

Strategic Risk, Organizational Resilience, and Institutional Reform in Post-Conflict and Transition Economies: An Integrated Study of Energy and Public Institutions

Authors Details

Shafiqullah Hilal^{1*}

Faculty of Economics, Department of National Economics, Shaikh Zayed University,
Khost, Afghanistan.

Mir Shah Khan²

Faculty of Economics, Department of Business Administration, Shaikh Zayed University,
Khost, Afghanistan.

Tooryalai Sangeen³

Faculty of Economics, Department of Business Administration, Shaikh Zayed University,
Khost, Afghanistan.

Abdul Wahab Zaheer⁴

Faculty of Economics, Department of National Economics, Shaikh Zayed University,
Khost, Afghanistan.

Corresponding Author: *Shafiqullah Hilal*

ABSTRACT: Post-conflict and transition economies face interconnected strategic risks that can undermined organizational performance, public service delivery, energy security, and institutional development. This study examinee the relationship between strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform, with particular attention to energy and public institutions. The study used a systematic integrative literature review to synthesize research on strategic risk management, organizational resilience, institutional change, public-sector resilience, and energy-sector reform. The review identifies recurring patterns

concerning the importance of anticipation, preparedness, adaptive capacity, leadership, information management, resource availability, coordination, and institutional learning. The findings indicated that organizational resilience was not limited to recovering from disruption; it also involved anticipating risks, maintaining essential functions, adapting to changing conditions, and learning from crises. Institutional conditions significantly influence these capabilities, while institutional reform can either strengthen resilience or create additional uncertainty when reforms are poorly aligned with local capacities and governance conditions. Energy institutions were particularly important because reliable energy systems support economic activity, public services, and wider institutional functioning. The study developed an integrated framework linking strategic risk recognition, organizational resilience capabilities, institutional response, and institutional reform. Recommendations were proposed: establishing integrated risk and resilience systems, designing reforms around local institutional capacity, and strengthening learning, coordination, and adaptive capabilities in energy and public institutions. The study concluded that sustainable resilience in post-conflict and transition settings requires an integrated approach that combines risk management, organizational capabilities, and context-sensitive institutional reform.

Keywords: *Strategic Risk; Organizational Resilience; Institutional Reform; Post-Conflict Economies; Transition Economies; Energy Institutions; Public Institutions; Institutional Resilience.*

Introduction

Post-conflict and transition economies operate within environments characterized by institutional uncertainty, political and economic change, infrastructure weaknesses, resource constraints, and exposure to multiple forms of disruption. These conditions create strategic risks for organizations and public institutions while simultaneously increasing the need for effective institutional adaptation.

Strategic risk differs from routine operational risk because it concerns developments that can substantially influence an organization's objectives, long-term position, or ability to create and sustain value. Strategic risk management therefore requires organizations to identify significant external and internal uncertainties and integrate risk considerations into strategic decision-making (Bromiley et al., 2015; Dhlamini, 2022).

Organizational resilience has emerged as an important response to such uncertainty. Rather than being understood simply as the ability to recover after a crisis, resilience can be conceptualized as a capability involving anticipation, coping, and adaptation (Duchek, 2020). Resilient organizations are therefore able to recognize emerging threats, mobilize resources, maintain essential functions, respond to disruption, and adapt following significant change.

Institutional reform is closely connected to these processes. Changes in laws, regulations, governance arrangements, organizational structures, and public-sector systems can alter the environment in which organizations operate. In transition economies, organizational responses are shaped by changing institutional arrangements and uncertainty surrounding new rules and governance structures (Roth & Kostova, 2003). In post-conflict environments, institutional reform is additionally affected by political settlements, competing interests, implementation capacity, and the legacy of conflict (Strasheim, 2017; World Bank, 2011).

Energy institutions deserve particular attention because energy systems are foundational to economic activity and public-service delivery. Power-sector reform involves institutional, regulatory, organizational, and technological changes, and international evidence indicates that reform outcomes depend significantly on country-specific political and economic conditions rather than a single universal model (World Bank, 2019).

Consequently, strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform should not be treated as separate issues. Their interaction is especially important in post-conflict and transition environments where institutional capacity is often constrained and the consequences of disruption can extend across multiple sectors.

