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Abstract

Objectives: Organizational resilience has been investigated in numerous performance contexts outside of sport, with substantial conceptual and operational variance. Given the growing interest in organizational environments in sport, the purpose of the study was to construct a definition of organizational resilience and identify resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations.

Design and method: Using the Delphi method, 62 expert panelists working in or with elite sport organizations ($n=45$) or having academic experience of resilience in various contexts ($n=17$), responded to four online iterative surveys over seven months, yielding both quantitative and qualitative data through item responses and accompanying comments. A reflexive thematic analysis of the integrated data was conducted from a critical realist standpoint.

Results: Organizational resilience was defined as “the dynamic capability of an organization to successfully deal with significant change. It emerges from multi-level (employee, team, and organizational) interacting characteristics and processes which enable an organization to prepare for, adapt to, and learn from significant change”. The five resilient characteristics identified from the analysis were structural clarity, flexible improvement, shared understanding, reciprocal commitment, and operational awareness.

Conclusions: By proposing a definition of organizational resilience which is appropriate to and endorsed by those in elite sport organizations, and identifying resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations, this study provides an important foundation for future research and practice endeavors in this area.
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Defining and characterizing organizational resilience in elite sport

While all organizations face some degree of turbulence and unexpected events, elite sport organizations often face particularly high levels of internal uncertainty and change due to stakeholder demands for demonstrable and sustained success (Wagstaff et al., 2016). As noted by Parent et al. (2018), state funded sport organizations in particular need to balance investment in grassroots development with high-performance targets, and face stakeholder heterogeneity in agendas and needs. Sport organizations have been on a ‘journey of professionalism’ from volunteer-driven to commercialized organizations (Shilbury & Ferkins, 2020), with a rapid change in the demands of governance practices. Beyond this, elite sport organizations frequently face reputational issues such as the allegations of financial corruption at FIFA (Boudreaux et al., 2016), doping within Russian sporting institutions (“Russia banned for four years”, 2019), or failures to prevent abuse at USA Gymnastics (Dure, 2019).

How organizations deal with uncertainty and disruption depends on a range of internal and external factors, with some being better equipped to respond than others. The term resilience is often applied where an organization, or indeed a team or individual, demonstrates a positive outcome following an unexpected or disruptive event (Britt et al., 2016; Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Linnenluecke, 2017). Organizational resilience is an emerging concept which seeks to understand and explain how and why organizations survive, adapt, and thrive in dynamic environments which are uncertain and complex (Duchek, 2020; Lee et al., 2013). This concept has been investigated in various contexts such as business and industry (Boin & van Eeten, 2013; Gittell et al., 2006), the public sector (Dalgaard-Nielsen, 2017; Fitzgerald, 2018), and community sport clubs (Wicker et al., 2013). Within the elite sport context, despite the presence of a growing body of literature on individual resilience (e.g., Bryan et al., 2019; Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012) and team resilience (e.g., Morgan et al., 2017), organizational resilience has yet to be explored.

Over the last decade or so, there has been definitional and conceptual advancement of
individual resilience (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013, 2016) and team resilience (Morgan et al., 2013) in the sport context. At the same time, there has been a burgeoning body of empirical evidence investigating individual resilience (see, for reviews, Bryan et al., 2019; Galli & Gonzalez, 2015; Sarkar & Fletcher, 2014) and team resilience in elite sport (see, for a review, Morgan et al., 2017). At the group level, team resilience has been defined as “a dynamic, psychosocial process which protects a group of individuals from the potential negative effect of the stressors they collectively encounter. It comprises of processes whereby team members use their individual and combined resources to positively adapt when experiencing adversity” (Morgan et al., 2013, p. 552). Researchers in this area have identified resilient characteristics of elite sport teams (group structure, mastery approaches, social capital, collective efficacy; Morgan et al., 2013) and psychosocial processes underpinning team resilience in elite sport (transformational leadership, shared team leadership, team learning, social identity, positive emotions; Morgan et al., 2015). Morgan et al. (2019) subsequently found five psychosocial enablers and strategies that promote the development of team resilience within a high-level sports team, namely inspiring, motivating, and challenging team members to achieve performance excellence, developing a team regulatory system based on ownership and responsibility, cultivating a team identity and togetherness based on a selfless culture, exposing the team to challenging training and unexpected/difficult situations, and promoting enjoyment and keeping a positive outlook during stressors. Within both the individual and team resilience in sport literatures, definitional inconsistencies remain (Britt et al., 2016; Morgan et al., 2017), such as the types of adversity which “trigger” resilience, and the necessary or expected outcomes.

The hitherto lack of research attention devoted to organizational resilience in elite sport is somewhat surprising given the growing acknowledgement that sport organizations are characterized by highly complex social and organizational environments which exert major influences on those that operate within them (see Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Wagstaff, 2017).
Furthermore, organizational resilience has the potential not only to positively influence the functioning of the sport organization itself, but also the resilience of its athletes and teams (Wagstaff et al., 2020). Allied to this, there have been calls to dedicate both theoretical and applied attention to understanding and influencing the cultural environments within elite sport organizations (Wagstaff & Burton-Wylie, 2018), and to promote the development of optimally functioning organizations (Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Wagstaff, 2017). Several features of elite sport make it an intuitively appealing context for organizational resilience research, including the relatively short, scheduled performance periods, the objective outcome of winning or losing (Shoenfelt, 2016), and that some of the stressors encountered in elite sport are “unquestionably more severe” (Fogarty & Perera, 2016, p. 424) than those encountered in other work settings. Specifically, the intensity of interactions within an elite sporting environment, having to fulfill different roles leading to task and relationship conflict, logistical demands, external expectations and cultural norms (Arnold & Fletcher, 2012; Rumbold et al., 2018) are all organizational stressors commonly encountered by individuals working in elite sport.

In order to better understand how organizations and the employees working within them deal with these stressors, it is necessary to consider how organizational resilience is conceptualized in the elite sport context, as well as the range of factors which may equip some organizations to respond better than others. Researchers have highlighted potential links between elite sport and various other performance domains, such as military, medical, and the performing arts (Molan et al., 2019). It follows that insights from organizational resilience research in other performance domains are therefore likely to aid understanding and interpretation of organizational resilience in elite sport.

Organizational resilience has variously been defined in other performance domains (for a review, see Conz & Magnani, 2020; Duchek, 2020) as “the maintenance of positive adjustment under challenging conditions such that the organization emerges from those conditions
strengthened and more resourceful” (Vogus & Sutcliffe, 2007, p. 3418), and “the inherent and adaptive qualities and capabilities that enable an organization’s adaptive capacity during turbulent periods” (Burnard & Bhamra, 2011, p. 5587). From these definitions, key strands are apparent (Annarelli & Nonino, 2016), principally the need for some kind of unexpected or disruptive resilience event, and a positive outcome following such an event. Nevertheless, there are inconsistencies in how these defining features are conceptualized, for example whether the adversity must be extreme or can encompass everyday stressors, and whether thriving is a necessary positive outcome, or mere survival is sufficient. Such variations in the current research base derive from the fragmentation and importation of organizational resilience definitions across and between domains (Conz & Magnani, 2020; Tarba et al., 2017).

