific intervention, such as clarifying delegated authority or simplifying duplicated reporting. Faster action is beneficial only when the associated review remains sufficient for the decision risk.

2. More Discriminating Allocation of Scarce Resources

Friction mapping can distinguish a low-value opportunity from a valuable opportunity that has become difficult to execute. That distinction matters because conventional allocation reviews may reject initiatives with high coordination costs without considering whether those costs are avoidable. The resource orchestration perspective emphasizes managerial action in creating value from resource combinations (Sirmon et al., 2007).

Where resources are limited, managers can compare not only forecast returns but also execution readiness, dependencies, reversibility, and the consequences of delay. Such analysis may improve prioritization, provided that it does not convert subjective assumptions into apparently objective rankings.

3. Greater Visibility of External Dependencies

Commercial volatility is frequently transmitted through supplier networks, distributors, logistics partners, or digital intermediaries. Mapping these relationships may reveal concentration risks, contractual switching restrictions, or informational dependencies that constrain operational response. Christopher and Peck (2004) underscore the importance of resilience in vulnerable supply chains.

Awareness of dependencies can support contingency planning and selective investment in alternatives. However, diversification can be expensive; the strategic objective is an acceptable balance between efficiency, continuity, and the cost of maintaining options.

4. Learning From Allocation Decisions

Decision records can clarify why resources were redeployed, what assumptions supported the choice, and where implementation encountered unexpected obstacles. March (1991) distinguishes learning through exploration and exploitation, an important tension in balancing existing commercial performance with experimentation.

Reviewing resource choices after market conditions evolve can help firms update their procedures and improve institutional learning. The interpretation should acknowledge that outcomes may reflect external shocks rather than the quality of the decision alone.

IMAGE 01: STRATEGIC FRICTION MAPPING — KEY COMMERCIAL CONSTRAINTS



Source: Original conceptual illustration developed for this manuscript; categories are illustrative and are not empirical measurements.

Challenges of Strategic Friction Mapping

The approach is not free from implementation difficulties. Volatility makes attribution uncertain: a delivery delay may be caused by a supplier shortage, a flawed forecast, insufficient managerial attention, or several factors at once. Mapping can be useful without perfect attribution, but management should avoid assuming that every observed delay is an avoidable organizational failure. Friction reduction can also create trade-offs. Review, contractual safeguards, and structured approvals often exist to protect resources and stakeholders. Effective governance requires

distinguishing controls that add value from procedural barriers that persist without a defensible purpose.

1. Ambiguous Causation and Weak Data

Commercial events commonly have multiple and interacting causes. Apparent delays may reflect prudent quality checks rather than administrative inefficiency. Managers should compare competing explanations and document the evidence supporting each diagnosis.

Incomplete timestamp records, inconsistent resource definitions, and limited visibility across partners can make analysis difficult. Qualitative interviews or process observations may be necessary in future applications, with appropriate consent and governance.

2. Cross-Functional Incentive Conflicts

Departments are frequently evaluated against targets that favor local efficiency over enterprise-wide adaptability. Finance may constrain discretionary spending while commercial teams favor rapid responses, creating friction rooted in genuine trade-offs rather than individual failure.

A mapping exercise can expose these conflicts but cannot automatically resolve them. Senior management must establish decision priorities, escalation rights, and performance criteria that reflect the organization's wider strategy.

3. Costly Reconfiguration and Contractual Constraints

Physical assets, specialist capabilities, long-term contracts, and supplier relationships may be expensive to change. Dynamic capabilities research emphasizes reconfiguration, yet not every resource can be moved quickly or without value loss (Teece, 2007).

Organizations should distinguish adjustments that are feasible immediately from those requiring staged investment or negotiation. A recommendation to redeploy resources without assessing switching and transition costs may be commercially unsound.

4. Overdiagnosis and Measurement Burden

A detailed map can become another source of friction if it generates extensive documentation, meetings, or continuous monitoring with limited decision value. Analytical effort must be proportionate to the importance and complexity of the resource choice.

Simple categories and limited core indicators may be preferable during early adoption. Expanding measurement should depend on whether the additional information demonstrably changes decisions.

5. Governance and Accountability Risks

Acceleration initiatives may unintentionally weaken financial approvals, supplier due diligence, privacy protections, or compliance controls. These safeguards should not be classified as unnecessary friction merely because they introduce delay.

A responsible system specifies non-negotiable controls and identifies opportunities to make them more efficient. The objective is a better quality of response, not an indiscriminate reduction in procedural steps.

