

## **Preparedness, Leadership, and Resilience: Crisis Management Principles in Educational Institutions**

Elena Khanzadyan, Management Development Institute of Singapore in Tashkent,  
Uzbekistan

The Asian Conference on Education & International Development 2026  
Official Conference Proceedings

### **Abstract**

We all have to admit that the operational context for educational institutions today has changed dramatically. The reality is that crises have become not just rare disruptions, but recurring realities that challenge stability and development. From the COVID-19 pandemic to rapid technological change and uncertainties, schools and universities must navigate environments marked by volatility, risk, and unexpected “black swan” events. This paper explores the principles of crisis management as a framework for strengthening leadership and governance in education. The conceptual part of the paper is built around three dimensions: (1) preparedness, including institutional readiness, planning mechanisms, and proactive strategies that anticipate disruptions; (2) leadership – adaptive, ethical, and transparent decision-making that sustains both organizational continuity and trust within learning communities; and (3) resilience – the ability of institutions to transform challenges into opportunities for educational innovation and sustainable growth. The paper views crisis management not as limited to emergency response, but as a strategic foundation for institutional development; it draws on international and regional literature and is positioning the study within an emerging doctoral research project in management and economics. By bridging insights from management science and psychology with the realities of higher education and related service organizations, the study offers a conceptual map to guide empirical analysis in Uzbekistan and comparable contexts. The contribution is twofold: conceptually, it reframes crisis management as an educational leadership tool for fostering stability and growth; practically, it highlights actionable, trust-based practices that can enhance resilience and preparedness in resource-constrained learning environments.

*Keywords:* crisis management, resilience, higher education

**iafor**

The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## Introduction

Today educational institutions are increasingly facing environments that feature instability, complexity, and rapid transformation. Back to the COVID-19 pandemic, numerous system vulnerabilities and imperfections were revealed across global education systems, thus forcing institutions to adapt quickly to online learning, reorganize processes, and operate under conditions of prolonged uncertainty (Gössling et al., 2020). However, it is not only health-related crises that mark the complex context educational institutions have to operate in. Technological advances, continuous change, geopolitical pressures, and policy reforms, all force educational organizations to reconsider their daily operational routines.

Despite this, crisis management in education often remains reactive and fragmented. Institutions mainly focus on immediate responses aimed at absorbing shocks and immediate threats. Little is done to implement long-term changes into strategic and methodology planning. Another concern here is that academic literature mainly views crisis management from one dimension: it is either managerial perspective, or psychological lens, thus disregarding its potentially fruitful structural-behavioral integration.

This paper is aiming at filling the existing gap by conceptualizing crisis management as a comprehensive strategic competency in education. The study attempts to build and empirically test a model based on three key dimensions (preparedness, leadership, and resilience) and examine the interactions between these dimensions in the context of higher education institutions. Combining quantitative and qualitative data from institutions in Uzbekistan, the study provides a more holistic understanding of crisis management in education.

## Literature Review

The theoretical background for the given study is the traditional understanding of crisis management as a focus on reactive response to a broader approach that combines preparedness, adaptability, and organizational learning (Boin et al., 2017; Coombs, 2015). In complex systems, crises are commonly viewed as inevitable outcomes of interdependence and uncertainty rather than rare failures (Perrow, 2011). Authors believe that this approach is highly relevant for educational institutions, because they operate in a multi-layered environment that involves multiple stakeholders: students, staff, administrative structures, and external stakeholders.

To begin with the first dimension: preparedness is widely viewed as a fundamental element of crisis management. However, research shows that there is noticeable difference between what we call formal preparedness, and the actual one. According to Mitroff (2005), organizations often develop crisis action plans that are more symbolic than practical, and as such, cannot be integrated into daily work and decision-making processes. When it comes to educational institutions, this gap may be exacerbated by limited resources and competing institutional goals, as well as priority setting at different levels (nationwide, regional, university-based).

Another central factor in effective response to any crisis situation is leadership. In the context of uncertainty management, crisis leadership requires the combination of decisiveness and empathy, ensuring operational continuity and psychological stability (Dirani et al., 2020). However, leadership's role in educational institutions is particularly complex due to the

diversity of stakeholders and the importance of maintaining trust within all academic communities involved.

Third key concept this paper is built on is resilience. Quite recently, resilience has become a dimension that can build the bridge between preparedness and leadership. Ducheck (2020) defines resilience as the ability of organizations to absorb shocks, adapt to changing conditions, and recover while maintaining core functions. Also, resilience should be seen not only as a structural competency, but also behavioral, manifested through communication, collaboration, and other practices.