Organizational resilience researchers are also interested in the factors which contribute towards an organization’s resilience capacity, allowing an organization to prepare for and respond to stressors (Hamel & Valikangas, 2003), as well as identifying strengths and areas of weakness (Morgan et al., 2013). Recent reviews in this area suggest that factors such as organizational structure, culture, networks, and resources, as well as an organization’s adaptive capacity, minimization of barriers, and employee engagement are potential characteristics of organizational resilience (Barasa et al., 2018; Rahi, 2019; Wagstaff et al., 2020).

Given the diverse range of organizations covered by the existing research base, and the need to give due consideration to contextual factors which may impact the applicability of extant findings to a novel domain such as elite sport (Suddaby, 2010), it is necessary to employ a research methodology which is conducted in close collaboration with end-users to foster usability and alignment to their needs. The Delphi method is a structured communication technique designed to transform expert opinion into group consensus through a series of survey rounds (Hasson & Keeney, 2011), and has been used in research on wellbeing in sport (Daykin et al., 2017), European resilience guidelines (Adini et al., 2017), and Paralympic athlete
classification (Ravensbergen et al., 2016). Selecting experts working in or with elite sport organizations alongside organizational resilience, or resilience in sport academics, the purpose of the study was to construct a definition of organizational resilience and to identify the resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations based on prior literature and expert opinion, providing an important stepping stone in the conceptual building process. The research objectives were twofold: 1) to understand the extent to which experts agree on the different features of existing definitions of organizational resilience; and 2) to identify which characteristics experts perceive as most important for organizational resilience in elite sport.

Method

Research Design

The research was informed by a critical realist perspective (Ronkainen & Wiltshire, 2019), underpinned by ontological realism (i.e., reality exists independently of our knowledge of it) and epistemological interpretivism (i.e., the production of knowledge is a social practice). Specifically, while social-psychological phenomena are regarded as multifaceted and complex, “there is a state of the matter which is what it is, regardless of how we do view it, choose to view it or are somehow manipulated into viewing it” (Archer, 2007, p. 195). This ontological perspective is congruent with the aim of constructing a definition of organizational resilience and identifying resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations. In adopting an epistemological interpretivist approach to this study, we recognize that knowledge is the product of intersubjective relations between individuals. Attempting to “align explanations of reality with reality itself” (Williams, 2018, p. 30), using the Delphi method within this study allowed us to explore multiple perspectives of organizational resilience while trying to align those multiple perspectives within an agreed co-produced definition and resilient characteristics. With an emphasis on methodological pluralism a distinguishing feature of critical realism (Ryba et al., in press), a mixed methods convergent design (Fetters et al., 2013) was used. Quantitative and
qualitative data were collected concurrently through forced response items and unforced open
responses via four online iterative surveys over a period of seven months.

Participants

To qualify as an “expert”, participants had to be able to provide insight into the
functioning of elite sport organizations (through working in or with such organizations) or have
academic expertise in organizational resilience or resilience in sport (determined through
relevant peer-reviewed publications). In the absence of an existing definition of an “elite sport
organization”, it was operationalized as a governing body for an Olympic or Paralympic sport, or
the organizational body employing a national or professional athlete or team, for example a
professional or national football club (cf. Swann et al., 2015; Grey-Thompson, 2017).

Of the 167 individuals invited to participate in the study, 82 (female=31%, age $M=43.2$
years, $SD=11.0$) took part in round 1, comprising 61 applied experts (47% of those invited to
participate) and 21 academic experts (55% of those invited), with 62 of those individuals
(female=31%, age $M=43.1$ years, $SD=11.3$) completing all four rounds. Of those participants
who completed all four rounds, 46 (74%) were based in the U.K., nine in North America, five in
Australasia, and two in Europe. The panelists had a combined experience of 744 years working
with elite sport organizations ($M=12.0$ years, $SD=9.4$), across 50 sports and held a range of roles
including coaches, support staff, CEOs, and practitioners. Of the academic panelists ($n=17$), 47%
were from a sport psychology background and 53% from organizational psychology.

Procedure

Participant recruitment

Following institutional ethical approval, criterion sampling of individuals qualifying as
experts was used to select participants in three stages. First, an initial list was compiled
comprising professionals known to, or suggested by, the research team. Second, the initial list
was augmented to include at least one representative from each of the major professional sports
in the United Kingdom (football, rugby, and cricket), and each of the national governing bodies
of Olympic and Paralympic sports in Great Britain. Where no email was available, potential
panelists were contacted by LinkedIn. Third, recruitment was broadened using snowball
sampling by asking panelists to forward the contact on to others within their organization who
met the expert criteria. To enhance the response rate, all invitations to participate were
personalized, and a maximum of two reminder emails were sent for each round, in addition to
follow up individual “thank you” messages (Iqbal & Pipon-Young, 2009). Informed consent was
obtained for each round. The study was conducted over seven months, with each round
remaining open for approximately four weeks.

**Delphi rounds**

Four Delphi rounds were employed with two aims, namely, to build consensus on
definitional aspects of organizational resilience in the elite sport context (rounds 1 and 2), and to
rate the importance of various potential resilient characteristics (rounds 3 and 4). For each aim,
the initial survey was constructed following a literature review of organizational resilience in
other performance domains, and individual and team resilience in sport, identifying areas of
conceptual ambiguity regarding the construct of organizational resilience together with key
results from the empirical research regarding potential characteristics of organizational
resilience. These areas of ambiguity and key results were converted into corresponding
statements presented in a uniform mode which were reviewed by the research team and, where
necessary, rephrased to ensure each item was standalone and consistent, and similar items were
consolidated. The draft surveys for rounds 1 and 3 were then piloted to check for clarity and
estimated completion time. As a result of feedback, the order of presentation of statements was
altered, and there was further consolidation of characteristics to reduce participant burden (for
every, “shared vision” and “shared values” were combined into “shared vision and values”,
and “hopeful” was subsumed within “optimistic”).

Throughout the data collection process, panelists were asked to draw on all their experiences in elite sport, not just their current role. In round 1, panelists were presented with ten statements concerning definitional and conceptual aspects of organizational resilience and asked to choose the response which best reflected their views. For example, “Within elite sport, organizational resilience is: a) a reaction to sudden stressors or changes, b) a reaction to incremental changes over time, c) both options could apply, d) neither option is relevant.” In addition to providing responses to the ten statements, all participants were asked to provide their own definition of organizational resilience in elite sport. The requirement for participants to suggest their own definition was intentionally placed after the ten statements to address potential concerns amongst those working in elite sport, rather than academia, that they may not have sufficient knowledge or awareness of organizational resilience to proffer their own definition.

In round 3, participants were asked to rate 63 potential characteristics of organizational resilience drawn from the literature review on a four-point Likert scale from “very important” to “not important”. Panelists were given the additional instruction in round 3 that “this section is not about the characteristics of your current organization, or of a successful elite sport organization, but of a resilient one.”

