



ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE AND VOLATILE, UNCERTAIN, COMPLEX AND AMBIGUOUS ENVIRONMENT OF FIRMS IN PORT HARCOURT NIGERIA

¹Anthonia Isi Suleiman-Hakeem, ²Benedict Chima Onuoha, Ph.D

¹Msc Student, Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt Business School, Port Harcourt, Rivers, Nigeria.

²Professor of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Organizational leaders in the 21st century face relentless changes in the business environments in which they operate. The diversity, intensity, and rapidity of these changes create volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), which challenge leaders on ways to lead effectively as existing methods prove inadequate. The problem in this study was that of inadequate leader preparedness to lead and win in VUCA environments. The purpose of this study was to explore the corporate executives about their VUCA business environment and the strategies they employed for VUCA readiness and success using Questionnaire. However, from our analysis it shows that Leadership can to a considerable extent control the Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous environment of a firm influence as our results shows a significant relationship with all variables. The key recommendations for practice are to inculcate VUCA-readiness and organizational resilience principles in line with this study's findings. The study findings may contribute to in providing strategies for organizational sustainability, firm success, business readiness, responsive leadership, and enhanced employee well-being.

KEYWORDS: Organization, Resilience, Leadership, Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity and Ambiguity.

INTRODUCTION

Background

Organizations in global value chains are increasingly affected by widely unexpected turbulences and crises those have appeared with increasing frequency in the recent times. More so, the global economic recessions and uncertain trade conditions have created major challenges for many western economies and the industries embedded in them, particularly to the organizations, in terms of difficulties in raising funds and controlling costs, as well as shrinking profitability, heavy reliance on few customers, increasing account receivable problems etc. (Chan 2011). organizations are particularly vulnerable to both continuous shifts in the economy and unpredictable events, being more sensitive to financial fluctuations in cash flow, changes in legislation, supply network relationships (i.e. power issues) and to changing customer requirements and demands, and even collapse of national financial systems (as it

happened recently in Greece) and are particularly less prepared to these events (Bhamra and Dani 2011).

In such market turbulence marked by frequent economic crises, how to thrive or at least hone survival instincts, and act upon them effectively to lead success/survival, has thus become imperative for organizations. In this context, the major driving premise of this thesis is that of the prevailing perspectives of resilience in business and management studies (Hamel and Välikangas 2003). Resilience has been conceptualized and adapted to the business world in a number of ways, some have focused on the corporate attributes that yield resilience by understanding its drivers and how to sustain it through positive adjustments (Vogus and Sutcliffe, 2007); some have aimed at expanding the concept in the field of supply chain management and designing, as done by Sheffi (2007) while some researchers have looked into its customer-centric perspectives like Gulati (2010). With the growing importance of resilience development in organizational context for success/survival during



crises and turbulences, there is an increased need to understand and investigate organizational resilience in VUCA Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Most mainstream perspectives related to organizational resilience in adaptation and change (Chakravarthy 1982) do capture various natures of firm responses to diverse kinds of market turbulences to suggest long-term survival and growth. While some works in this line have proposed organizational routines for developing adaptive fits for diverse environmental conditions. More recently, Rodrigues and Child (1999) have proposed ways to deal with environmental complexities, while Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) have tried to suggest various organizational routines to match different environmental conditions. Furthermore, Lengnick-Hall and Beck (2009) have proposed the need for robust transformations besides adaptive fits for devising a continuum of organizational responses by orchestrating various capabilities to face different paces of market turbulence. Their proposition for developing resilience capacity also explains how the experience of diverse environmental conditions helps organizations to execute various routines to realize performance outcomes. However, these researches prescribe strict either-or interaction between organizational routines and environmental conditions for yielding higher performance, which is not always relevant. As it does not always capture the full range of firms' responses to various environmental conditions (varying in pace) through dynamic orchestration of their organizational capabilities and along a multi-strategic initiative highlighting diverse facets of resilience development, through Leadership, People, Product, and Process. as highlighted in the British Standards Institution (BSI) report, (2017).

