

LEARNING FROM CRISIS: POST-CRISIS EVALUATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE



Angia Sulaeman
Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia
angiasulaeman@gmail.com

Abstract

In an organization, failure is an inevitable occurrence. Organizational responses reflect a form of learning that is expected to improve organizational quality in the post-crisis period. Organizations are required to integrate crisis communication at both managerial and operational levels in order to create synergy and develop effective strategies for dealing with future crises and recover the image that caused by the previous crisis. Therefore, post-crisis evaluation is essential as a learning process for anticipating and managing future crises and should be carried out at all levels of the organization. Based on a literature review on post-crisis evaluation and organizational resilience, effective post-crisis management requires the development of multi-level resilience, transparency, and integration of crisis communication, leadership integration, knowledge management, organizational learning, and post-crisis handling aimed at rebuilding trust and organizational reputation. By establishing a comprehensive crisis evaluation process, organizations are expected to restore public legitimacy and trust.

Keywords: Crisis Management, Post-Crisis Evaluation, Organizational Resilience, Crisis Communication, Organizational Learning, Public Trust

INTRODUCTION

In an organization, post-crisis evaluation serves as a means of disseminating a culture of self reflection and learning and is regarded as a highly effective tool for improving the quality of rapid response systems after a crisis (Conoscenti et al., 2021). The integration of crisis communication and operational crisis management helps to build strong crisis preparedness strategies and coordinated crisis responses. Consequently, strengthening crisis detection and prevention, particularly in the form of attack-related crises, will support organizations in dealing with future crises (Dobosz, 2020). During a crisis, the optimization of resource management is vital. Key activities include preparing planning and preparedness strategies, allocating available resources, developing technology and data analytics, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders. These efforts are undertaken to enhance readiness in facing future challenges, as the complexity of subsequent crises is expected to continue increasing (Khirfan et al., 2025). Furthermore, evaluations of crisis management efforts must be effective and result in actionable and implementable recommendations (Conoscenti et al., 2021).

Organization images will always dynamic, the crisis treatment within organization would be different, a corporation's image is not unitary or homogenous. Audiences will continue to evaluate whether corrective promises into concrete action. Ethnography and experimental approaches to solve the post crisis be needed not only depend on the rhetorical criticism, particularly in advancing image theory (Benoit & Benoit, 2009) Image is the essential to organization, image is a central concept to the field of public relations, the key to understanding image repair strategies during crisis has 2 components that consist of the accused is held responsible for an action and the act is considered offensive (Benoit, 1997).

Organizational resilience in dealing with crises cannot be built solely through technology or policy measures; rather, it must be cultivated across all organizational levels using a multilevel and interdisciplinary approach (Borg et al., 2022). There are three primary levels of organizational resilience individual, group, and organizational which together form an integrated system of organizational resilience (Raetze et al., 2021). Organizational resilience is a critical factor in times of uncertainty, and one of the key actions to strengthen it is the development of a set of strategic initiatives prepared by various sub-units within the organization (Gečienė, 2020). Based on the discussion above, a research question emerges regarding how organizations can build and implement organizational resilience across all levels through post crisis learning in order to survive and remain effective amid uncertainty.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Situational crisis communication theory (SCCT) explain that the effectivity of crisis response is depend on how audience see the organization response thorough the caused of crisis and how to response the crisis, since audience never see the crisis from the neutral side (Coombs, 2021). Basically SCCT combine instructing and adjusting information to create base response. SCCT hold that the ethical base response should be the first communication from an organization when the crisis create or has the potential to create victims (Coombs, 2021). Crisis communication should be viewed as strategic communication as well as a chance to demonstrate the organizations as well a chance to demonstrate the organization's crisis performance capabilities, it should be shifted from the threat become to opportunity (Coombs, 2021). There are three main categories to response the crisis that consist of

adjusting information, instructing information and reputation management. The crisis manager should be starting with the ethical response that is ideal for combating the reputational damage (Coombs, 2021). Beside the SCCT, Image restoration theory (IRT) should be implementing in related respon the crisis. IRT is the approach that will be used by the organization to recover their reputation or image (Benoit & Benoit, 2009). Image is the perception that owned by the organization based on how audience see the organization (Benoit, 1997).