Problem Statement

Post-conflict and transition economies face multiple and interconnected risks, including institutional instability, economic uncertainty, infrastructure limitations, political change, resource constraints, technological disruption, and weaknesses in public-sector capacity. Energy and public institutions are particularly exposed because disruptions in these institutions can affect essential services and wider economic activity.

Although extensive literature exists on strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform, these areas are frequently examined independently. Consequently, there is limited integration of the three concepts within a common framework, particularly in relation to energy and public institutions operating in post-conflict and transition settings.

The central problem addressed by this study is therefore the insufficient integration of strategic risk management, organizational resilience, and institutional reform into a unified analytical perspective.

Research Gap

Three principal gaps emerge from the literature.

First, strategic risk research frequently focuses on enterprise risk management without sufficiently considering the institutional conditions of post-conflict and transition economies.

Second, organizational resilience research has expanded considerably but remains conceptually diverse. Recent research emphasizes resilience as involving maintenance, recovery, and adaptation rather than recovery alone (Li et al., 2026).

Third, institutional reform and organizational resilience are often analyzed separately. More integrated research is needed to explain how organizations respond to strategic risks while simultaneously adapting to institutional change.

This study addresses these gaps by integrating the three concepts and applying them to energy and public institutions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to systematically synthesize existing literature on strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform and to develop an integrated framework explaining their relationship in post-conflict and transition economies, with particular attention to energy and public institutions.

Research Objectives

The study aims to:

1. Identify major strategic risks affecting energy and public institutions in post-conflict and transition economies.
2. Examine organizational capabilities associated with resilience.
3. Analyze the relationship between organizational resilience and institutional reform.
4. Examine the role of energy institutions in strengthening or constraining resilience.
5. Develop an integrated conceptual framework linking strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform.

Significance of the Study

The study contributes to academic literature by connecting three related but frequently separated research areas. It also provides a conceptual basis for understanding institutional resilience in environments characterized by uncertainty and structural change.

For practitioners and policymakers, the study highlights the importance of integrating risk management with organizational learning, institutional capacity, coordination, and adaptive reform. The findings are particularly relevant to energy authorities, public institutions, regulatory organizations, and organizations operating in fragile or transitional environments.

Scope of the Study

The study focuses on literature concerning strategic risk, organizational resilience, institutional reform, public institutions, energy institutions, post-conflict environments, and transition economies. It emphasizes conceptual and empirical evidence relevant to institutional and organizational responses to uncertainty and disruption.

Literature Review

Strategic Risk

Strategic risk concerns uncertainty that can affect an organization's strategic objectives, competitive position, long-term sustainability, or ability to create value. Strategic risk

management extends beyond identifying individual risks by integrating risk considerations with organizational strategy and decision-making (Bromiley et al., 2015; Gates, 2006).

Dhlamini (2022), in a systematic review of strategic risk management research, identifies several recurring categories, including regulatory, competitive, economic, political, technological, and partnership-related risks. These categories are particularly relevant to organizations operating in unstable institutional environments.

Organizational Resilience

Organizational resilience refers to an organization's capacity to anticipate disruption, respond effectively, maintain essential functions, and adapt to changing conditions. Duchek (2020) conceptualizes resilience as a meta-capability consisting of anticipation, coping, and adaptation.

Annarelli and Nonino (2016) similarly demonstrate that organizational resilience involves multiple dimensions and should not be reduced to crisis recovery. Resilience depends on organizational resources, processes, structures, knowledge, and the ability to respond to uncertainty.

Strategic Risk and Organizational Resilience

Strategic risk and organizational resilience are closely connected. Risk identification provides organizations with information about potential threats, while resilience determines how effectively organizations can prepare for and respond to those threats.

Resilience therefore represents an important organizational response to strategic uncertainty. Organizations that combine strategic foresight, information management, resource flexibility, leadership, and learning may be better positioned to manage disruptions than organizations relying primarily on reactive crisis responses.

Institutional Reform

Institutional reform involves changes to formal rules, governance structures, regulations, administrative systems, and organizational arrangements. Institutional change can occur gradually through adjustments to existing arrangements or more rapidly following major political or economic disruption.

Mahoney and Thelen (2010) emphasize that institutional change can result from ambiguity, political conflict, and the strategic behavior of institutional actors. This perspective is particularly relevant to transition settings where institutional rules may be incomplete or contested.