Nevertheless, this paper aims at evaluating Organizational Resilience in VUCA Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria. Thus, the following Research question are guided the conduct of this study:

1. To what extent Does Leadership affect the Volatile Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria?
2. To what extent Does Leadership affect the Uncertain Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria?
3. To what extent Does Leadership affect the Complex Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria?
4. To what extent Does Leadership affect the Ambiguous Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

The Situation Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT)

Crisis, within the context of organization and management studies, refers to disruptions and negating impact of events or factors outside the control of the organization (Coombs, 2007). Crisis could be caused by internal (fire outbreak due to staff negligence) or external factors (flooding), yet still, the approach towards addressing and responding to crisis situations is considered key in determining the organizations continuity and survival. This paper, in view of the noted distinctiveness of crisis situations in a (VUCA) Environment and the need for context-based tailored responses, adopts the Situation Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT) as its theoretical framework (Coombs, 2007). The SCCT as advocated by Coombs (2007) presents an approach towards crisis situations primarily concerned with (a) understanding the nature and severity of the crisis situation, (b) identifying possible targets of the crisis and as such, specifying key vulnerability areas, and (c) communicating and tailoring responses in line and in consideration of context based characteristics. As such, response strategies from the perspective of the SCCT should be designed to not only curb or address crisis situations, but also to protect and accommodate the peculiarities of constituents. This is as Coombs (2007) argued that in most situations, aggravated crisis outcomes may not result from the crisis itself but from the inappropriate measures adopted or engaged in the control of the crisis.

Conceptual Review

Concept of Organization Resilience

Resilience has emerged as a critical characteristic of complex, dynamic systems in a range of disciplines till it recently emerged strongly into the business literatures and management studies like in the works of Christopher (2004), Sheffi (2007) and many others. Resilience has become a semantically overloaded term, meaning somewhat different things in different fields (Madni and Jackson 2009). Some authors have focused on the corporate attributes that yield resilience, understanding its drivers and how to sustain it. Furthermore, some have incorporated its concept in supply chain designing like Sheffi (2007). Different schools of thought have investigated resilience as a company's ability to either continuously anticipate or react fast to the trends and turbulences. According to Hamel and Välikangas (2003) companies need to dynamically reinvent or renew their business models and strategies as circumstances change – to



attain zero traumas and this forms the core for building an organization's strategic resilience.

However, to achieve this, the British Standards Institution (BSI) report, (2017) has derived the 16 elements of Organizational Resilience that organizations should consider as part of their long-term success by distilling and merging four key standards of relevant best practice. They include: Leadership, People, Process and Product.

Leadership

This Identifies the key roles and responsibilities for leaders in all types of organization. Its elements include: Leadership, Vision and Purpose, Reputational Risk, Financial Aspects and Resource Management

People

This Identifies the organization's people, culture and values determine business success. This includes how the company interacts with the environment, civil society and stakeholders on ethical and social responsibility issues. Its element includes: Culture, Community Engagement, Awareness, Training and Testing and Alignment.

Process

This identifies the embedding habits of excellence into the development of products and services and how they are brought to market is a key component of success. Organizations need a systematic approach to quality processes in the broadest sense of the word. Its elements include: Governance and Accountability, Business Continuity, Supply Chain, and Information and Knowledge Management.

Product

Organizations must also understand and anticipate how their products or services meet the needs of customers or clients and conform to regulatory requirements. The elements in this section require a forward-looking approach: truly resilient businesses innovate by creating new products and markets to stay ahead of competitors. Its elements include: Horizon Scanning, Innovation and Adaptive Capacity.

Concept of Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, and Ambiguity (VUCA)

In the 1990s, the U.S. Army War College coined the term VUCA to denote the end of the Old War and the beginning of a new Next Generation warfare characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (Cousins, 2018). The Old Wars, such as World War I, World War II, and the Cold War happened in the field with known enemies and were defined by known tactics of engagement, aggression, combat, which were long term in nature. The 21st century marked the beginning of the Next Generation warfare, such as 9/11 and the Syrian war, where

globalization and technology fueled a new kind of conflict defined by guerilla tactics of ambush, infiltration, and insurgency (Fry, 2016).