Rounds 2 and 4 consisted of items that failed to reach consensus in the preceding rounds (rounds 1 and 3 respectively), together with feedback as to how other panel members had responded. The feedback contained both statistics, and examples of comments provided by participants, given the preference for this format by expert panelists (Meijering & Tobi, 2016).

1 A copy of the items comprising each round is available from the lead author on request.
more compelling than individual opinions, but that it is also important that each expert has an equal opportunity to impact the overall decision-making process (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004). In these rounds, participants were reminded, via email, of their original responses.

Participants were encouraged to add comments throughout each round, and these were reviewed at each stage of the study with any issues addressed in the following round. For example, in round 1, there were two statements regarding whether organizational resilience in the elite sport context is different to other contexts, and whether it differs according to the type of sport (see Table 1, statements 9 and 10). The comments indicated that there was a lack of clarity amongst participants as to whether they were being asked if the contexts were different, or if the concept was generalizable between contexts. A clarifying note was subsequently added to these statements when they were repeated in round 2. As a further illustration, in round 3, some participants stated that their responses would depend on contextual factors such as the size of the organization. An additional response of “it depends” was subsequently included in round 4 with a request for accompanying comments. Additionally, an item was clarified so that “Access to resources (e.g., centrally controlled or freely available resources)” was re-presented as two separate items of “Centrally controlled access to resources” and “Freely available access to resources”. Although participants had been invited in round 3 to suggest any additional characteristics to include within round 4, they were found to constitute rewordings of characteristics already presented in round 3, for example “a compelling vision” was not regarded as sufficiently unique from “shared vision and values” to warrant a new characteristic. Therefore, while those suggestions were considered in the qualitative analysis, the research team felt that none emerged consistently and separately from the existing list to warrant inclusion in round 4.

Data Analysis

The quantitative and qualitative data yielded by this research in the form of responses to, and comments on, survey items necessitated different approaches to data analysis. For the
quantitative data produced in each round of the study, it was necessary to establish the degree of
consensus between panelists to determine whether items were to be retained or to be removed
from the next round. In determining how to calculate consensus in Delphi studies, it is necessary
to consider the research aims, the types of measurement items (von der Gracht, 2012), and the
number of possible responses (Diamond et al., 2014). In this study, two different percentage rates
were applied, to reflect the different types of measurement items and the different possible
responses in rounds 1 and 2, and 3 and 4 respectively. In rounds 1 and 2, the responses were
nominal and largely entailed four discrete responses (each item and the possible responses are
detailed in Table 1). Given the type and spread of possible responses, it was necessary to
introduce a higher level of sensitivity to the point at which consensus could be said to have been
reached than the more common figure of 75-80% for Likert-type scales (cf. von der Gracht,
2012). Specifically, the Average Percentage of Majority Opinion (AMPO; Kapoor, 1987)
attempts to quantify an appropriate percentage rate for consensus based on the actual data in a
specific Delphi study round (see Cottam et al., 2004; Price & Robinson, 2017). Based on the data
for round 1 the AMPO was calculated to be 65.1%, this being the sum of majority opinions
(round 1 responses chosen by >50% of participants, \(n=801\)) divided by total opinions expressed
(number of participants x number of questions, \(n=82 \times 15^2=1,230\)). In rounds 3 and 4, which
employed Likert scale ratings to determine the importance of potential resilient characteristics,
consensus was assessed using the most commonly employed method for these types of
responses, namely a pre-determined threshold of 80% (von der Gracht, 2012). This percentage
was applied to summed responses of either ‘important’ or ‘unimportant’ (e.g., Moreira et al.,

\[2\] As two of the ten statements in round 1 allowed more than one response, each option was
treated as a separate question with “agree” or “disagree” as the possible answers for the purpose of
calculating the APMO. This produced a total number of questions as 15.
In the case of both preliminary rounds (i.e., rounds 1 and 3), items that reached or exceeded the appropriate consensus threshold were removed, and unagreed items were carried forward. As a result, four items were carried forward to round 2 and ten items were carried forward to round 4.

All items that reached consensus in rounds 1 and 2, together with the accompanying qualitative comments regarding definitional and conceptual aspects of organizational resilience (totaling 27 pages of single-spaced text), were integrated through merging the data sets on an item by item basis. Specifically, after calculating the percentage of participants agreeing with each item response, the research team read and reread the accompanying comments, together with the panelists’ own suggested definitions, to explore the extent to which those comments confirmed, expanded on, or were discordant with the apparent consensus response from the quantitative data, weaving the analysis into a single definition (Fetters et al., 2013).

For the quantitative data from rounds 3 and 4, as well as determining whether items had reached consensus, the item responses were also ranked numerically (“very important”=3, with “not important”=0), from which mean rankings were calculated for each item. Items were rated as “very important” to organizational resilience in elite sport if they had a mean ranking of 2.5 or above, “somewhat important” for a mean ranking of 1.5-2.49, and “not very important” if the mean ranking was below 1.5. For participants who selected the additional response of “it depends” included in round 4 following participant comments in round 3, these responses were treated as neutral and removed from the final ranking calculations (Adini et al., 2017). Only those characteristics ranked as “very important” were retained for the next stage of analysis.

The resilient characteristics ranked as “very important” were subsequently considered as qualitative data and analyzed alongside the participants accompanying comments from rounds 3 and 4 (totaling 13 pages of single-spaced text) using reflexive inductive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019) from a critical realist standpoint. The aim of this analysis was to identify
patterns of shared semantic meaning across data sets, as opposed to participants’ individual experiences, in line with the epistemological interpretivist approach that knowledge is the product of intersubjective relations between individuals. Guided by the six phases suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006) for conducting thematic analysis, the characteristics identified from the consensus and ranking stage of analysis were treated as preliminary codes. The accompanying comments provided by participants were explored to identify additional codes, or to rename the preliminary codes. The codes were then examined to identify broader patterns, checking each against the original dataset to ensure faithfulness to the integrated survey data and panelists’ comments and suggestions. Different combinations of themes were explored by the research team, who adopted a predominantly inductive approach whilst acknowledging and reflexively examining how the research team’s knowledge of the extant literature was influencing the development of themes. Once agreed, the description of each theme was refined, and exemplar comments were chosen, before finally settling on the name of each theme.

Whilst it is common in thematic analysis for each data item to be given equal attention during the coding process (Braun & Clarke, 2006), greater weighting was given in the present study to the quantitative results of the Delphi surveys by using this data to identify initial patterns or central concepts, given these represented the views of all participants, whereas the provision of comments was voluntary with 58% of participants providing comments in round 3, and 42% of participants providing comments in round 4. This prioritizing was to avoid concepts being generated from a few vivid examples (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

**Methodological Quality**

The study was guided by a critical realist approach to judge the credibility and quality of the research (Maxwell, 2017). In doing so, the research team accept that the Delphi method cannot directly offer indisputable fact but instead provides a snapshot of a range of expert opinions at a point in time which can be used to inform theory development (Okoli &
Specifically, the Delphi method, through the ongoing feedback given to panelists and invitation to reconsider dissensus responses or provide additional comments, contains an inherent form of member reflection to increase the ontological plausibility of the research findings (cf. Ronkainen & Wiltshire, 2019; Smith & McGannon, 2018).