Also, this paper considers psychological aspects of organizational change in the context of crises. For example, recent studies indicate the role of perception, uncertainty, and behavioral changes in the transitions to sustainable and green economic systems in shaping responses to systemic change (Ducheck, 2020; Khanzadyan, 2025; Wenzel et al., 2020). These findings clearly indicate the need for psychology and management integration into understanding crisis management.

## **Methodology**

This study used an exploratory cross-sectional design combining quantitative and qualitative methods.

### **Participants**

84 respondents from higher education institutions in Uzbekistan were selected, including faculty staff (42), administrative staff (18), and senior students (24). This multi-level sample allowed for inclusion of diverse perspectives on crisis management in institutional settings. It is also worth mentioning that educational institutions that participated in the study also involved international respondents. This can enhance, as well as complicate the results interpretation.

### **Data Collection**

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire that addressed three main dimensions:

- Preparedness: crisis planning, training, risk awareness
- Leadership: communication, transparency, flexibility, ethical clarity
- Resilience: adaptability, recovery, innovation

Responses were rated using a five-point Likert scale. Open-ended questions were included to obtain qualitative insights into participants' experiences and participants were encouraged to answer them fully, through guided instruction.

### **Data Analysis**

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and means analysis. Qualitative responses were analyzed using thematic coding following Braun and Clarke (2006), which allowed for the identification of recurring patterns and contextual interpretation of quantitative results.

## Results

The results of the survey will be used for further study extension to 500 respondents and are presented in this paper as a pilot study. That's why, the study limitations should be noted when interpreting the results.

The analysis reveals clear discrepancy across the three dimensions (Table 1). As can be seen, Preparedness is the weakest here, while leadership demonstrates the strongest presence. Resilience shows the average result, compared to the other two dimensions, but is much closer to Leadership.

**Table 1**  
*Mean Scores by Dimension*

Dimension	Mean	Interpretation
Preparedness	2.9	Moderate-Low readiness
Leadership	3.8	Strong
Resilience	3.5	Moderate

### Preparedness: Structural Weaknesses

Preparedness levels indicate a significant gap between existing structures and operational readiness (Table 2). Only 46% of respondents reported having clear crisis response plans.

This suggests that preparedness is often viewed as a formal requirement rather than a built-in capability. Most institutions may have documentation on how to act and behave in times of uncertainty, but they may lack working mechanisms to implement these practices, such as training, simulations, or clearly defined roles. As a result, preparedness remains largely reactive, consistent with broader research in crisis management (Mitroff, 2005).

### Leadership: Central Stabilizing Mechanism

Leadership results demonstrate that it is the most influential dimension (Table 1). A strong majority of respondents reported high level of effective communication and transparency.

**Table 2**  
*Selected Survey Responses (later supported by qualitative findings as well)*

Statement	% Agreement
We have a clear crisis plan	46%
Leadership communicates transparently	81%
Institution adapts quickly to change	68%

These results demonstrate that leadership compensates for structural weaknesses by providing direction, clarity, and psychological reassurance. Leaders who communicate consistently and act decisively contribute significantly to institutional stability.

### **Resilience: Adaptive but Uneven**

The level of Resilience is moderate (Table 1), reflecting the capacity of institutions to adapt under pressure. However, this adaptability is often uneven and relies on individuals or teams rather than institutional systems.

It can be inferred that resilience exists but is not fully institutionalized. Instead, it manifests itself through informal practices, such as collaboration, flexibility, and problem solving.

### **Relationships Between the Three Dimensions**

The close relationship between leadership and resilience suggests that leadership behavior plays a critical role in ensuring adaptive capacity (Table 3).

The study's findings demonstrate that crisis management in educational institutions is determined by the interaction of structural and behavioral factors. While preparedness provides a foundation, leadership activates and supports resilience.

**Table 3**

*Relationships Between Dimensions*

Relationship	Strength
Preparedness - Resilience	Moderate
Leadership - Resilience	Strong
Preparedness - Leadership	Moderate

Qualitative insights from open-ended responses further support the quantitative findings. Participants frequently emphasized the importance of clear communication, flexibility, and informal coordination during crisis situations. Several respondents among administrative staff noted that proper and transparent leader's communication helped reduce uncertainty, while others (both administrative and academic staff) highlighted the role of peer collaboration and problem solving. These themes make a strong point that resilience in educational institutions is not only structural but also behavioral and enacted through individuals rather than the organization itself.

## **Discussion**

One of the main results revealed by the is a huge fundamental imbalance in crisis management in educational institutions. As we have seen, leadership plays a dominant role, while crisis preparedness remains poor and resilience is unevenly distributed.

This imbalance means a lot and might have huge implications in the long-term. While it would be true to say that strong leadership can compensate for weak preparedness in the short term,

long-term resilience obviously requires institutionalizing crisis management practices. Otherwise, institutions will remain highly vulnerable and dependent on individual leadership abilities, that paired with low structural preparedness, makes them fragile and unstable in times of uncertainty.