However, like the military, organizations are experiencing a shift in their operating environments similarly fueled by globalization, technology, and hyper-competition, which marks the end of relative stability, known rules, and structured thinking. VUCA entered the business lexicon in the late 1990s and early 2000s primarily through the work of Stiehm and Townsend (2002). The founding fathers of VUCA in organizations described it as the turbulence experienced in today's world of work (Stiehm & Townsend, 2002) while Johansen (2007) defined it as the 21st century's conceptual framework. Despite the age of these assertions, the current reality portrays a complex and dynamic business environment. The simultaneous and high intensity changes at the macro-levels of the global, economic, social, environmental, regulatory, and political arenas became a constant predicament expedited by digital disruptions that redefined the concept of work (Noonan, Richter, Durham, & Pierce, 2017). The impact of the dynamic and turbulent changes penetrated the micro-levels to upset normalcy.

However, VUCA is a metaphor for today's leadership defining the different textures of change that require a different leadership approach from traditional leadership (Rodriguez & Rodriguez, 2015). These authors confirm that in a VUCA environment, leaders require a new set of operating procedures that have the flexibility to change with each VUCA predicament. Nevertheless, to be able to understand this concept, each components or factor of VUCA shall be examined. Hence, the below definitions and descriptions of each VUCA factor allows a deeper understanding of the key differences and signals of each factor to distinguish the phenomenon present in the environment.

Volatility Aspect of VUCA

The word volatile implies instability. Organizations experience volatility when unexpected events upset an established routine with the speed, magnitude, and volume of change creating disorder (Horney & O'Shea, 2015). Furthermore, they noted that in volatility, leaders understand the changes and have sufficient information about the change. However, the frequency and unpredictability of the changes compound risk exposure and decision-making (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014). Volatility is not a new concept in the world of work, the only difference is that previously volatility happened periodically driven by wars, natural disasters, epidemics, and severe economic crises (Horney & O'Shea, 2015). Today, the catalysts of



volatility are broad and far-reaching fueled by globalization triggering increased interconnectivity and interdependence, technology instigating digital and social media disruptions, financial interdependences producing volatile markets, and growing consumer awareness leading to constantly changing demands (Horney & O'Shea, 2015). The flurry of sudden changes creates challenges for organizations built to operate in relative stability adhering to set plans and routines with fixed structures built for reliability.

Uncertainty Aspect of VUCA

There are two schools of thought on what uncertainty represents in turbulent environments. The first one states that organizations experience uncertainty in situations where they know the change happening yet are unable to determine the level of impact the change have on the organization (Saleh & Watson, 2017). Bennett and Lemoine (2014) gave the example of terrorism as an uncertain issue affecting markets. The authors explained that the causes of terrorism were known with the time, place, and impact of a terrorist attack remaining relatively unknown. The downside of this school of thought is it fails to demonstrate how leaders would effectively mine the enormous amount data to select the correct triggers for action. The second school of thought posits that uncertainty is being unable to predict events and lacking clarity on what is happening in the business environment (Pandit et al., 2018). The speed of change and the multitude of players with often conflicting interests complicate the levels of uncertainty experienced by leaders (Horney & O'Shea, 2015).

Complexity Aspect of VUCA

In complexity or complex business environments, simple patterns combine and interconnect in multiple ways that result in disruptions, convolutions, and information overload (Cousins, 2018). Complexity refers to the many moving parts, their iterations, and the multiplicity of actors in any given situation causing chaos, confusion, and a lack of mastering the intricacies to formulate cohesive responses (Codreanu, 2016). Internal and external business environments have become more complex as globalization and technology increase both the volume and the rate of networking to fashion what is referred to as wicked problems for decision-making.