Strategies for Resource Allocation Through Strategic Friction Mapping

A practical approach begins with a specific allocation decision rather than an ambition to map every activity in the enterprise. Managers should identify the resources involved, the trigger for reconsideration, the time horizon, and the commercial consequences of delay or inaction. This bounded starting point makes the diagnosis relevant and limits unnecessary analytical effort.

Implementation can then proceed through a structured but revisable series of actions. The sequence below is a proposed managerial pathway and should be adapted to the risk, scale, and operating arrangements of the organization.

1. Establish a Commercial Trigger

Define the event that calls an existing allocation into question, such as a persistent demand shift, a supplier interruption, a significant change in contribution margin, or a new capacity constraint. The trigger should be observable and linked to a decision the organization can actually make.

Setting a clear decision horizon prevents teams from analyzing every market signal as equally urgent. It also separates short-lived fluctuations from changes that may justify structural resource reallocation.

2. Trace the Actual Decision and Execution Path

Identify the individuals, systems, contractual partners, and approval stages through which resources move. Document necessary safeguards as well as discretionary steps that might be simplified or coordinated differently.

The map should identify accountable decision owners and highlight where incomplete data, waiting times, and competing priorities prevent action. Process tracing is intended to support discussion rather than assign blame.

3. Assess Materiality and Reversibility

Classify frictions by likely commercial consequence, the confidence of the underlying evidence, and the feasibility of addressing them. Resource choices with high irreversibility deserve more deliberate examination than small, reversible experiments.

Decision-makers may use scenario ranges for delay costs and required investment, but they should disclose assumptions and avoid unsupported precision. Assessments should account for customer outcomes and operational reliability in addition to financial effects.

4. Reallocate Through Controlled Commitments

Where appropriate, redirect resources in stages: pilot a channel, reassign a limited team, renegotiate a discrete contract, or release funding conditionally on observed results. Staging helps preserve options under uncertainty.

Each action needs a responsible manager, an expected learning outcome, and criteria for continuation or reversal. Temporary flexibility should not displace the governance requirements associated with larger commitments.

5. Review Results and Revise the Map

After implementation, compare the expected obstacle with what actually occurred. Determine whether the intervention reduced delay, improved coordination, or merely shifted the burden to another function or partner.

Regular review turns the map into an organizational learning tool rather than a static diagram. Both unsuccessful and successful interventions can clarify which adaptations merit broader application.

Image 02: Proposed Strategic Response Pathway



Source: Original conceptual illustration developed for this manuscript. The sequence is a proposed managerial aid, not a statistically validated intervention.

Discussion

Strategic friction mapping combines several established streams of scholarship without claiming that they describe one unified, existing theory. The resource-based view explains why resources and capabilities matter for competitive advantage (Barney, 1991), whereas resource orchestration emphasizes managerial actions required to structure and leverage them (Sirmon et al., 2007). Friction mapping extends this reasoning by directing attention to the observable impediments that prevent reallocation after managers recognize changing commercial conditions.

Information-processing and transaction-cost perspectives provide complementary explanations for these impediments. Galbraith (1974) connects uncertainty with organizational

coordination requirements; Williamson (1985) explains why governance and exchange conditions shape the costs of business relationships. Together they help explain why apparent inefficiency can arise from organizational design, information limits, and deliberately imposed safeguards. These mechanisms should be examined before recommending changes to decision authority or supplier arrangements.

Dynamic capabilities scholarship adds the temporal dimension. Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) describe dynamic capabilities as identifiable processes, while Teece (2007) emphasizes sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring. Friction mapping offers a proposed diagnostic bridge from sensing a change to actually shifting resources. Such a bridge is useful conceptually, but its independent contribution must be tested against existing planning, process-mapping, and risk-management tools. Commercial resilience further complicates the interpretation. Firms that minimize all apparent slack can perform efficiently under predictable conditions while becoming less adaptable to disruption. Supply-chain resilience research identifies the need to examine vulnerability and continuity, suggesting that some reserves and alternative relationships can be strategically valuable (Christopher & Peck, 2004). Friction mapping should therefore treat slack and safeguards as possible sources of resilience rather than automatically as inefficiency.

The practical test of the framework is not whether it produces a detailed diagram, but whether it leads to better resource decisions with justifiable costs. This paper cannot establish that proposition through its conceptual method. Firm-level studies will need to compare mapped and unmapped decisions, define measurable outcomes, account for industry and firm characteristics, and examine possible unintended effects.