Several quality indicators for Delphi studies are available. These include clearly stating the aim of the Delphi method employed, and the criteria used to identify “expert” panelists and to define consensus or agreement (Diamond et al., 2014; Hasson & Keeney, 2011). Involving individuals from target organizations as “experts” helps to engage relevant stakeholders, and to ground the research in its context (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). Resilience researchers were included to integrate the research in a novel (sport) context with the wider resilience literature across different levels of analysis and domains, and to address concerns of resilience being studied in silos (Britt et al., 2016). The degree of consensus required when analyzing the data in each round, and the restriction to four rounds of surveys in total, was determined before inviting experts to participate. These decisions were guided by the origin of the survey items, having been drawn from a literature review, and to minimize participant fatigue in light of the substantial commitment required from participants in a Delphi study (Hasson et al., 2000).

**Results**

The results across four rounds of the Delphi study, together with analysis of the accompanying qualitative commentary provided by the expert panel, are presented in two parts to offer a definition of organizational resilience followed by the resilient characteristics, of elite sport organizations. In each case a brief overview of the quantitative survey results is presented, followed by examples from the integrated quantitative and qualitative data, to illuminate facets of the suggested definition and the five characteristics of organizational resilience, namely structural clarity, flexible improvement, shared understanding, reciprocal commitment, and operational awareness.
Definition of Organizational Resilience

Based on the survey results across rounds 1 and 2 of the Delphi study, and the accompanying comments provided by the expert panel, organizational resilience is defined as: The dynamic capability of an organization to successfully deal with significant change. It emerges from multi-level (employee, team, and organizational) interacting characteristics and processes which enable an organization to prepare for, adapt to, and learn from significant change.

An integrated summary of the quantitative results from rounds 1 and 2 of the Delphi study is shown in Table 1. Of the eight statements which required a single response, six statements achieved consensus in round 1 (statements 1-3 and 5-7), and two statements achieved consensus in round 2 (statements 9 and 10 in Table 1). A further two statements (statements 4 and 8 in Table 1) allowed panelists to select as many of the responses as they felt were applicable, with two of the seven possible responses (responses 4c and 8b) having achieved consensus by the end of round 2. Panelists were also asked to provide their own definitions of organizational resilience. Using the integrated quantitative and qualitative data, a definition of organizational resilience was developed, and the panelists were given an opportunity to comment on this definition during round 3. The comments were compared with the research data from rounds 1 and 2 and discussed amongst the research team, which led to minor revisions to the original proposed definition (e.g. “the” dynamic capability rather than “a” dynamic capability).

In this study, our panel of experts were invited to evaluate and comment on the nuanced ways in which organizational resilience has been defined, centered around two key concepts – an unexpected or disruptive resilience event, and a positive outcome following that event (Britt et al., 2016; Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Linnenluecke, 2017). In terms of an unexpected or disruptive resilience event, our panelists reached consensus within statements 1 and 2 that resilience events
can span a range in intensity and duration from everyday incremental changes or stressors which 
accumulate over time to sudden major events (see Table 1), with several panelists commenting
on how everyday hassles can be aggregated to be appraised as big problems, such that “even
seemingly small stressors could be perceived as big at an untimely moment”. Our resulting
conceptualization of resilience events as “significant change” purposefully retains some
linguistic ambiguity (Suddaby, 2010) to encompass this perceived breadth of dimensions for
resilience events.

Within statements 3 and 4, we explored proximal and distal positive outcomes, namely
what does the organization look like both immediately following exposure to significant change,
and in the longer term, if it is to be regarded as resilient. For proximal outcomes (statement 3),
72% of our panelists agreed that organizational resilience could encompass both an initial loss of
functioning immediately following the exposure to significant change before recovering and
deflecting changes such that there is no loss of functioning. Participants noted that positive
outcomes may depend on the nature of the resilience event, as well as organizational priorities in
the context of finite resources, described by a senior sport psychologist as “picking your battles”.

Within statement 4, we asked participants to select all relevant distal positive outcomes,
or resilience trajectories, listed in the survey as recovery to a former level, recovery to an
enhanced level, adaptation, and sustainability of recovery or adaptation. Although each response
was analyzed for consensus individually, the statement was re-presented to participants in round
2 in its entirety to standardize the statement across rounds as some of the responses did not
achieve consensus following round 1. Adaptation (response 4c) maintained a high level of
consensus (83%), and recovery (response 4a) maintained a lack of consensus across rounds as to
its relevance to organizational resilience. For the potential outcomes of recovery to an enhanced
level, and sustainability of recovery (responses 4b and 4d), participants demonstrated a reduced
consensus in round 2 following the feedback provided from round 1. Such movements in
consensus highlight the importance of integrating the accompanying comments with the
quantitative results on a statement by statement basis to interpret the data holistically. For
example, from the accompanying comments it was apparent many participants felt that enhanced
recovery could be a consequence of, rather than a necessary part of, resilience, and this
perspective was included in the feedback provided when participants were asked to complete
round 2. Given the panelists’ inclusive perspective on proximal outcomes (statement 3), and the
lack of consensus on distal outcomes (statement 4), the authors’ definition of organizational
resilience therefore refers to “successfully dealing with…” since it is not prescriptive as to the
exact nature of either the proximal or distal resilience outcomes, and appeared as a term used by
several participants ahead of similar expressions such as “withstand”, “manage”, “handle”, “cope
with”, and “overcome”.

Within statement 5, we also explored whether organizational resilience was considered
by the expert panel to be a reactive phenomenon in response to changes in the external
environment or a proactive phenomenon, with organizations planning for potential resilience
events. Our panel concluded that organizational resilience comprised both reactive and proactive
elements (85%). Specifically, while the initial survey statement referred to “planning” when
discussing the proactive element of organizational resilience, participants instead referred to
“preparing for”. “Preparation” goes beyond “planning” to include raising awareness, testing
plans, providing training, and embedding resilience processes (Boin & Lagadec, 2000), and
therefore seems to provide a better linguistic fit with organizational resilience.

In statement 8 we considered how organizational resilience has been conceptualized, with
researchers portraying this as a quality, a process, an outcome, or a combination of these. As was
the case for statement 4, statement 8 was re-presented to participants in round 2 in its entirety as
the quality and outcome elements (responses 8a and 8c) did not achieve consensus in round 1,
either for agreement or disagreement. Participants did reach and maintain consensus regarding
organizational resilience having a process component (78%), which from an analysis of the accompanying comments reflects the “dynamic”, proactive element of resilience emerging or developing over time. The panel failed to reach consensus regarding resilience as an outcome (62% disagreeing) or a quality (58% agreeing) as illustrated in Table 1. This latter finding was somewhat surprising given the majority of definitions provided by the participants (74%) referred to organizational resilience as an “ability”, “capability”, or “capacity”. Our analysis of the participants’ commentary led to the interpretation that the panelists regarded “quality” as inferring a static concept, akin to a personality trait, rather than a skill that can be developed. The final definition of organizational resilience as a “dynamic capability” which emerges over time reflects the panelists' views and attempts to capture both the quantitative findings of a “dynamic” process component and the high number of references to “capability” from the qualitative analysis of definitions provided by the participants.