Institutional Reform in Post-Conflict Environments

Post-conflict institutional reform is complicated by weak administrative capacity, political competition, institutional legacies, and uncertainty over future governance arrangements. The World Bank (2011) emphasizes the importance of capable and legitimate institutions in reducing the risk of repeated instability.

Strasheim (2017), examining Nepal, demonstrates that the politics surrounding institutional reform can influence post-conflict stability. Institutional reforms therefore need to be understood not simply as technical changes but as processes embedded in political and organizational environments.

Institutional Resilience

Institutional resilience refers to the capacity of institutions to maintain core functions while adapting to changing conditions. It involves continuity, recovery, learning, and transformation.

Recent research in public administration identifies maintenance, recovery, and adaptability as distinct but interconnected dimensions of resilience (Li et al., 2026). The evidence also highlights networking, collaboration, digital technology, and leadership as important contributors to resilience.

Energy Institutions and Resilience

Energy institutions are central to resilience because reliable energy is necessary for economic production, communication, transportation, healthcare, education, and public administration.

The World Bank (2019) reports that power-sector reforms have produced varied experiences across developing countries and that reform strategies must account for political and economic conditions. This suggests that energy-sector resilience depends not

only on infrastructure but also on regulatory quality, institutional coordination, organizational capacity, and appropriate governance arrangements.

Research on organizational resilience during energy crises also demonstrates the importance of organizational adaptation to energy-related disruption (Ingram et al., 2023).

Public Institutions and Resilience

Public institutions face distinctive resilience requirements because they must maintain essential services while operating under political, legal, fiscal, and administrative constraints.

The public-administration literature increasingly views resilience as a combination of maintaining essential functions, recovering from disruptions, and adapting institutions to new conditions (Li et al., 2026). Collaboration, leadership, digital technologies, and decentralized decision-making can contribute to institutional adaptability.

Integrated Perspective

The literature indicates that strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform are mutually connected.

Strategic risks create pressures for organizational adaptation. Organizational resilience determines how institutions absorb and respond to those pressures. Institutional reform modifies the rules and structures within which organizational adaptation occurs. Reform can therefore either increase resilience by improving capacity and coordination or generate additional uncertainty when poorly designed or implemented.

The relationship is consequently better understood as recursive rather than strictly linear.

Research Review and Previous Studies

Previous studies provide evidence concerning organizational transformation, resilience, institutional change, and energy-sector adaptation.

Newman (2000) examines organizational transformation during periods of institutional upheaval and demonstrates the importance of institutional change in shaping organizational transformation. Roth and Kostova (2003), based on evidence from firms in Central and

Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States, show that organizational responses to institutional upheaval are influenced by both organizational and institutional conditions.

Barasa et al. (2018), through a systematic review of empirical research, identify resources, preparedness, information management, leadership, organizational culture, human capital, governance, and collaboration as important contributors to organizational resilience.

Duchek (2020) develops a capability-based model in which resilience includes anticipation, coping, and adaptation. This provides a useful theoretical foundation for understanding resilience as an organizational capability rather than simply an outcome.

Ingram et al. (2023) examine organizational resilience in the context of energy crises and identify a growing body of research linking resilience to energy systems, sustainability, energy security, and organizational responses to disruption.

More recently, Li et al. (2026) synthesize 49 empirical studies in public administration and distinguish maintenance, recovery, and adaptability as interconnected resilience narratives.

Comparison of Previous Research

Study	Main focus	Major contribution
Newman (2000)	Institutional upheaval	Organizational transformation during institutional change
Roth & Kostova (2003)	Transition economies	Organizational adaptation to institutional upheaval
Barasa et al. (2018)	Organizational resilience	Resources, leadership, governance, information and collaboration
Duchek (2020)	Organizational resilience	Anticipation, coping and adaptation capabilities
Ingram et al. (2023)	Energy crisis	Organizational responses to energy-related disruption
Li et al. (2026)	Public administration	Maintenance, recovery and adaptability

The studies collectively indicate that resilience depends on more than financial resources or crisis response. Organizational capabilities and institutional conditions interact to determine how organizations respond to disruption.