The tsunami of convolutions may create high levels of disorder that can overwhelm decision makers (Horney & O'Shea, 2015). Horney and O'Shea indicated that (a) complexity was one of the greatest challenges facing chief executive officers in this century and (b) complexity had the power to influence

the other VUCA elements by making them worse. Complexity, unlike the other VUCA elements, is a leadership challenge in the management lexicon with several authors and schools of thought discussing various ways to manage the chaos of complex environments.

Ambiguity Aspect of VUCA

The current organizational reality is hazy with mixed meanings, multifarious, and opaque leading to a lack of concrete knowledge or solutions due to the ambiguity (Codreanu, 2016). VUCA subject authors cannot agree on a single characterization of ambiguity. One school of thought believes that ambiguity is born of the other three VUCA events when they happen simultaneously affecting an organizations ability to read the signals, hence resulting in vague multifarious situations (Codreanu, 2016). The second school of thought posits that ambiguous situations are novel, unusual, and/or emergent where the cause and effect of the situation are unknown as it lacks precedence, which makes prognosis difficult (Gilman, 2017). Similarly, in ambiguity, the lack of clarity due to the many competing narratives, perspectives, and interpretations is compounded by a lack of understanding due to the novelty of the innovation or market, which leads to leader distress (Pandit et al., 2018).

Hence, regarding the above concepts on organizational resilience in VUCA Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria. This study would review how Organizational Resilience proxied by (Leadership), not minding other key element (People, Process and Product) affects VUCA Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria

Leadership and VUCA Environment

Winning in a VUCA world is not just about the hardware. It is also about having new software – a new kind of leadership that is value-led and purpose-driven and leaders who can redefine the role of business in society. To be values-led is more than simply putting your values down on a piece of paper. It is about living and breathing those values every day. As a business leader, it is about having a true north – an internal compass with nonnegotiable. It is also about being clear on what those non-negotiable are, and most importantly, it is about sticking to them in good times and in adversity. Leaders, from CEO to any other internal manager, therefore, have a major role to play in ensuring their organizations are responding to the requirements of the VUCA business environment. More so, there are two different types of development–horizontal and vertical. A great deal of time has been spent on “horizontal” development (competencies), but



very little time on “vertical” development (developmental stages). The methods for horizontal and vertical development are very different. Horizontal development can be “transmitted” (from an expert), but vertical development must be earned (for oneself).

Also, Leadership development has come to a point of being too individually focused and elitist. There is a transition occurring from the old paradigm in which leadership resided in a person or role, to a new one in which leadership is a collective process that is spread throughout networks of people. The question will change from, “Who are the leaders?” to “What conditions do we need for leadership to flourish in the network?” How do we spread leadership capacity throughout the organization and democratize leadership? Much Greater Focus on Leadership Development Methods as there are no simple, existing models or programs that will be sufficient to develop the levels of collective leadership required to meet an increasingly complex future. Instead, an era of rapid innovation will be needed, in which organizations experiment with new approaches that combine diverse ideas in new ways and share these with others. Nevertheless, technology and the web will both provide the infrastructure and drive the change, of which organizations that embrace the changes will do better than those who resist it. Thus, our Hypothesis are stated in their null form:

- Ho1.** There is no significant relationship between Leadership and Volatile Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.
- Ho2.** There is no significant relationship between Leadership and Uncertain Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.
- Ho3.** There is no significant relationship between Leadership and Complex Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.
- Ho4.** There is no significant relationship between Leadership and Ambiguous Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.

Empirical Review

Cressey (2010) studied “The Concept of Resilience: Its Components and Relevance, a Theoretical and Empirical Analysis” in which he evaluated the concept of resilience and how it plays out in organizations undergoing restructuring. He sees organization’s ability to recognize resilience as a core issue that requires a programmatic response across the organization. Thus, he addressed many of the same problems but do not frame their response in terms of resilience building. Therefore, the purpose is to supply the language and the categories through which we can

speak of, and recognize, resilience in its organizational context.