The organization has to choose their own strategy to evaluate their crisis that match with their image restoration (Chen et al., 2023)

1. Popularity analysis of emergencies
The effectiveness of corporate image restoration during a crisis can be observed through the level of public attention and public opinion *before* the organization issues an official response. This effectiveness is strongly influenced by the speed of the organizational response to the crisis. Approximately 80% of organizations typically release an initial statement within the first 12 hours, a period in which public emotions are generally at their peak.
2. Sentiment analysis of textual data
This analysis is conducted to assess whether image restoration strategies are capable of reducing negative public emotions before and after a crisis event
3. Extraction of public opinions in specific industry
This approach is used to evaluate the suitability of particular crisis response strategies within a given industry context. Benoit (1997) proposes that Image Restoration Theory consists of five primary strategies:
 - a. Denial, a strategy aimed at restoring image by rejecting responsibility, which includes two variations, direct and explicit denial of the allegations and Shifting blame to another party.
 - b. Evading responsibility, which includes Claiming that the organization's actions were merely responses to the offensive actions of others, avoiding responsibility by asserting a lack of information or control, framing the offensive act as unintentional and claiming that the action was undertaken with good intentions.
 - c. Reducing offensiveness, whereby an organization accused of wrongdoing attempts to lessen the perceived severity of the act. This strategy includes six forms : bolstering (emphasizing positive attributes), minimization (downplaying the severity of the act), differentiation (distinguishing the act from more offensive behaviors), transcendence (placing the act within a more favorable context), attacking the accuser, and compensation (providing restitution to affected parties).
 - d. Mortification, which involves offering an apology as part of image restoration efforts.
 - e. Corrective action, in which the organization promises the public that the same mistake will not be repeated
4. Public opinion topic mining of specific corporate. Based on these five strategies, negative public emotions can effectively be mitigated primarily through two

approaches: corrective action and mortification. In contrast, denial, trivializing the crisis, and evading responsibility tend to exacerbate reputational damage rather than facilitate image recovery.

Decision-making during crises is influenced by multiple variables. In business contexts, timeliness is central to managerial behavior; therefore, management must cultivate the capability to act swiftly in order to enter the market before competitors do, as delayed responses may disrupt profitability (Coccia, 2020). Effective decision-making must account for bounded rationality, as decision makers face limitations stemming from problem complexity, human cognitive constraints, and the limited time available to make decisions. Under such conditions, organizations tend to pursue satisficing behavior rather than maximizing optimal critical decisions (Coccia, 2020). In general, complex problems can provide valuable lessons for organizational contingency planning and future crisis training. However, the extraction of such lessons is often hindered by cognitive and organizational barriers. Consequently, Coccia (2020) identifies three decision-making approaches in crisis contexts:

1. Resolution: applying existing or previously used solutions.
2. Solution: seeking the most optimal solution available.
3. Dissolution: redesigning organizational structures to eliminate the root causes of the problem an approach considered most effective in addressing complex crises and turbulent business environments.

