Business Continuity Innovation in Disruption Time: Sociotechnical Systems, Business Analytics, Virtual Business, and Mediating Role of Knowledge Absorptive Capacity

Srishti Agarwal
Rukmini Devi Institute of Advanced Studies (Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi)

[1] *Date of Receiving: 28 January 2024;*
Date of Acceptance: 13 March 2024;
Date of Publication: 30 April 2024

ABSTRACT

Disruptions—from pandemics and cyber incidents to supply-chain shocks—are now routine rather than rare. This paper integrates four streams to explain business continuity innovation (BCI): (1) sociotechnical systems (STS), (2) business analytics capabilities (BA/BDAC), (3) virtual business models and digitalization, and (4) the mediating role of knowledge absorptive capacity (ACAP). We synthesize recent evidence (2013–2023) to argue that continuity is not merely operational recovery but adaptive renewal: organizations that jointly optimize people–process–technology (STS), sense and decide with BA, virtualize core interactions, and deliberately build ACAP convert shocks into learning, new offerings, and productivity gains. We develop a testable conceptual model with propositions (H1–H6), offer a comparative analysis across disruption types, and provide a 90-day managerial playbook. The paper closes with a research agenda detailing measures and designs to empirically evaluate the framework.

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 shock and subsequent geopolitical and cyber disruptions exposed a gap: many organizations had disaster plans but lacked innovation under duress. Business continuity innovation (BCI) reframes continuity as a capability to sense-absorb-adapt-renew during disruption. Empirical work shows analytics capabilities and digitalization improved firms' crisis resilience and performance, while platform contexts required new resource orchestration for resilience.

Virtual work and digital channels helped sustain output—though effects on productivity are heterogeneous—underscoring the need to align technology with organization and work design.

Table 1. Core constructs used in this paper

Construct	Working definition
Business Continuity Innovation (BCI)	The capability to maintain essential functions and create adaptive changes (new processes, offerings) during/after disruption
Sociotechnical Systems (STS)	Joint optimization of social (people, structure) and technical (tools, tasks) subsystems for resilient performance
Business Analytics Capability (BDAC/BA)	Bundles of data, tech, talent, and governance that turn data into decisions and action

[1] ***How to cite the article**: Agarwal S (2024); Business Continuity Innovation in Disruption Time: Sociotechnical Systems, Business Analytics, Virtual Business, and Mediating Role of Knowledge Absorptive Capacity; *International Journal of Innovations in Applied Sciences and Engineering*; Vol 10, 79-85

Construct	Working definition
Virtual Business/Digitalization	Digitally mediated processes (remote work, e-commerce, platforms) sustaining value delivery when physical channels fail
Absorptive Capacity (ACAP)	Organizational ability to acquire, assimilate, transform, and exploit knowledge; posited mediator for BCI

2. Theory and Literature Synthesis

2.1 Sociotechnical systems (STS) and continuity

STS research shows resilience emerges when work design, roles, incentives, and technology are co-designed, not bolted on. In cyber-physical and critical-infrastructure settings, resilience depends on human–machine coordination and boundary-spanning routines, not only technical redundancy.

Implication: During shocks, STS design choices (e.g., decentralized decision rights + reliable information plumbing) lower decision latency and error propagation.

Table 2. STS principles translated to continuity levers

STS Principle	Continuity lever	BCI payoff
Joint optimization	Cross-functional incident cells; human-in-the-loop automation	Faster, safer decisions
Redundancy & slack	Shadow roles, runbooks, circuit-breakers	Fewer single points of failure
Feedback & learning	After-action reviews; incident knowledge base	Shorter learning cycles, fewer repeats

2.2 Business analytics capabilities (BA/BDAC)

BDACs—data infrastructure, analytical talent, and data-driven culture—are repeatedly linked to competitive and operational outcomes, typically indirectly via dynamic/operational capabilities (agility, marketing/tech capabilities).

In disruption, analytics turn noisy signals into timely resource reallocation (e.g., channel mix, inventory hedges). Reviews and large-sample studies suggest BDAC improves decision quality and enables rapid sensing and reconfiguration.

Table 3. Typical BDAC dimensions and continuity-relevant indicators

Dimension	Examples	Continuity-relevant indicator
Data foundation	Streaming/ETL, data quality	Time-to-signal (minutes/hours)
Analytics talent & tools	Forecasting, causal inference, optimization	Forecast error delta during shock
Governance & culture	Decision rights, MLOps, model risk	% decisions supported by analytics in crisis

2.3 Virtual business and digitalization

Digitally intensive firms and e-commerce channels showed higher crisis resilience, with measurable performance cushions for firms whose business models were more digital.
Remote work scaled essential knowledge work, though productivity effects varied by task, coordination costs, and management practices—pointing again to the STS lens.
E-commerce ecosystems adapted quickly, improving consumer resilience under mobility restrictions.