In statements 9 and 10, we explored the context specificity of resilience; that is, whether organizational resilience in elite sport was perceived by the panelists as different to organizational resilience in other domains, and indeed, whether it differs according to the type of sport. There was consensus for organizational resilience as an overarching concept rather than being specific to elite sport, with panelists noting that while resilient behaviors will likely vary across sport types, the decontextualized term “organizational resilience” is the same regardless of context. The data presented in Table 1 indicate that both statements 9 and 10 moved to consensus across rounds 1 and 2. It is possible that this increase in consensus was due, at least in part, to a clarifying note added to each of these two questions in round 2 that these statements were concerned with similarities in the concept of organizational resilience, rather than similarities in the context of elite sport or the types of challenges faced. The ability to amend survey items during the research process following panellist feedback is a valuable quality of Delphi studies, where experts’ degree of opinion change outside of such refinements is generally limited.
Resilient Characteristics of Elite Sport Organizations

The initial 63 items included in round 3 of the Delphi study yielded 33 items rated as “very important” to organizational resilience in elite sport (i.e. with a mean ranking of 2.5 or above). None of the items carried forwards to round 4 were rated as “very important”. Internal communication (2.98), a desire to learn and improve (2.95), and role clarity (2.88) emerged as the most important items for organizational resilience in elite sport, with longevity (1.06), low tolerance of failure (1.12), and risk avoidance (1.17) as the lowest ranked items. A thematic analysis of the 33 items ranked as “very important” to organizational resilience in elite sport, integrated with the accompanying qualitative comments, were categorized into five themes to represent the resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations: structural clarity, flexible improvement, shared understanding, reciprocal commitment, and operational awareness. For each resilient characteristic, relevant items from the Delphi study with their mean ranking and percentage agreement, together with illustrative qualitative comments, are provided in Table 2.

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

Structural clarity

Structural clarity refers to the need for an organization to have a clear and effective structure, particularly regarding communication channels, roles and responsibilities between individuals and teams, and decision making. As noted by a performance director, “Every organization needs a structure which is clear internally and externally. Crucially individual role clarity and clarity of responsibility for and across discrete teams is also essential.” Three of the top five ranked items in the Delphi survey are in this theme as shown in Table 2, namely effective internal communication channels (2.98), role clarity (2.88), and transparent decision making (2.84), with effective external communication channels (2.59) and a flexible or adaptable structure (2.58) also rated as very important.
Overall, participants agreed that “communication is probably the most important part of elite sport resilience,” with a warning that “Chinese whispers can kill any organization.” Commenting on the link between communication and decision-making, a board director of a national governing body noted the need for “emphasis on openness and transparency as to [the] rationale for decisions whether strategic or operational to allow all levels of the organization to grasp [the] rationale for decision-making”. Clear and effective communication channels were also seen as providing the structure which facilitates shared understanding, with a performance director explaining that through “getting comfortable in understanding what others are trying to achieve and [making] communication happen, we achieve much better shared consciousness”.

The panelists’ comments regarding the role of team-level boundaries within an organizational structure was illuminating for this theme. Boundaries were seen as potentially impeding communication between groups, with a professor in organizational resilience noting that “for resilient organizations communication and decision making needs to flow rapidly.” Nevertheless, boundaries can also facilitate individual role clarity and provide space to focus on team-specific goals, illuminated in the comment from a development director that the “right and left hand need to talk to each other but also need that spacing to concentrate on their own goals”. Several participants stated that clear structural boundaries may also provide important divisions to allow delegated decision making and free allocation of resources within those boundaries, given the number of variables which may be changing within an organization at any one time. From the qualitative comments, it seems the importance lies not in whether boundaries exist or not (which may be specific to the organizational type and size), but in clarity around where the boundaries lie, and how teams coexist, communicate and benefit from each other. It was also suggested that boundaries may provide important feedback regarding the extent to which boundaries are challenged or stretched during times of adversity such that “when the tolerances of those boundaries are exceeded during periods of adversity it can be recognized and the
potential impact identified”, with the ability to “flex and lean on other areas when needed or in
times of stress” as a way to absorb that strain.

Flexible improvement

Within a culture of flexible improvement, learning and innovation are valued and the
need for flexibility of approach is recognized. More than a mindset, this characteristic also
encapsulates the capability of an organization to learn and innovatively adapt. This combination
of culture and capability is embodied in one elite coach’s comment that “the organization doesn’t
have to have the most expensive equipment but it has to have human resources that are willing
and able to adapt to what is available to them”. A desire to learn and improve was the second
highest ranked item in the Delphi survey (2.95), reflected in the comment from a vice president
of a professional sport organization: “we realize the outcomes mean that we will make mistakes
and lose sometimes, but our commitment is to learn and get better every day” and that “if all you
try to do is not lose, you can never win.” Other items contributing towards the theme of flexible
improvement (see Table 2) include openness to ideas (2.77); adaptable/flexible (2.77); innovation
and creativity (2.61); accepting uncertainty and change (2.59); and optimism (2.53). Flexibility
of use (2.64), creating a solution out of whatever resources are available, is key to the capability
to adapt, with the human resources director of an elite sport organization noting “there needs to
be clarity of what resources are aligned to what priorities which should have some level of
flexibility which can be retargeted to new emerging priorities.”

Panelists’ qualitative comments regarding uncertainty, risk, and failure highlighted the
need to accept risk and failure as an inherent precursor of the capability to learn and adapt.
Specifically, panelists commented that pursuing innovation is likely to increase both rates of
failure and opportunities to learn and adapt, while noting this strategy will concurrently increase
the vulnerabilities or stressors in the system over the short term, for example by diminishing the
available resources. The lead psychologist for a national sport organization observed that in elite
sport too much resource can be allocated to innovation, and instead suggested “focusing on nailing the basics really well and learning from others”. Furthermore, there was a tension amongst participants between accepting failure in order to learn, and delivering high performance, with concerns that “high tolerance [of failure] might mean that people do not push themselves to achieve.” The pressures were summarized by a development director commenting that “more is often learnt from failing in order to find the right way, but there does become a point when organizations have to deliver.”

**Shared understanding**

Shared understanding incorporates not only the organization’s vision and values (ranked 2.8 in the Delphi survey), but more widely across the organization a shared belief in the collective ability to achieve goals (2.77), shared rules governing behavior (2.66), and shared regard for unity and integration (2.55) including “a shared understanding of individual/departmental strengths and a willingness to develop them further”. A sport psychologist working in an elite football organization noted that “to have staff working on the same page and delivering core messages that align throughout the organization is vital.” It seems that a corporate vision on its own is not enough, and any vision or values must be shared between an organization and its employees with “individual values and identity nurtured and linked to the mission” and embedded into everyday processes if it is to galvanize collective effort and drive behaviors, as highlighted by a performance director who explained:

I have worked in teams who 'believe' in the organization and its Vision, Mission, Objectives and Values [“VMOV”] and in teams where the VMOV have either been weak or where the leadership lacks the authenticity and passion to take their team on the journey … a compelling VMOV that attracts, develops and retains passionate employees is critical.