Methodological Characteristics

The previous literature contains systematic reviews, conceptual studies, empirical organizational research, institutional analysis, and policy research. This methodological diversity provides broad insight but also limits direct statistical comparison.

Because the literature examines different sectors, countries, institutional systems, and definitions of resilience, thematic synthesis is more appropriate than statistical meta-analysis for the present study.

Research Gaps

The review identifies four principal gaps:

1. Limited integration of strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform.
2. Limited attention to the interaction between organizational and institutional resilience.
3. Insufficient integration of energy institutions into broader resilience frameworks.
4. Limited context-specific evidence from post-conflict and transition economies.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study adopts a systematic integrative literature review design. The approach combines systematic identification and selection principles with thematic synthesis of heterogeneous literature.

The reporting logic is informed by PRISMA 2020, which provides guidance for transparent reporting of systematic reviews (Page et al., 2021).

Information Sources

The review framework considers peer-reviewed literature from major academic databases and publisher platforms, including:

- Scopus
- Web of Science
- ScienceDirect
- SpringerLink
- Emerald
- Wiley Online Library
- Taylor & Francis
- Google Scholar

Institutional sources from organizations such as the World Bank were considered separately where they provided relevant evidence concerning institutional reform, energy systems, governance, or post-conflict development.

Search concepts were organized around the following combinations:

- “strategic risk” AND organizational resilience
- “strategic risk management” AND institutions
- “organizational resilience” AND public institutions
- “organizational resilience” AND energy
- “institutional reform” AND post-conflict
- “institutional change” AND transition economies
- “energy reform” AND institutional capacity
- “public sector resilience” AND governance

Additional combinations were developed using related terms such as adaptation, crisis management, institutional capacity, energy security, governance, and transition economies.

Eligibility Criteria

Studies were considered relevant when they:

- addressed strategic risk, organizational resilience, institutional reform, or closely related concepts;
- examined organizations, public institutions, energy institutions, or institutional systems;
- provided conceptual, theoretical, empirical, or systematic-review evidence;
- were relevant to post-conflict, fragile, developing, or transition environments, or provided transferable evidence for such contexts.

Studies unrelated to the research questions, lacking substantive relevance, or providing insufficient information were excluded.

Screening and Selection

The review process follows the general sequence of identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and final inclusion recommended by PRISMA 2020 (Page et al., 2021).

No numerical search, screening, or exclusion counts are reported because those figures should be generated from the authors' actual database-search records. Presenting invented figures would compromise the methodological integrity of the study.

Data Extraction

Relevant information was organized around:

- author and publication year;
- research context;
- research focus;
- strategic risks examined;

- resilience capabilities;
- institutional factors;
- energy-sector relevance;
- major findings;
- methodological approach;
- implications for post-conflict and transition environments.

Data Synthesis

The evidence was synthesized thematically rather than through meta-analysis. This approach is appropriate because the literature differs substantially in research design, geographical setting, institutional context, sector, measurement approaches, and conceptualization of resilience.

The synthesis focused on recurring relationships among strategic risk, resilience capabilities, institutional conditions, and reform.

Methodological Limitations

The principal limitation is the heterogeneity of the literature. Differences in definitions, sectors, countries, and research methods restrict direct comparison.

A second limitation is the relative scarcity of empirical research specifically connecting strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform in post-conflict settings.

A third limitation is that institutional reports and policy documents differ from peer-reviewed research in methodology and evidentiary standards. They were therefore treated as contextual evidence rather than equivalent to empirical journal studies.

Results and Discussion

Strategic Risks Are Interconnected: The literature indicates that strategic risks in post-conflict and transition economies rarely occur independently. Political, regulatory, economic, technological, infrastructure, and resource risks can reinforce one another.

For example, institutional instability can influence investment, infrastructure development, regulatory implementation, and organizational decision-making. Strategic risk management therefore requires an integrated perspective rather than isolated treatment of individual risks.

Organizational Resilience Is a Capability System: The evidence supports the interpretation of resilience as a combination of capabilities rather than a single organizational characteristic.

Duchek (2020) identifies anticipation, coping, and adaptation as core stages of resilience. These stages imply that organizations need capabilities before, during, and after disruption.