In responding to future crises, learning during crises serves as a prerequisite for developing a learning organization that contributes to organizational memory. The establishment of knowledge management systems can function as an infrastructure for rapid yet measured decision-making (Buhagiar & Anand, 2023). In post-crisis remedial activities, organizations are required to remain consistent with legitimacy theory, whereby organizational members voluntarily and substantially increase the disclosure of relevant information to restore public legitimacy (Whitehead & Belghitar, 2022).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a literature review approach as its primary research method. The review is conducted in a concise and focused manner, synthesizing key scholarly works that are most relevant to the research topic. Rather than exhaustively covering all available sources, the literature review is structured around a detailed analytical framework that identifies central themes and potential references for further development, as suggested by Creswell (2009). The selection of literature was carried out using purposive sampling based on three main criteria. First, the selected studies demonstrate strong thematic relevance to the research focus, particularly in relation to post-crisis management, the development of multi-level organizational resilience after crises, transparency and integrity in post-crisis communication, the integration of leadership, knowledge management, and organizational learning, as well as post-crisis efforts aimed at maintaining organizational reputation and external trust. These themes reflect the core dimensions of post crisis learning and resilience building discussed in contemporary crisis management literature.

Second, this study includes only peer reviewed journal articles published between 2020 and 2025, while books published between 2015 and 2025 were also considered to

provide foundational theoretical perspectives. This time frame was selected to ensure that the analysis reflects the most recent developments and insights in crisis management and organizational resilience research. Third, academic validation was ensured by selecting publications from reputable and internationally recognized publishers and journals, including SAGE, Taylor & Francis, Elsevier, Wiley, Oxford, MDPI, Emerald, as well as other journals indexed and accredited by Scopus. This rigorous selection process was intended to maintain the quality, credibility, and academic robustness of the literature reviewed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Post-Crisis Management

In essence, organizations inevitably experience crises; some fail, while others successfully navigate them. The most critical aspect for organizations is their ability to draw lessons from past crises (Ulmer et al., 2019). Although risks cannot be entirely avoided after a crisis, they must be managed dynamically (Das & Wong, 2014). Organizations are therefore required to maintain continuous readiness for crises that may permanently disrupt organizational stability and, where possible, to prevent crises from occurring (Vašíčková, 2020). Post-crisis planning is essential as both an evaluative and strategic tool, enabling organizations to adapt, recover, and strengthen remaining systems following a crisis (Khirfan et al., 2025). Figure X illustrates how crisis management operates as a process (Vašíčková, 2020).

Crisis management as a process involves a sequence of steps and procedures that guide crisis prediction and identification. A crisis management approach refers to the strategy selected to resolve a crisis. A reactive approach aims to restore business stability through clear procedures initiated after crisis identification, whereas a proactive approach anticipates future crises based on analysis and lessons learned from previous events (Vašíčková, 2020).

Crises can be categorized into *predictable surprises*, which can be anticipated and prepared for, and *unpredictable surprises*, which occur unexpectedly and are often associated with attack-related crises that may threaten organizational reputation (Dobosz, 2020; Ulmer et al., 2019). According to Buhagiar and Anand (2023), every crisis must be anticipated through three key dimensions:

- a. **Organizational personnel:** Organizational leaders, occupying strategic positions, must proactively manage crisis processes by balancing paradoxes and tensions, fostering organizational flexibility, regulatory compliance, employee voice, and preventing opinion isolation.
- b. **Organizational learning:** Leaders in crisis contexts are required to demonstrate commitment to creating a continuous learning environment grounded in past organizational experiences or organizational memory.
- c. **Knowledge management:** Knowledge management functions as a guideline for decision-making based on organizational history.

To support post-crisis learning, evaluation is indispensable in determining which practices remain applicable and which should be discontinued. Such evaluations must be crisis-specific and adopt tailored approaches depending on the nature of the crisis, for example, by involving stakeholders and clearly communicating post-evaluation

recommendations. These approaches are applicable across organizational domains, and recommendations must be disseminated to all organizational members, as employees generally recognize the importance of learning from crises (Björnqvist et al., 2025; Conoscenti et al., 2021). It is also important to recognize two organizational models: organizations that implement pre-damage minimization can significantly reduce crisis impacts, particularly when complemented by post-crisis actions. Conversely, organizations lacking pre-damage minimization experience greater negative effects, which are further amplified in the absence of post-damage minimization. This demonstrates that both pre-crisis and post-crisis preparedness significantly influence crisis outcomes (Sato, 2015; Sokol et al., 2021).