Crossan et al. (1999) proposed a convergence to an organizational learning framework based on research streams of information processing by Huber, managerial cognition March & Olsen and innovation Nonaka & Takeuchi. From a dynamic capability’s perspective, this framework identified strategic renewal as a common theme on which to combine previous research stream and in doing so, identified the extreme dynamic nature of organizational learning and the associated impact to strategic renewal of the firm (Crossan et al., 1999). By highlighting the dynamic nature of organizational learning, Crossan et al. (1999) noted the importance of managerial/leaders capability to balance internal processes of the organization and external factor to promote organizational learning.

Similar to Crossan et al. (1999); Sun & Anderson (2010) offered an integrated view of absorptive capacity and organizational resilience from a system thinking perspective by proposing a framework noting absorptive capacity of a firm is contingent on its ability to learn through a combination of organizational processes (Kim et al., 2014). Thus, organizational resilience cannot be over emphasis as it is important for leaders to be resilient with respect to its VUCA environment.

METHODOLOGY

The Survey approach was used to evaluate Organisational Resilience in VUCA Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria. Also, the statistical treatment of the variables of the study (Organisational Resilience; proxied by Leadership) and how it relates to the VUCA Environment will be analysed in subsequent Headings of which the questions, hypotheses of the study and the results and recommendations shall be discussed. The target population are Leaders and employees of some firms in Port Harcourt. The author employed the convenience sampling technique and employed a sample size of 50 using the stratified and simple random sampling techniques to select the respondents from some of the firms whereby the employees were stratified according to their Organisations. Questionnaires were used to collect data which were validated. The questions were closed ended on a five-point Likert scale. Descriptive statistics, Correlation matrix as well as Regression analysis were used to analyse data through the aid of STATA 16.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study proceeds to summarize the results of the study as follows:



Demographic:The first analysis conducted was a demographic features of the sample. descriptive illustration of the characteristics of the

Table 4.1 Tabulation of Gender

What is your Gender/Sex?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Male	32	64.00	64.00
Female	18	36.00	100.00
Total	50	100.00	

Table 4.2 Tabulation of Age Grade

What is your Age grade?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
18-22 years	6	12.00	12.00
23-27 years	8	16.00	28.00
28-32 years	17	34.00	62.00
33-37 years	16	32.00	94.00
38 years and Above	3	6.00	100.00
Total	50	100.00	

Table 4.3 Tabulation of Marital Status

What is your Marital Status?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Divorced	3	6.00	6.00
Married	16	32.00	38.00
Single	31	62.00	100.0
Total	50	100.00	

Table 4.4 Tabulation of Organizational level

What is your Organizational Level?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Low	22	44.00	44.00
Middle	15	30.00	74.00
Top	13	26.00	100.00
Total	50	100.00	

From Table 4.1 demographic data of Gender shows that, 32 respondents (64%) were male while 18 respondents (36%) were female. Implying most of the organizations had a predominantly male occupied workplace as compared to their female counterparts.

From Table 4.2 demographic data of Age Grade shows that 6 respondents,12% were within the age grade of 18-22 years, 8 respondents 16% were within the age grade of 23-27 years, 17 respondents 34% were within the age grade of 28-32years, 16 respondent 32% were within the age grade of 33-37years while 3 respondents 6% are 38 years and above. This implies a higher percentage of the workers fall within 28 to 37

years, possibly as a result of the targeted cadre of respondents with emphasis on Middle and Top-level staff of the target institutions.

From Table 4.3 demographic data of Marital Status, shows that, 3 respondents (6%) are Divorcee, 16 respondents (32%) are Married while 31 respondents (62%) are Single. This implies a higher percentage of Single workers which could also be as a result of the targeted cadre of audience which constituted mostly senior staff of the institutions studied.

From Table 4.4 demographic data of Educational Level, shows that, 22 respondents (44%) are at the top level of the management cadre, 15



respondents (30%) are at the middle level of the management cadre while, 13 respondent (26%) are of the low level management. This implies a higher percentage of top-level workers which could also be as a result of the targeted cadre of audience which constituted mostly senior staff of the institutions studied.