**Reciprocal commitment**
Reciprocal commitment recognizes the partnership between employees and employer as a two-way allegiance within which employees feel valued, supported and safe, with a highly-cited organizational resilience academic emphasizing the importance of “reciprocal commitment and investment between members and the organization as well as a belief and demonstrated behaviors that all groups of participants (players, owners, etc.) are valued comparably.” It was interesting to note that our panelists ranked items such as employees feel valued (2.84), high levels of employee loyalty and commitment (2.8) and enthusiasm (2.61), effective internal partnerships (2.78), a trusting (2.77) and supportive (2.69) culture, and psychological safety (2.66), as detailed in Table 2, over and above unidirectional items provided by the organization to its employees such as prioritizing employee wellbeing (2.64), structured training programs (2.58), appropriate remuneration (2.34), and job security (2.27), emphasizing the importance of mutually supportive relationships amongst individuals, and between employees and the organization. These items may be related, with a sport psychologist noting that “employees are more likely to be enthusiastic if they are valued” and a board chairperson commenting “I think people do their best work when they genuinely care about the people they work with/for, and have fun at work. The organization can sustain this by ensuring the employee feels valued for their contribution.” There was a particular emphasis on the high levels of loyalty within elite sport organizations, and employees who are willing to go the extra mile because of the passion for sport, with an operations manager for an elite sport organization commenting that this is the case “without the remuneration or well-being offered by the organization being of the same level” (presumably by comparison to other types of organization).

The resilient characteristic of reciprocal commitment incorporates a belief that the organization is a safe place to fail (ranked 2.66), providing psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999), which it has been suggested supports organizational resilience through fostering a willingness to take interpersonal risks (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011), and cultivating a learning
capability (Edmondson, 1999). Linking psychological safety to other resilient characteristics of structural clarity and flexible innovation, a national performance manager noted the importance of clarity in communicating the acceptability of failure within an elite sport organization as “it’s so easy to create a high fear-based environment” in a setting which is so focused on winning.

**Operational awareness**

Operational awareness is a capability to identify and assess the range of options available to the organization through understanding the operating environment, available resources, and alternative viewpoints. As shown in Table 2, items from the Delphi survey included the capability to anticipate problems early (2.8), be aware of priorities in a crisis (2.69), be aware of and understand the organization’s operating environment (2.66), to gather and consider alternative viewpoints and options (2.59), to pause and reflect before making decisions (2.56), and awareness of the opportunities or resources available (2.53). In particular, panelists from both academic and applied backgrounds agreed that recovery from adversity requires an understanding of environmental and organizational priorities so that leaders can monitor and allocate resources appropriately.

While the capabilities of being able to respond rapidly (2.39), make decisions quickly (2.28), and to pause and reflect before making decisions (2.56) reached consensus in the Delphi survey, it was interesting to note that in a fast-paced, high-change, environment such as elite sport that only the capability to pause and reflect was ranked as “very important”. Shedding light on this further was the comment by the lead psychologist of a national team that “sport often prioritizes urgency over strategic priority”. Thus, in terms of the speed of response, participants suggested resilience is linked to the ability to make “timely” rather than “quick” decisions, and that “it is about making decisions as rapidly as the situation requires”.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to construct a definition of organizational resilience and to
identify the resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations. As such, this study provides a timely contribution to the currently wide-ranging and fragmented organizational resilience research by offering a compass to navigate an obfuscated definitional and conceptual landscape. The definition that was constructed from the findings of the Delphi survey is “the dynamic capability of an organization to successfully deal with significant change, emerging from multi-level (employee, team, and organizational) interacting characteristics and processes which enable an organization to prepare for, adapt to, and learn from significant change”. In contrast to extant review-based work in which researchers have sought to extract and integrate key strands of the heterogeneity of organizational resilience definitions, picking and choosing from those originating in different research fields (e.g., Annarelli & Nonino, 2016; Conz & Magnani, 2020; Linnenluecke, 2017), this is the first study which has sought to develop consensus from a panel of experts as to which features and areas of ambiguity of organizational resilience definitions are most suited to a specific context (in this case, elite sport).

Our discussion is centered around key insights regarding the two main parts of the definition of organizational resilience, namely positive outcomes following unexpected or disruptive resilience events, and the temporal phases and multiple levels across which organizational resilience takes place. Furthermore, by integrating the five resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations suggested by our findings (viz. structural clarity, flexible improvement, shared understanding, reciprocal commitment, and operational awareness) into the discussion with our proposed definition, alongside findings from the wider organizational resilience and resilience in sport literatures, we hope to facilitate a multi-level understanding of the concept of organizational resilience.

The first part of our proposed definition, “successfully deal with significant change”, centres around positive outcomes following resilience events. Our findings suggest that the type of outcome regarded as “successful” in a specific context may depend on the nature of the
change faced by an organization, given the potential scope of intensity and duration that our
panellists felt could be encompassed within resilience events. Whether an outcome is successful
or not will also be interpreted with reference to organizational priorities and values, an integral
part of the shared understanding resilient characteristic, alongside collective efficacy and group
norms. Previous organizational resilience research has highlighted the importance of shared
goals, values, and vision (Billington et al., 2017; Chen, 2016; Larsson et al., 2016; Ortiz-de-
Mandojana & Bansal, 2016; Witmer & Mellinger, 2016), and research by Morgan et al. (2013,
2015) has suggested that social identity and collective efficacy are key factors for team resilience
in elite sport. The importance of the organizational-level characteristic of shared understanding
may lie not only in its ability to guide individual-level employee behaviours towards
organizational-level goals, but also in helping to identify when those goals have been
successfully achieved in the face of significant change.

We incorporated the term “deal with” significant change to encompass the variety of
outcomes which could immediately follow the impact of significant change on an organization,
including an initial loss of functioning immediately following the change before recovering (cf.
Koronis & Ponis, 2018; Sheffi, 2005), and deflecting changes such that there is no loss of
with” also mirrors the breadth of potential proximal outcomes following significant change
across the individual (Britt et al., 2016) and team (Gucciardi et al., 2018) resilience literatures.

Furthermore, by referring to “significant change”, this reflects the dynamic and
interactive nature of resilience events suggested by our panellists. This terminology moves away
from organizational resilience research originating in crisis management (see Williams et al.,
2017) pursuant to which resilience events are seen as predominantly unexpected and externally
genenerated, or in the alternative, research originating in high-reliability organizations (e.g. Weick
et al., 1999) where resilience events are frequently ongoing and foreseeable. Instead the
terminology moves towards a systems-based model in which the interactions between an
organization and the environment are dynamic and emergent (e.g. Holling, 1973). Reviewing
organizational resilience literature in health systems, Barasa et al. (2018) noted that a framework
of complex adaptive systems is commonly used to understand resilience as an emergent property
of systems interacting and adapting in a dynamic and non-linear manner, enabling organizations
to adjust to multiple changes at any given time (Cilliers, 2001; de Coning, 2016). Overall,
defining organizational resilience as a dynamic capability to successfully deal with significant
change represents a shift in organizational resilience thinking away from simplistic engineering-
based models in which external, singular events cause an organization to temporarily deviate
from a linear trajectory. Instead, organizational resilience is expressed in terms of a complex
systems-based model in which resilience events, organizational systems, and their wider
sociocultural context dynamically interact (Morgeson et al., 2015).