Crises may also trigger organizational learning by highlighting the importance of both internal and external resources. Learning can occur indirectly through *vicarious learning* or directly through *experiential learning* (Islam et al., 2022). Externally, government policies may contribute to post-crisis recovery by protecting society at large, including affected organizations (Kudej et al., 2021). Internally, shared understanding and collective mental models regarding organizational development and change initiatives are critical to effective learning and organizational growth (Nyström et al., 2018). Public attention to crises reflects an ongoing process of public evaluation. As stakeholders assess crisis responses, organizations must engage in continued communication and crisis monitoring to mitigate residual risks, particularly when crises generate *crisis hooks* that prolong public scrutiny (Coombs, 2021; Hendriks et al., 2020). In some cases, organizations employ corporate crisis advertising, typically involving apologies and disclosures of mitigation efforts. However, organizations must exercise caution, as such communication may backfire if perceived as insincere or inconsistent with actual practices (Ho et al., 2017).

2. Multilevel Resilience Development

Post-crisis management cannot be conducted by a single organizational actor, particularly from a communication perspective. Effective integration of crisis communication and operational crisis management facilitates cohesive crisis responses and robust preparedness strategies (Dobosz, 2020). Organizational member participation in crisis response is influenced by internal communication practices, servant leadership, and transparent communication, which encourage post-crisis learning and adaptation, thereby strengthening organizational resilience, legitimacy, and trust (Elshaer & Saad, 2022; Hendriks et al., 2020).

The development of professional principles at both personal and systemic levels, along with the implementation of monitoring systems, supports effective organizational governance (Jambarsang et al., 2025). To cultivate positive organizational character, leaders must model exemplary behavior by empowering employees, providing recognition, respecting individual interests, and granting autonomy, thereby enabling employees to adapt and build resilience (Elshaer & Saad, 2022).

Organizational resilience operates across individual, team, and organizational levels. At the individual level, resilience is shaped by optimism, coping skills, self-efficacy, leadership support, and emotional regulation. Team-level resilience reflects collective responses to pressure, emerging through shared beliefs, mutual trust, and adaptive coordination that enhance performance, innovation, and learning capacity. At the organizational level, resilience is defined as adaptive capacity to sustain core functions

and engage in critical learning, resulting in empirically demonstrated positive relationships between resilience, firm performance, product innovation, and organizational effectiveness (Raetze et al., 2021).

3. Transparency and Integration of Crisis Communication

Transparent organizational communication during crises positively influences the development and reinforcement of employee resilience, contributing to a constructive work climate in which employees participate in decision-making and face future challenges with confidence (Elshaer & Saad, 2022). Communication transparency emerges through interdisciplinary integration that enriches organizational knowledge regarding resilience (Elshaer & Saad, 2022). Ideally, crisis communication should prioritize transparency and public safety; however, sensitive information is often withheld within organizations (Dobosz, 2020).

4. Integration of Leadership, Knowledge Management, and Organizational Learning

In market contexts, consumers are frequently exposed to negative information about organizations or individuals, triggering adverse reactions that influence negative word-of-mouth through vicarious learning. To mitigate such damage, organizations must implement strategies encompassing pre-crisis damage alleviation, such as reputational insurance, and post-crisis damage alleviation through public statements and recovery actions (Sato, 2015; Ulmer et al., 2019).

Stronger integration between crisis communication and operational crisis management promotes cohesive crisis responses and enhanced preparedness. Consequently, communication practitioners add organizational value in post-crisis contexts by supporting reputation building and stakeholder engagement, which directly affect organizational outcomes (Dobosz, 2020). Learning during crises is a prerequisite for developing learning-oriented organizations and contributes to organizational memory. Knowledge management systems serve as infrastructure for rapid yet measured decision-making (Buhagiar & Anand, 2023).