Managerial Contribution and Implications

The central contribution is a distinction between inadequate resources and inadequate resource mobility. Traditional planning reports may document budgets and targets without showing where decisions stall. Strategic friction mapping proposes a structured explanation of those bottlenecks, including both external dependencies and internal processes.

For commercial managers, the principal implication is to ground interventions in decision pathways rather than generic demands for agility. The approach can help identify whether a

particular problem calls for better information, clearer authority, modified contractual arrangements, a different resource mix, or deliberate acceptance of a necessary safeguard.

For governance, the framework underscores that faster allocation is not always superior. Decisions should be evaluated in terms of their expected value, reversibility, distribution of risk, and effects across functions. Theoretical integration offers an organizing framework, not a basis for claiming proven productivity, profitability, or resilience gains.

Conclusion

Volatile commercial ecosystems challenge conventional resource allocation because market requirements can change before established planning and approval mechanisms respond. The resulting difficulties may not be attributable to scarcity alone. Delays, information gaps, contractual dependence, specialized assets, and conflicting departmental incentives can restrict the movement of resources even when an organization recognizes the need for change. Strategic friction mapping offers a conceptual approach for diagnosing these constraints and distinguishing them from essential safeguards.

This paper developed an integrated description of demand-related, informational, structural, relational, and financial frictions. Drawing on resource-based strategy, organizational information processing, transaction costs, dynamic capabilities, and resource orchestration, it argued that resource deployment should be studied as a sequence of coordinated decisions rather than a purely financial allocation exercise. The resulting perspective emphasizes traceability, economic materiality, reversibility, and enterprise-wide outcomes.

Potential opportunities include clearer identification of bottlenecks, improved allocation discussions, greater visibility of external dependencies, and more systematic learning from commercial decisions. The analysis also highlighted difficulties concerning data quality, causal interpretation, departmental conflicts, reconfiguration costs, excessive measurement, and governance risks. These limitations indicate that friction mapping should be selective and proportional to the decisions it is intended to support.

The proposed response pathway—detecting triggers, tracing obstacles, assessing materiality, implementing controlled reallocations, and reviewing outcomes—provides a foundation for

managerial experimentation. Its effectiveness has not been empirically established. Further investigation should determine whether structured friction mapping improves resource-deployment decisions compared with existing practices and under which market conditions its benefits exceed the costs of implementation.

Limitations and Future Research

The study is based on conceptual integration rather than primary observations or exhaustive systematic evidence retrieval. It cannot demonstrate how frequently each friction arises, quantify its financial consequences, or establish that the proposed mapping sequence improves organizational outcomes. The five categories are analytical constructs and should not be interpreted as psychometrically validated dimensions.

Future studies could compare resource-allocation episodes within and across firms, using process logs, decision interviews, supplier records, and financial measures collected with appropriate permissions. Potential outcomes include decision lead time, implementation cost, redeployment success, fulfillment continuity, and ex post contribution margin. Research should also test whether interventions merely move bottlenecks elsewhere and whether effects vary by organization size, industry, and environmental volatility.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest is declared for this illustrative conceptual manuscript. Funding: No external funding is reported. Ethics Statement: No human participants, identifiable personal information, or primary data collection were involved. Data Availability: No original research dataset was created. Author Metadata Statement: All listed author details and the institutional affiliation are explicitly hypothetical and must be replaced with verified contributor information before journal submission.

References

1. Adner, R. (2006). Match your innovation strategy to your innovation ecosystem. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(4), 98–107.



2. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
3. Christopher, M., & Peck, H. (2004). Building the resilient supply chain. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 15(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09574090410700275>
4. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128–152. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553>
5. Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121.
6. Galbraith, J. R. (1974). Organization design: An information processing view. *Interfaces*, 4(3), 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.1287/inte.4.3.28>
7. Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2003). The dynamic resource-based view: Capability lifecycles. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(10), 997–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.332>
8. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
9. Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization Science*, 3(3), 383–397. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.3.3.383>
10. Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.14.080188.001535>
11. March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71–87. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71>
12. O'Reilly, C. A., III, & Tushman, M. L. (2013). Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(4), 324–338. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0025>
13. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row.
14. Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.



-
15. Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. (2001). Is the resource-based “view” a useful perspective for strategic management research? *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 22–40. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4011928>
 16. Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. (2007). Managing firm resources in dynamic environments to create value: Looking inside the black box. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 273–292. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.23466005>
 17. Simon, H. A. (1979). Rational decision making in business organizations. *American Economic Review*, 69(4), 493–513.
 18. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
 19. Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage Publications.
 20. Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism: Firms, markets, relational contracting*. Free Press.