The second part of our proposed definition of organizational resilience incorporates the
temporal phases and multiple levels across which organizational resilience takes place, described
as “emerging from multi-level (employee, team, and organizational) interacting characteristics
and processes which enable an organization to prepare for, adapt to, and learn from significant
change.” Noting the dynamic interplay between individuals and their organizational
environments, this aspect of our definition is underpinned by the resilient characteristic of
reciprocal commitment that recognizes the employee-employer relationship. In their focus-group
research with resilient sport teams, Morgan et al. (2013) identified the existence of high-quality
interactions and caring relationships within the team, termed “social capital”, as a key
characteristic of team resilience in elite sport. Empirical evidence has emerged to demonstrate
that a lack of support and connection undermines organizational resilience (Branicki et al.,
2019), suggesting that it may be beneficial to explore organizational resilience from the
perspective of relational systems (Kahn et al., 2013) in which employees, teams, and society are
considered as an integral part of the organization rather than as separate entities. Specifically, how employees successfully co-ordinate, make sense of, and respond to significant change within the context of supportive and safe relationships to produce resilient outcomes merits further exploration (Barton & Kahn, 2019).

The capability of an organization to prepare for significant change is underpinned by the resilient characteristic of operational awareness, mirroring previous literature which highlighted the importance of organizations having an understanding of their operating environment (Boin & van Eeten, 2013; Hopkin, 2014; Lee et al., 2013; McManus et al., 2008). Within the individual and team resilience in sport literatures, challenge appraisal (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012) and collective positive appraisal of setbacks (Morgan et al., 2015) foreground a positive evaluation of current stressors, but do not incorporate proactive attempts to monitor, identify, realistically assess, and prepare for potential future stressors.

The capability of an organization to adapt to significant change will be influenced by its cultural and structural characteristics (Barasa et al., 2018), specifically the resilient characteristic of flexible improvement. Within an organization’s culture, comprising the shared values, beliefs, and practices governing the way employees think about and act on challenges (Choi et al., 2010; Cruickshank & Collins, 2012), the importance of a willingness to adapt (Lee et al., 2013; McManus et al., 2008) and a desire to learn and continuously improve (Chen, 2016; Pal et al., 2014) have been found to be relevant for organizational resilience.

Alongside a willingness to adapt, there needs to be the capability to do so. Adaptive systems rely on dynamic interactions and feedback in order to assess the need for, and consequences of, adaptation (de Coning, 2016). In both the present study, and the findings of Morgan et al. (2013) in relation to team resilience in elite sport, communication channels were important structural aspects of resilient characteristics. This suggests a need to understand the channels through which teams within organizations communicate and interact in times of
change. Specifically, Kahn et al. (2018) noted that significant change is unlikely to be experienced uniformly across an organization, highlighting the need to understand the interactions through which the impact subsequently spreads (Morgeson et al., 2015).

By incorporating reference to multi-level characteristics and processes, and the phases of preparing, adapting, and learning from significant change within the definition of organizational resilience, attention is focused on the interactive and temporal elements of organizational resilience, facilitating an understanding of organizational resilience as a dynamic and complex phenomenon emerging from interactions between individuals and within teams and which manifests collectively over time in the context of organizational factors which shape and constrain these lower level phenomenon (Kozlowski et al., 2016).

**Strengths and Limitations**

This research was notable both in terms of the large number, and range, of experience of participants, and also the breadth of sports and roles represented in elite sport. The low drop-out rate across the study (averaging less than 10% between each Delphi round) was particularly noteworthy given the number of rounds and therefore the required workload, together with the number of items in each round. However, the study is not without its limitations. While the Delphi panel consisted of experts representing a range of applied and academic disciplines, the study would have benefitted from the inclusion of participants from wider cultural backgrounds to advance a socio-culturally sensitive understanding of organizational resilience. Similarly, it would be useful to explore how representative the findings from an elite sport context are to the wider sport context, such as community-based sport organizations focused on enhancing local physical activity participation. Finally, it is unclear the extent to which experts were persuaded to move towards consensus between Delphi rounds following feedback provided from the previous round. In researching expert consensus during Delphi studies, Meijering and Tobi (2016) found no significant move in the opinions of experts between rounds. The utility of additional rounds in
Delphi studies may instead lie in the ability for researchers to amend and clarify items in line with expert opinion, rather than increasing the level of consensus per se.

**Practical Implications and Future Research Directions**

The identification of five resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations provides a framework for practitioners to design interventions targeted at enhancing organizational resilience in elite sport. The extent to which any such organizational-level interventions may also positively impact employee resilience merits further attention, given the likely mutually beneficial interactions. For example, research has indicated that organizational resilience supports individual resilience (Kuntz et al., 2016), individual resilience supports wellbeing (e.g. Grant et al., 2009; Sood et al., 2011), and employee wellbeing constitutes a fundamental factor in organizational resilience (Nilakant et al., 2016). More specifically, organizational structures and values can signpost desirable employee behaviors (Kuntz et al., 2016), balancing challenging work with autonomy can support innovative goals (Li et al., 2014), and encouraging network-leveraging collaborative behaviors can improve employee wellbeing and adaptability (Kuntz et al., 2016). Therefore, interventions targeted at enhancing structural clarity, such as an informal communications audit, could shed light on the effectiveness of formal communication channels and also signpost open and transparent communication behaviors. Network-leveraging mentoring schemes are an opportunity to enhance reciprocal commitment within an organization. Scenario planning is a multi-purpose intervention which can be used to evaluate operational awareness, enhance shared understanding, and support flexible improvement. Specifically, identifying potential significant changes and how equipped the organization is to deal with them illuminates the organization’s current operational awareness (McManus et al., 2008). Shared understanding is enhanced through the growth of mutual understanding among those involved in the planning process (Crichton et al., 2009). Finally, practitioners could design scenario planning exercises targeted at supporting flexible improvement which involve the mobilization of increasingly
scarce resources to balance employee challenge and autonomy.

The present study has identified resilient characteristics indicating what a resilient elite sport organization has. Future research to examine what a resilient elite sport organization does, and to identify the underlying dynamic processes, would benefit from a longitudinal perspective. At the individual level, key resilience processes include event appraisal, coping/self-regulatory efforts, and social support (Britt et al., 2016; Fisher et al., 2019). At the team level, key resilience processes include information sharing, monitoring, planning, accessing and deployment of resources, social identity, team learning, intra-team relationships, and shared leadership (Bowers et al., 2017; Gucciardi et al. 2018; Hartmann et al., 2019; Hartwig et al., 2020; Morgan et al., 2015). At the organizational level, Wagstaff et al. (2020) suggest that planning, adaptation, learning, relationship networks, and leadership may be important. Thus, a deeper understanding of the relative contributions of, and mutual interactions between, these multi-level processes over time will greatly enhance future organizational resilience research.