5. Post-Crisis Management in Building Trust and Reputation

Organizational reputation is constructed through public evaluation based on criticism, support, and contestation. Positive evaluations can benefit organizations through improved product ratings and customer satisfaction, whereas negative assessments make reputational recovery increasingly difficult (Stanton, 2020). Crises generate affective and cognitive responses that shape reputation, necessitating remedial efforts (Ho et al., 2017; Sato, 2015; Vašíčková, 2020; Whitehead & Belghitar, 2022).

Public trust recovery can be achieved through transparent communication and leadership practices (Dobosz, 2020; Elshaer & Saad, 2022; Ulmer et al., 2019). Reputation can be restored through remedial actions aimed at re-establishing organizational legitimacy (Whitehead & Belghitar, 2022). Organizations may also leverage technology to support reputational recovery, as integrated crisis strategies influence response acceptance and strengthen public trust (Dobosz, 2020).

Social media represents a key mechanism for crisis communication, enabling public access to information and facilitating public discourse. During crises, social media allows publics to (a) communicate with others, (b) communicate about others, (c) engage in oppositional communication, (d) discuss past events, and (e) evaluate one another (Baniya, 2024). In implementing post-crisis remedial actions, organizations must remain consistent with legitimacy theory, whereby organizational actors voluntarily and substantially increase relevant disclosures to restore public legitimacy (Whitehead & Belghitar, 2022).

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that post crisis evaluation plays a critical role in transforming crises into valuable learning opportunities for organizations. Through systematic reflection and evaluation, organizations are able to identify weaknesses, improve crisis response mechanisms, and strengthen organizational resilience across individual, group, and organizational levels. The integration of post-crisis evaluation with effective leadership, transparent crisis communication, knowledge management, and organizational learning significantly enhances an organization's capacity to adapt to and respond to future uncertainties. Ultimately, organizations that institutionalize post-crisis learning are better positioned to restore legitimacy, rebuild public trust, and sustain long-term resilience in an increasingly complex and unpredictable environment.

Recommendations

Based on the discussion, several reflections and implications emerge, leading to a set of practical recommendations. Post-crisis situations represent a critical turning point for organizations to ensure their survival. To develop effective recovery strategies, organizations need to conduct comprehensive evaluations and institutionalize post-crisis assessments through standardized operating procedures (SOPs). Formalizing evaluation standards not only strengthens reflection and organizational learning but also enables organizations to repeatedly apply lessons learned when facing future crises (Conoscenti et al., 2021; Sokol et al., 2021). In efforts to restore organizational reputation after a crisis, the strategic use of social media can serve as an effective crisis communication tool by providing transparent information and regular updates to the public (Dobosz, 2020). Additionally, engaging directly with specific communities can support reputation recovery by rebuilding relationships and public perception (Hurtado Illanes, 2024).

Post-crisis management should be recognized as a shared responsibility across all organizational levels. Conducting training programs and crisis drills tailored to each organizational role can enhance preparedness and clarify responsibilities in anticipating future crises (Ho et al., 2017; Raetze et al., 2021). Furthermore, maintaining transparency and open dialogue with stakeholders is a more effective approach to reputation recovery than denying or avoiding acknowledgment of past crises. Honest communication can significantly contribute to restoring public trust (Hendriks et al., 2020; Whitehead & Belghitar, 2022). Complementary actions, such as implementing corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, may also function as symbolic and practical expressions of accountability and apology (Sato, 2015). Organizational leaders are expected to adopt a service-oriented mindset toward employees, which can be fostered through targeted leadership development

programs based on the outcomes of leadership evaluations (Elshaer & Saad, 2022; Jambarsang et al., 2025). Where feasible, post-crisis strategies derived from evaluation processes should be further examined through empirical research to assess the effectiveness of integrated crisis management frameworks.