Important capabilities include:

- strategic foresight;
- information management;
- leadership;
- resource flexibility;
- organizational learning;
- collaboration;
- communication;
- preparedness;
- adaptive decision-making.

Barasa et al. (2018) similarly identify resources, preparedness, leadership, governance, human capital, information, and social networks as important elements of organizational resilience.

Institutional Context Shapes Organizational Resilience

Organizations do not operate independently of their institutional environments. Laws, regulations, governance structures, administrative capacity, and political conditions affect the resources and choices available to organizations.

Evidence from transition economies demonstrates that organizational adaptation is influenced by institutional upheaval and the emergence of new governance arrangements (Roth & Kostova, 2003).

Consequently, organizational resilience should be examined as both an internal capability and an institutionally embedded process.

Institutional Reform Can Strengthen or Complicate Resilience

Institutional reform can strengthen resilience when it improves accountability, coordination, regulatory clarity, organizational capacity, and access to resources.

However, reform can also produce uncertainty when new institutional arrangements are poorly coordinated, inadequately implemented, or disconnected from local capacity.

The evidence from post-conflict settings demonstrates that institutional reform is embedded in political and social processes and can be affected by competing interests and implementation challenges (Strasheim, 2017).

Energy Institutions Are Central to Institutional Resilience

Energy institutions occupy a particularly important position because energy availability affects economic activity and public-service delivery.

The World Bank's review of power-sector reform emphasizes that reform experiences differ across developing countries and that institutional and political-economic conditions influence reform outcomes (World Bank, 2019).

Energy resilience therefore requires more than physical infrastructure. It also requires effective regulation, institutional coordination, organizational capability, contingency planning, and adaptive governance.

Public-Sector Resilience Requires Continuity and Adaptation

Public institutions must maintain essential functions during disruption while also adapting to changing circumstances. Recent public-administration research identifies maintenance, recovery, and adaptability as interconnected dimensions of resilience (Li et al., 2026).

This suggests that resilience should not be measured only by how quickly an institution returns to previous operations. In some circumstances, adaptation to a new institutional environment may be more appropriate than restoration of the previous state.

Energy Reform and Governance Are Interdependent

Energy-sector reform can influence institutional capacity, while institutional capacity also affects the implementation of energy reform.

Weak regulation, limited administrative capacity, fragmented responsibilities, or insufficient coordination can reduce the effectiveness of reform. Conversely, effective institutions can improve energy governance, planning, accountability, and resilience.

Post-Conflict Settings Require Context-Specific Resilience

Post-conflict environments differ significantly in institutional history, political structures, economic resources, social conditions, and security environments. Consequently, resilience strategies cannot simply be transferred from stable economies without contextual adaptation.

The World Bank (2011) emphasizes that institutional development in conflict-affected environments requires long-term approaches rather than isolated short-term interventions.

Integrated Conceptual Framework

The synthesis supports the following framework:

Strategic Risks

↓

Risk Recognition and Strategic Foresight

↓

Organizational Resilience Capabilities

↓

Institutional Response and Adaptation

↓

Institutional Reform

↓

Long-Term Institutional Capacity and Resilience

The relationship is recursive rather than strictly linear. Institutional reform can alter future risks, while organizational learning from previous disruptions can improve subsequent risk recognition and resilience.

Theoretical Contribution

The principal theoretical contribution is the integration of three perspectives.

First, strategic risk explains the sources and nature of uncertainty.

Second, organizational resilience explains the capabilities through which organizations anticipate, absorb, respond to, and adapt to disruption.

Third, institutional reform explains how changes in rules, governance structures, and organizational arrangements shape the environment within which resilience develops.

Together, these perspectives provide a more comprehensive framework for studying institutions operating under prolonged uncertainty.

Recommendations

Establish Integrated Strategic Risk and Resilience Systems: Energy and public institutions should integrate strategic risk assessment with organizational resilience planning. Risk registers, scenario analysis, early-warning mechanisms, continuity planning, information systems, and organizational learning should be connected to strategic decision-making rather than treated as separate administrative activities.

Design Institutional Reforms Around Local Capacity and Governance Conditions: Institutional reforms should be designed according to local administrative capacity, regulatory conditions, organizational resources, political-economic realities, and implementation capabilities. Reform models should therefore be adapted to context rather than applied as standardized institutional packages.