Table 4. Virtualization mechanisms and continuity outcomes

Mechanism	Example	Observed continuity effect
Remote operations	Hybrid/remote processes for core functions	Maintained output; task-dependent productivity
Digital channels	E-stores/marketplaces	Revenue continuity; supply adjustments
Platform orchestration	Partner/API ecosystems	Faster recombination of services

2.4 Absorptive capacity (ACAP) as mediator

ACAP—acquire, assimilate, transform, exploit—converts exposure to novel information into usable knowledge. Recent empirical studies (2013–2023) reaffirm ACAP's role in innovation and agility, including under digital/analytics investments.

Why mediation? BA and virtual work increase information inflow, but without ACAP the signal-to-action pipeline clogs. With strong ACAP, firms reframe disruptions as learning experiments, translating data and external knowledge into process and business model changes.

Table 5. ACAP stages, routines, and continuity-relevant artifacts

ACAP stage	Continuity routine	Artifact
Acquire	Horizon scanning; incident telemetry review	Signal registry
Assimilate	Cross-functional sensemaking	Joint incident brief
Transform	Rapid pilots; temporary process variants	"Trial cards"
Exploit	Standardize; scale; retire workaround	Updated SOPs/ playbooks

3. Conceptual Model and Propositions

Model logic: STS design quality (H1) and BDAC (H2) both improve continuity performance (speed to restore/renew). Virtualization strengthens continuity directly (H3). ACAP mediates the effects of STS (H4) and BDAC (H5) on BCI. Finally, virtual business amplifies the BA→ACAP path by creating high-variety knowledge inflows (H6). Evidence across domains supports each link, though typically studied in isolation; we integrate them here.

H1. STS joint optimization → higher BCI (speed/quality of adaptive renewal).
H2. BDAC → higher BCI, primarily via capability reconfiguration.
H3. Virtual business intensity → higher BCI through channel/operations continuity.
H4. ACAP mediates STS → BCI by converting experiential learning into process/model changes.
H5. ACAP mediates BDAC → BCI by translating insights into action.

H6. Virtualization strengthens the BA→ACAP path (moderated mediation): more digital interactions increase knowledge variety and recombination opportunities.

Table 6. Summary of propositions and exemplar indicators

Proposition	**Indicator examples (outcome)**
H1 STS → BCI	MTTR↓, decision latency↓, novel SOPs in 30 days
H2 BDAC → BCI	Forecast error delta↓, reallocation speed↑
H3 Virtualization → BCI	% revenue preserved, % processes virtualized
H4/5 ACAP mediation	Time from “insight” to “standard” ↓; rate of process innovation↑
H6 Moderated mediation	Stronger BA→ACAP slope at higher digital intensity

4. Comparative Analysis Across Disruption Types

We compare how STS, BA, virtual business, and ACAP play out across three archetypes: pandemic (systemic mobility shock), cyber incident (fast, technical), and upstream supply shock (persistent, uncertain).

Table 7. Cross-disruption comparative analysis

Disruption	STS challenges	BA role	Virtual business role	ACAP role	Key evidence
Pandemic	Human safety, remote coordination; re-tasking	Demand sensing; channel mix optimization	Remote work; e-commerce substitution	Capture rapid practice innovations	Digitalized firms more resilient; online channels sustained continuity; WFH productivity mixed/task-specific.
Cyber incident	Rapid cross-functional response; human–machine teaming	Anomaly detection; blast-radius analysis	Temporary isolation/virtualized backups	Institutionalize lessons into runbooks	STS in cyber-physical resilience emphasizes socio-organizational routines alongside tech.
Supply shock	Supplier visibility; redesign of planning roles	Risk sensing; scenario planning; inventory hedges	Digital sales w/ transparent lead times	Assimilate external info; redesign policies	E-commerce + analytics aided continuity in affected sectors.

5. Managerial Playbook: A 90-Day Continuity-Innovation Roadmap

North-star: Treat every incident as an experiment—optimize for time-to-insight and time-to-standard.

Table 8. 90-day actions mapped to the framework

Stream	0–30 days	30–60 days	60–90 days
STS	Stand up incident cells; clarify decision rights; publish single source of truth	Codify handoffs & escalation runbooks	Conduct AARs; retire or standardize workarounds
BDAC	Instrument leading indicators; build crisis dashboards	Embed experiment tracking; uplift data quality on critical pipelines	Add causal/optimization methods to key decisions
Virtual business	Virtualize critical workflows; stress-test remote tools	Scale e-commerce/omnichannel; API with key partners	Optimize hybrid work/ops by task; refine SLAs
ACAP	Launch “insight registry”; schedule cross-functional sensemaking	Fund rapid pilots; measure “insight→action” lag	Institutionalize: update SOPs, training, metrics

6. Research Agenda and Methods

To empirically test the model:

Design. Multi-industry survey + archival performance (pre/during/post disruption), complemented by matched case studies.