From a scholarly perspective, several implications can be highlighted. Crisis management should not be viewed solely as operational recovery but as a long-term process aimed at restoring legitimacy and public trust (Sato, 2015). Organizational resilience cannot be achieved through a single dimension; instead, it requires the development of multi-level resilience encompassing individuals, groups, and organizational systems (Nyström et al., 2018; Raetze et al., 2021). Transparent crisis communication plays a crucial role in repairing trust, as post-crisis reputation is shaped not only by organizational image but also by voluntary stakeholder support and the quality of organizational relationships (Buhagiar & Anand, 2023; Dobosz, 2020; Whitehead & Belghitar, 2022). Moreover, leaders' ability to learn from failure enhances organizational readiness in dealing with predictable surprise crises and fosters a culture of integrity-based communication (Buhagiar & Anand, 2023; Elshaer & Saad, 2022; Hendriks et al., 2020; Ulmer et al., 2019). Finally, improvements in organizational reputation are strongly influenced by transparency and honesty, while the integration of leadership, knowledge management, and organizational learning remains a key determinant of effective post crisis management (Hendriks et al., 2020; Ulmer et al., 2019; Buhagiar & Anand, 2023).

REFERENCES

- Baniya, S. (2024). *Transnational assemblages: Social justice and crisis communication during disaster*. <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/swr/assemblages/>
- Benoit, W. L. (1997). *Image Repair Discourse and Crisis Communication*. 23(2), 177–186.
- Benoit, W. L., & Benoit, W. L. (2009). *strategies*. 3373(May). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370009385578>
- Coccia, M. (2020, June). Critical decision in crisis management: Rational strategies of decision making. *KSPJournals.org*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.1453/jel.v7i2.2049>
- Chen, F., Chen, H., Huang, S., Liang, Y., & Liu, Y. (2023). *Roles of Corporate Reputation and Service Recovery in Food Safety*.
- Coombs, W. . T. (2021). Ongoing Crisis Communication. In *ペインクリニック学会治療指針 2*.
- Björnvist, A., Jonson, C. O., Prytz, E., Johansson, B. J. E., & Berggren, P. (2025). Assessing the impact of evaluations of crisis management efforts. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 118, 105226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2025.105226>
- Borg, N., Naderpajouh, N., Scott-Young, C. M., & Borg, J. (2022). An interdisciplinary and multi-level review of resilience to inform training of human resources for critical infrastructure. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 78, 103113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2022.103113>
- Buhagiar, K., & Anand, A. (2023). Synergistic triad of crisis management: Leadership, knowledge management and organizational learning. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(2), 412–429. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-03-2021-2672>

- Conoscenti, E., Martucci, G., Piazza, M., Tuzzolino, F., Ragonese, B., Burgio, G., Arena, G., Blot, S., Luca, A., Arcadipane, A., & Chiaramonte, G. (2021). Post-crisis debriefing: A tool for improving quality in the medical emergency team system. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, 63, 102977. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iccn.2020.102977>
- Coombs, W. T. (2021). *Ongoing crisis communication*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.).
- Das, R., & Wong, M. C. S. (2014). Understanding the relationship between liquidity and inflation in the post-crisis period in India: From bank dealers' perspectives. In *Emerging markets and the global economy: A handbook* (1st ed.). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-411549-1.00005-3>
- Dobosz, S. (2020). Crisis, communication, and Canadian hospitals: An analysis and evaluation of risk preparedness and crisis communication efforts of Ontario hospitals. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 45(3), 365–385. <https://doi.org/10.22230/CJC.2020V45N3A3591>
- Elshaer, I. A., & Saad, S. K. (2022). Learning from failure: Building resilience in small- and medium-sized tourism enterprises, the role of servant leadership and transparent communication. *Sustainability*, 14(22). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142215199>
- Gečienė, J. (2020). The resilience of organizations in the context of regional social sustainability: Management challenges under uncertainty. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 83(1), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mosr-2020-0003>
- Hendriks, F., Kienhues, D., & Bromme, R. (2020). Replication crisis = trust crisis? The effect of successful vs failed replications on laypeople's trust in researchers and research. *Public Understanding of Science*, 29(3), 270–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662520902383>
- Ho, B., Shin, W., & Pang, A. (2017). Corporate crisis advertising: A framework examining the use and effects of corporate advertising before and after crises. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 23(6), 537–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2015.1136349>
- Hurtado Illanes, M. (2024). Exploring shared challenges of empowered patients and entrepreneurs: Towards diversity, innovation, and entrepreneurship in post-crisis contexts. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14080164>
- Isbahi, M. B., Zuana, M. M. M. ., & Mariana, E. R. . (2022). The Technology Strategy in Website Communication Media in Improving Business Activities. *Majapahit Journal of Islamic Finance and Management*, 1(2), 126–138. <https://doi.org/10.31538/mjifm.v1i2.17>
- Islam, K., Edwards, A. L., Shi, D., Lim, J. R., Sheppard, R., Liu, B. F., & Seeger, M. W. (2022). Crisis communication and learning: The US higher education's response to a global pandemic. *The Learning Organization*, 29(4), 357–376. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-10-2021-0121>
- Jambarsang, S., Mehrparvar, A. H., & Keshmiri, F. (2025). Assessment of leadership and professional behavior of educational managers in the complex and post-crisis era:

- Perspectives of educators. *BMC Research Notes*, 18(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-025-07166-7>
- Khirfan, R., AlHasan, N., Atiyeh, H., Khalifeh, A. H., Holmes, S., & Kotb, H. (2025). Optimizing resources management in crises: Strategies, challenges, benefits and conceptual framework development. *Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology*, 2249–2255. <https://doi.org/10.52711/0974-360X.2025.00322>
- Kudej, M., Gavurova, B., & Rowland, Z. (2021). Evaluation of the selected economic parameters of Czech companies and their potential for overcoming global crises during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of International Studies*, 14(1), 258–275. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2021/14-1/18>
- Nyström, M. E., Höög, E., Garvare, R., Andersson Bäck, M., Terris, D. D., & Hansson, J. (2018). Exploring the potential of a multi-level approach to improve capability for continuous organizational improvement and learning in a Swedish healthcare region. *BMC Health Services Research*, 18(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3129-3>
- Raetze, S., Duchek, S., Maynard, M. T., & Kirkman, B. L. (2021). Resilience in organizations: An integrative multilevel review and editorial introduction. *Group & Organization Management*, 46(4), 607–656. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011211032129>
- Sato, S. (2015). *Sports management and sports humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-4-431-55324-3>
- Sokol, R. L., Heinze, J., Doan, J., Normand, M., Grodzinski, A., Pomerantz, N., Scott, B. A., Gaswirth, M., & Zimmerman, M. (2021). Crisis interventions in schools: A systematic review. *Journal of School Violence*, 20(2), 241–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2021.1879098>
- Stanton, P. V. (2020). *The PR News book of crisis management: A guide to preparing for, mitigating during, and recovering after crises* (Vol. 10). https://www.prnewsonline.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/prnews_crisis-management-vol-10-guidebook_final.pdf
- Ulmer, R. R., Sellnow, T. L., & Seeger, M. W. (2019). *Effective crisis communication* (4th ed.).
- Vašíčková, V. (2020). Crisis management process: A literature review and a conceptual integration. *Acta Oeconomica Pragensia*, 27(3–4), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.aop.628>
- Whitehead, M., & Belghitar, Y. (2022). Responding to a corruption crisis through disclosure and remedial action: The case of Petrobras. *The British Accounting Review*, 54(5), 101119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2022.101119>
- Zuana, M. M. M., Toha, M., & Isbahi, M. B. (2024). Exploration of Community Empowerment in a Village as the Entrance to a Lake in East Java. *Malacca: Journal of Management and Business Development*, 1(1), 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.69965/malacca.v1i1.52>