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

Decision Rule

Test of Significance

H_0 = There is no significant relationship, H_A = There is a significant relationship

If P -value $>$ 0.05 accept the Null and reject the alternative, otherwise reject null and accept the alternative if P -value $<$ 0.05.

Table 4.5 Correlation Matrix

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) leadership	1.000 50 -				
(2) volatility	0.472 50 0.005	1.000 50 -			
(3) uncertainty	0.607 50 0.000	0.730 50 0.000	1.000 50 -		
(4) complexity	0.544 50 0.000	0.638 50 0.000	0.725 50 0.000	1.000 50 -	
(5) ambiguity	0.627 50 0.000	0.628 50 0.000	0.710 50 0.000	0.813 50 0.000	1.000 50 -

Spearman rho = 0.813

Table 4.6 Linear regression Leadership and Volatility

volatility	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
leadership	.513	.136	3.78	0	.241	.786	***
Constant	1.403	.4	3.50	.001	.597	2.208	***
Mean dependent var	2.853		SD dependent var		0.921		
R-squared	0.230		Number of obs		50.000		
F-test	14.317		Prob > F		0.000		
Akaike crit. (AIC)	123.636		Bayesian crit. (BIC)		127.460		

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 4.7 Linear regression Leadership and Uncertainty

uncertainty	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
leadership	.632	.121	5.23	0	.389	.875	***
Constant	.961	.357	2.69	.01	.244	1.678	***
Mean dependent var	2.747		SD dependent var		0.902		
R-squared	0.363		Number of obs		50.000		
F-test	27.328		Prob > F		0.000		
Akaike crit. (AIC)	112.082		Bayesian crit. (BIC)		115.906		

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$



Table 4.8 Linear regression Leadership and Complexity

complexity	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
leadership	.543	.118	4.61	0	.306	.781	***
Constant	1.277	.348	3.67	.001	.577	1.977	***
Mean dependent var	2.813		SD dependent var		0.844		
R-squared	0.307		Number of obs		50.000		
F-test	21.245		Prob > F		0.000		
Akaike crit. (AIC)	109.629		Bayesian crit. (BIC)		113.453		

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 4.9 Linear regression Leadership and Ambiguity

ambiguity	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
leadership	.609	.112	5.46	0	.385	.834	***
Constant	1.084	.329	3.29	.002	.422	1.747	***
Mean dependent var	2.807		SD dependent var		0.847		
R-squared	0.383		Number of obs		50.000		
F-test	29.837		Prob > F		0.000		
Akaike crit. (AIC)	104.076		Bayesian crit. (BIC)		107.901		

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Based on the analysis of the above in tables 4.5 – 4.9 the results can be explained as follows: our results show that for Hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4 there is a significant relationship between Leadership and Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt. This is evident by the fact that our:

Coeff: The *C-Stat* (intercept and slope estimates) which tells the direction of the relationship, shows that Leadership has a positive relationship with the dependent variable (Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity and Ambiguity) with Values (.513, .632, .543 and .609).

t-stat: The *t*-stat from the above results shows the number of standard errors from the coefficient. However, if the *t*-stat are above 2.0 hence it is sufficient evidence against the null hypothesis of which has Values (3.78, 5.23, 4.61 and 5.46)

Prob.: The *P-Value* from the above results (0.000000 and 0.000000) shows that the relationship is significant. This is evident by the fact that the *p*-value indicates a 100% confidence that the slope coefficient is non-zero (that is, (100-0)).

R-squared: The *R*-squared from the above results (0.230, 0.363, 0.307 and 0.383) shows that Leadership can control 23% of Volatility in the Firms Environment, Leadership can control 36% of uncertainty in the Firms Environment, Leadership can control 30% of complexity in the Firms Environment,

and can control 38% of Ambiguity in the Firms Environment.