Strengthen Learning, Coordination, and Adaptive Capacity: Energy and public institutions should strengthen cross-institutional coordination, leadership development, knowledge sharing, digital capacity, organizational learning, and adaptive decision-making. These

capabilities can improve institutional responses to both immediate shocks and longer-term structural changes.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between strategic risk, organizational resilience, and institutional reform in post-conflict and transition economies, with particular attention to energy and public institutions.

The literature indicates that strategic risks in these environments are interconnected and that effective responses require more than conventional risk-control mechanisms. Organizational resilience involves anticipation, preparedness, coping, adaptation, learning, leadership, information management, resource flexibility, and collaboration.

Institutional conditions significantly influence these capabilities. Institutional reform can strengthen resilience by improving governance, coordination, accountability, and capacity, but poorly aligned reforms can also create additional uncertainty and implementation challenges.

Energy institutions are especially important because energy systems support economic activity and essential public services. Their resilience therefore depends on the interaction of infrastructure, organizational capabilities, regulation, governance, and institutional capacity.

The study proposes an integrated framework in which strategic risks influence the need for organizational resilience; organizational resilience shapes institutional responses; and institutional reform modifies long-term institutional capacity. The relationship is dynamic and recursive, with learning and adaptation influencing future risk management.

Overall, the literature supports a shift from viewing resilience primarily as crisis recovery toward understanding it as a continuous institutional and organizational capability. For post-conflict and transition economies, sustainable resilience requires the integration of strategic risk management, organizational learning, adaptive capacity, effective governance, and context-sensitive institutional reform.

Future empirical research should test the proposed framework within specific countries and sectors, particularly through comparative studies of energy institutions and public organizations operating under conditions of institutional transition.

References

1. Annarelli, A., & Nonino, F. (2016). Strategic and operational management of organizational resilience: Current state of research and future directions. *Omega*, 62, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2015.08.004>
2. Barasa, E., Mbau, R., & Gilson, L. (2018). What is resilience and how can it be nurtured? A systematic review of empirical literature on organizational resilience. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 7(6), 491–503. <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2018.06>
3. Béné, C., Godfrey-Wood, R., Newsham, A., & Davies, M. (2012). Resilience: New utopia or new tyranny? Reflection about the potentials and limits of the concept of resilience in relation to vulnerability reduction programmes. *IDS Working Papers*, 2012(405), 1–61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2012.00405.x>
4. Bromiley, P., McShane, M. K., Nair, A., & Rustambekov, E. (2015). Enterprise risk management: Review, critique, and research directions. *Long Range Planning*, 48(4), 265–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2014.07.005>
5. Dhlamini, J. (2022). Strategic risk management: A systematic review from 2001 to 2020. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 19(2), 212–237. <https://doi.org/10.35683/jcm22008.165>
6. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13(1), 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
7. Gates, S. (2006). Incorporating strategic risk into enterprise risk management: A survey of current corporate practice. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 18(4), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6622.2006.00114.x>

8. Ingram, T., Wieczorek-Kosmala, M., & Hlaváček, K. (2023). Organizational resilience as a response to the energy crisis: Systematic literature review. *Energies*, 16(2), 702. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en16020702>
9. Li, J., Tang, S.-Y., & Wen, B. (2026). Unpacking resilience in public administration: Insights from a meta-narrative review. *Public Administration Review*, 86(5), 1235–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.70083>
10. Mahoney, J., & Thelen, K. (2010). A theory of gradual institutional change. In J. Mahoney & K. Thelen (Eds.), *Explaining institutional change: Ambiguity, agency, and power* (pp. 1–37). Cambridge University Press.
11. Newman, K. L. (2000). Organizational transformation during institutional upheaval. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 602–619. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3363525>
12. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
13. Roth, K., & Kostova, T. (2003). Organizational coping with institutional upheaval in transition economies. *Journal of World Business*, 38(4), 314–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2003.08.018>
14. Strasheim, J. (2017). *The politics of institutional reform and post-conflict violence in Nepal* (GIGA Working Paper No. 296). German Institute of Global and Area Studies.
15. World Bank. (2011). *World development report 2011: Conflict, security, and development*. World Bank.
16. World Bank. (2019). *Rethinking power sector reform in the developing world*. World Bank.