Conclusion

The results presented in this study provide a novel and significant contribution to the field of sport psychology by identifying and consolidating a wide variety of concepts pertaining to organizational resilience and evaluating their applicability to the elite sport context, providing a vital stepping stone between conceptual development and empirical research (Verreynne et al., 2018). The formulation of a definition of organizational resilience and the identification of resilient characteristics of elite sport organizations endorsed by experts working within elite sport lends legitimacy to this research stream as an area worth investigating further, both by academics and practitioners. While changing organizational practices will be more challenging than focusing on individual and team level behaviors (Sarkar, 2018), this focus on organizational-level factors is an essential component of creating high performance environments in which individuals, teams, and organizations can thrive (Wagstaff, 2017).
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## Table 1

### Results of Rounds 1 and 2 Regarding Definitional Aspects of Organizational Resilience in Elite Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response – number (percentage of all responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Within elite sport, organizational resilience is a reaction to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant stressors – 8 (9.8%)</td>
<td>everyday stressors – 1 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both could apply - 69 (84.1%)</td>
<td>neither is relevant - 4 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Within elite sport, organizational resilience is a reaction to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sudden changes - 13 (15.9%)</td>
<td>incremental changes - 4 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both could apply - 62 (75.6%)</td>
<td>neither is relevant - 3 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 If an elite sport organization has displayed resilience, it has:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absorbed stressors, so experienced disruption then recovered - 12 (14.6%)</td>
<td>deflected stressors, so maintained functioning - 9 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both could apply - 59 (72%)</td>
<td>neither is relevant - 2 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 *If an elite sport organization has displayed resilience, it has (select all which apply):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a recovered its former level of performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 1) – 47 (57.3%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 1) – 35 (42.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 2) – 35 (49.3%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 2) – 36 (50.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b enhanced its performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 1) – 58 (70.7%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 1) – 24 (29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 2) – 40 (56.3%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 2) – 31 (43.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c adapted and developed new capabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 1) – 70 (85.4%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 1) – 12 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 2) – 59 (83.1%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 2) – 12 (16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d embarked on a positive, sustainable path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 1) – 54 (65.9%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 1) – 28 (34.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree (round 2) – 38 (53.5%)</td>
<td>disagree (round 2) – 33 (46.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Within elite sport, organizational resilience is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a reactive capacity – 6 (7.3%)</td>
<td>a proactive capacity - 6 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both could apply - 70 (85.4%)</td>
<td>neither is relevant - 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 If you consider organizational resilience has some proactive element, is this focused towards:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering and planning for</td>
<td>considering and seeking out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both could apply - 59 (72%)</td>
<td>neither is relevant - 1 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Response – number (percentage of all responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Within elite sport, organizational resilience is concerned with:</td>
<td>problems - 20 (24.4%)  opportunites - 2 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reliability and stability - 10 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>innovation and change - 8 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>both could apply - 59 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neither is relevant - 5 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  *Organizational resilience is (select all which apply):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a  a quality</td>
<td>disagree (round 1) – 33 (40.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree (round 2) - 30 (42.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree (round 1) – 49 (59.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree (round 2) - 41 (57.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b  a process</td>
<td>disagree (round 1) – 27 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree (round 2) – 16 (22.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree (round 2) – 55 (77.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c  an outcome</td>
<td>disagree (round 1) – 43 (52.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree (round 2) – 44 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree (round 1) – 39 (47.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree (round 2) – 27 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  *Do you think that organizational resilience in an elite sport context is similar or different to organizational resilience in other contexts?</td>
<td>similar (round 1) - 47 (57.3%)  different (round 1) - 8 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>similar (round 2) – 51 (71.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different (round 2) – 7 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it could be both (round 1) – 21 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it could be both (round 2) – 12 (16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m not sure (round 1) – 6 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m not sure (round 2) – 1 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 *Do you think organizational resilience is similar across an elite sport context, or unique to the particular sport?</td>
<td>similar (round 1) - 40 (48.8%)  unique (round 1) - 6 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>similar (round 2) – 52 (73.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unique (round 2) – 5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it could be both (round 1) – 31 (37.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it could be both (round 2) – 12 (16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m not sure (round 1) – 5 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m not sure (round 2) – 2 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Note: Consensus ≥ 65.1%. Consensus responses are in bold. * these statements did not reach consensus after round 1, so were carried forwards to round 2. In round 1, the total number of responses was 82. In round 2, the total number of responses was 71.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Illustrative comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Structural clarity     | Effective internal communication channels (100/2.98); role clarity (100/2.88); transparent decision making (100/2.84); effective external communication channels (96.9/2.59); a flexible or adaptable structure (93.8/2.58) | “For resilient organizations communications and decision making needs to flow rapidly”  
“high levels of comms between different elements, to allow learning and joint problem-solving”  
“understanding what others are trying to achieve and [making] communication happen, we achieve much better shared consciousness”  
“You need to know what your role is and who you report to. You need to know who makes the decisions and what accountability looks like. Boundaries can be important but clear communication channels are more important.”  
“Every organization needs a structure which is clear internally and externally. Crucially individual role clarity and clarity of responsibility for and across discrete teams is also essential.” |
| Flexible improvement   | Desire to learn and improve (100/2.95); openness to ideas (100/2.77); adaptable /flexible (100/2.77); flexibility of use (95.3/2.64); innovation and creativity (95.3/2.61); accepts uncertainty and change (95.3/2.59); structured training and development program (96.9; 2.58); optimistic (95.3/2.53) | “Adaptability and learning...contribute to capability to interact across multiple levels of the organization”  
“human resources that are willing and able to adapt to what is available to them”  
“A shared understanding of individual / department strengths and a willingness to develop them further” |
<p>| Shared understanding   | Shared vision and values (100/2.88); collective efficacy (100/2.77); group norms (98.4/2.66); values unity / integration (95.3/2.55) | “A core set of organizational values adopted and bought into by all so that we ‘live’ them day to day provides a really stable level of resilience.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes*</th>
<th>Illustrative comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>Employees feel valued (100/2.84); high levels of employee loyalty and commitment (96.9/2.8); effective internal partnerships (96.9/2.78); trusting (100/2.77); supportive (98.4/2.69); psychological safety (98.4/2.66); employee wellbeing prioritized (95.3/2.64); enthusiastic employees (93.8/2.61); affectionate relationships (90.6/2.52)</td>
<td>“passionate people in caring, trusting relationships are always the basis for resilience. When people get isolated or choose to isolate themselves, then issues can occur.” “reciprocal commitment and investment between members and the organization”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Anticipate problems early (100/2.8); awareness of priorities in a crisis (98.4/2.69); awareness and understanding of operating environment (98.4/2.66); gathering and considering alternative options (100/2.59); pause and reflect before making decisions (96.9/2.56); awareness of opportunities or resources available (93.8/2.53)</td>
<td>“As a leader it is essential to be aware of both environment and organizational priorities” “foresight, focus on external environment, awareness of changes taking place in the [external] landscape”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *extracted from Delphi survey. Numbers in brackets are firstly the percentage of consensus agreement on a characteristic as being very important or somewhat important to organizational resilience in elite sport, and secondly the mean ranking from the Delphi survey.