FINDINGS

Thus, from the above analysis one will deduce that:

- Ho1.** There is a significant relationship between Leadership and Volatile Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.
- Ho2.** There is a significant relationship between Leadership and Uncertain Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.
- Ho3.** There is a significant relationship between Leadership and Complex Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.
- Ho4.** There is a significant relationship between Leadership and Ambiguous Environment of Firms in Port Harcourt Nigeria.

RECOMMENDATION

Several opportunities exist for future research and for practice. The participants of this study were cuts across employees, of whom were male and female. However, for future researchers, Research on the other three Key factors of organizational resilience should be reviewed. Different points of view allow a broader understanding of the phenomenon and additionally help cement the circle of understanding. Replicating this study to other types of organizations, sectors, and countries may provide confirmatory or contradictory data for an enhanced understanding of VUCA. The



testing of the study findings quantitatively may allow for generalization and the formulation of frameworks relevant for leader training and application. For practice, it is important to train leaders on strategies they can use to enhance their VUCA-preparedness and for organizational resilience. The findings of this study could provide an avenue for these trainings and additionally offer guidance for new competency requirements

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to VUCA literature by providing a Nigerian perspective on VUCA studies that is currently lacking, providing a management perspective on VUCA (Nandram, 2017), introducing readiness as a necessary competence in VUCA and leadership discourse, and providing a hermeneutic phenomenological study on VUCA (Choain & Malzy, 2017). Closing existing research gaps enhances learning and opens new avenues for further research to ensure a multiplicity of perspectives for researchers, leaders, and institutional consumption. The findings support positive social change by providing strategies for leaders to apply in VUCA environments to achieve success thus preventing failure and reducing employee stress levels brought on by constant change and uncertainty. In a world where markets are constantly changing in VUCA ways, leaders require to augment their skills, mindsets, and daily strategies to ensure survival and longevity. Agility, resilience, recovery, stakeholder alliance, leadership, change orientation, lean thinking, and new competences were some of the key findings in this study.

REFERENCE

1. Bhamra, R., Dani, S., & Burnard, K. (2011). *Resilience: the concept, a literature review and future directions*. *International journal of production research*, 49(18), 5375-5393.
2. Chakravarthy, B. S. (1982). *Adaptation: A promising metaphor for strategic management*. *Academy of management review*, 7(1), 35-44.
3. Chan, J. W. (2011). *Enhancing organisational resilience: application of viable system model and MCDA in a small Hong Kong company*. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5545-5563.
4. Child, J., & Rodrigues, S. B. (2011). *How organizations engage with external complexity: A political action perspective*. *Organization Studies*, 32(6), 803-824.
5. Christopher, M., & Peck, H. (2004). *Building the resilient supply chain*.
6. Coombs, T. W. (2007). *Crisis management and communications*.
7. Cousins, B. (2018). *Design thinking: Organizational learning in VUCA environments*. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(2), 1-18.
8. Eisenhardt, K., & Piezunka, H. (2011). *Complexity theory and corporate strategy*. *The SAGE handbook of complexity and management*, 506-523.
9. Gulati, R. (2010). *Reorganize for resilience: Putting customers at the center of your business*. Harvard Business Press.
10. Hamel, G., & Valikangas, L. (2003). *En busca de la resiliencia*.
11. Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). *Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management*. *Human resource management review*, 21(3), 243-255.
12. Madni, A. M., & Jackson, S. (2009). *Towards a conceptual framework for resilience engineering*. *IEEE Systems Journal*, 3(2), 181-191.
13. Sheffi, Y. (2007). *The resilient enterprise: overcoming vulnerability for competitive advantage*. Zone Books.
14. Sheffi, Y. (2007). *The resilient enterprise: overcoming vulnerability for competitive advantage*. Zone Books.
15. Välikangas, L., Hoegl, M., & Gibbert, M. (2009). *Why learning from failure isn't easy (and what to do about it): Innovation trauma at Sun Microsystems*. *European Management Journal*, 27(4), 225-233.
16. Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007, October). *Organizational resilience: towards a theory and research agenda*. In 2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics (pp. 3418-3422). IEEE.