Measures (validated where possible).

Table 9. Indicative measurement blueprint

Construct	Example measure	Source cues
STS design quality	Decentralization, psychological safety, clarity of decision rights	STS & cyber-physical resilience scales (adapt).
BDAC	Data infrastructure, analytics talent, governance indices	Gupta & George (instrument), Mikalef et al.
Virtual intensity	% revenue digital, % virtualized processes, platform dependency	Digitalization–resilience studies.
ACAP	Acquire/assimilate/transform/exploit subscales	Recent ACAP empirical work.
BCI outcomes	(a) MTTR, decision latency; (b) renewal metrics: time-to-new SOP/product, % revenue continuity	This paper; sector-specific KPIs

Analytical strategy.

- SEM/PLS to test mediation (ACAP) and moderated mediation (virtualization).
- Event-study around disruption dates to estimate performance cushions (digitalized vs. non-digitalized firms).
- Qualitative process tracing in high-performing cases to observe “insight→standard” cycles.

Comparative lens. Replicate across disruption archetypes (pandemic, cyber, supply) to test boundary conditions.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

Our synthesis positions BCI as an integration of STS (work design), BA (sense/decide), virtual business (deliver), and ACAP (learn/convert). The evidence base from 2013–2023 suggests: (i) BDAC pays off mostly indirectly via dynamic/operational capabilities; (ii) digital/virtual operating models cushion shocks; (iii) ACAP explains why similar tools yield different outcomes; and (iv) STS design determines whether remote/analytics become resilient complements or coordination costs.

Managerial takeaway: Design for time-to-insight and time-to-standard; budget for ACAP routines (sensemaking, pilots, SOP updates) as first-class continuity investments.

References

Alwan, S. Y., Al-Hattami, H. M., & Akram, U. (2023). Sustainable and resilient e-commerce under COVID-19: A meta-theoretical analysis. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30*, 58871–58888. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-25456-0

Bürgel, T. R., Hiebl, M. R. W., & Pielsticker, D. I. (2023). Digitalization and entrepreneurial firms' resilience to pandemic crises: Evidence from COVID-19 and the German Mittelstand. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 186*, 122135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.122135

Dunn Cavelty, M. (2013). From "securitization" to "cyber-security governance": A sociotechnical approach. In J. K.-H. Schmidt & A. Keller (Eds.), *Informatik-Spektrum* (pp. 91–101). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36883-1_4

Gibbs, M., Mengel, F., & Siemroth, C. (2023). Work from home and productivity: Evidence from personnel and analytics data. *Journal of Political Economy Microeconomics, 1*(1), 71–110. https://doi.org/10.1086/721803

Guo, J., Wang, J., & Zhao, Z. (2023). E-commerce and supply chain resilience during COVID-19. *Journal of Agricultural Economics, 74*(2), 465–490. https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12518

Gupta, M., & George, J. F. (2016). Toward the development of a big data analytics capability. *Information & Management, 53*(8), 1049–1064. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2016.07.004

Khan, A., & Tao, J. (2022). Knowledge absorption capacity's efficacy to enhance agility and innovation performance: The mediating role of cost leadership strategy. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 7*(4), 100201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100201

Mikalef, P., Boura, M., Lekakos, G., & Krogstie, J. (2021). Building dynamic capabilities by leveraging big data analytics: An empirical investigation. *Information & Management, 58*(6), 103412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2020.103412

Mikalef, P., Krogstie, J., Pappas, I. O., & Pavlou, P. A. (2020). Exploring the relationship between big data analytics capability and competitive performance: The mediating roles of dynamic and operational capabilities. *Information & Management, 57*(8), 103387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2019.05.004

Radic, M., Herrmann, P., Haberland, P. H., & Riese, C. R. (2022). Development of a business model resilience framework for managers and strategic decision-makers. *Schmalenbach Journal of Business Research, 74*(4), 543–574. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41471-022-00135-x

Said, O., Albagory, Y., Helmy, Y., & El-Shafei, M. (2019). Social cyber-physical resilience (SCPR): A new perspective for enabling next-generation resilience. *SAGE Open, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1847979019827151

Sancho-Zamora, R., Arroyo-Carrion, J., Martínez-Martínez, A., & García-Lillo, F. (2022). The impact of absorptive capacity on innovation: A bibliometric review and measurement scale. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(2), 842. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19020842

Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J.-F., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. *Journal of Business Research, 70*, 356–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.009

Yuan, Y., Lu, H., & Yang, M. (2022). Understanding organizational resilience in a platform context: Resource orchestration as a microfoundation. *Journal of Business Research, 144*, 527–539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.11.012