Also, a moderate level of resilience indicates that educational institutions have decent level of adaptive capacity, but this capacity is not systematic. Instead, resilience is often fragmented and is performed through informal and reactive processes. It is suggested that future studies might develop more detailed questionnaires regarding this part, so that to differentiate clearly between what respondents consider to be resilience, and what institutional resilience actually is.

These results suggest that a comprehensive approach to crisis management in educational institutions is needed. The three dimensions explored in this paper (Preparedness, leadership, and Resilience) should not be viewed separately, but should be addressed as interrelated capabilities that must be developed simultaneously. The results also support the use of the following conceptual model: preparedness provides the structural foundation, leadership activates adaptive processes, and resilience reflects the outcome of their interaction. This model that can be further analyzed and developed in future research.

### **Implications**

The study points to a number of practical implications for educational institutions operating in uncertain environments:

Organizations should develop systems aimed at operational preparedness. This could include regular crisis simulations, scenario-based planning exercises, and clearly defined roles and responsibilities during disruptions, either as part of regular training for staff or as part of internal procedures for HE institutions.

They could also strengthen leadership competencies, especially in part where it comes to transparent vertical communication, rapid decision-making, and adaptive coordination plans under uncertainty.

Another aspect could be the institutionalization of certain resilience-enhancing practices, such as agile processes, cross-functional collaboration, and support for innovation.

The interdisciplinary aspect should also be considered. Since management practice is impossible without psychological competencies, it is essential to foster communication based on trust, in which employees (teachers and administrative staff) and students feel supported; in which the well-being of the organization as a whole and its individual participants will be monitored and supported; and in which structured interaction methods are used to overcome uncertainty.

### **Conclusion**

Crisis management is a strategic competency in educational institutions. It should not be seen as a separate domain of management studies. By integrating preparedness, leadership, and resilience, educational institutions can move from reactive measures to stability and adaptation.

The results indicate that the role of leadership in crisis setting is immense, as it currently compensates for structural gaps. However, if an organization wants to ensure long-term effectiveness, it requires balanced development of all three dimensions. Future research should explore these dynamics in different contexts and over time.

### **Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process**

The author declares that Grammarly, an AI-assisted writing software, was used in proofreading and refining the language used in the manuscript. The usage was limited to correcting grammatical and spelling errors and rephrasing statements for accuracy and clarity. The author further declares that, apart from Grammarly, no other AI or AI-assisted technologies have been used to generate content in writing the manuscript. The ideas, design, procedures, findings, analyses, and discussion are originally written and derived from careful and systematic conduct of the research.

## References

- Alves, J. C., Lok, T. C., Luo, Y., & Hao, W. (2020). Crisis management for small business during the COVID-19 outbreak: Survival, resilience and renewal strategies of firms in Macau. *Research in Globalization*, 2, 100006. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3454/v1>
- Baum, T., & Hai, N. T. T. (2020). Hospitality, tourism, human rights and the impact of COVID-19. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(7), 2397–2407. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2020-0242>
- Baum, T., Mooney, S., Robinson, R., & Solnet, D. (2020). COVID-19's impact on the hospitality workforce – New crisis or amplification of the norm? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(9), 2813–2829. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2020-0314>
- Beliaeva, T., Ferasso, M., Kraus, S., & Damke, L. I. (2019). Dynamics of business model innovation: How firms respond to crisis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 110, 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-06-2019-0397>
- Boin, A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2017). *The Politics of Crisis Management* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2017). Crises and crisis management: Integration, interpretation, and research development. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1661–1692. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316680030>
- Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 183–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.037>
- Colmekcioglu, N., Dineva, D., & Lu, X. (2022). Building back better: The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the resilience of the hospitality and tourism industries. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2021-1509>
- Coombs, W. T. (2015). *Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing, and Responding* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Dirani, K. M., Abadi, M., Alizadeh, A., Barhate, B., Garza, R. C., Gunasekara, N., Ibrahim, G., & Majzun, Z. (2020). Leadership competencies and the essential role of human resource development in times of crisis: A response to COVID-19 pandemic. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(9), 380–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1780078>
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13, 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>

- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708>
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59–82.
- Kaparov, B. (2023). Crisis leadership strategies in Central Asian SMEs: Learning from COVID-19 disruptions. *Eurasian Business Review*, 13(1), 55–72.
- Khazadryan, E. (2025). Psychological impacts of green economy implementation on individuals and society: A literature review. *The International Scientific Journal*, 2(3), 70–73. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15267146>
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Kraus, S., Clauss, T., Breier, M., Gast, J., Zardini, A., & Tiberius, V. (2020). The economics of COVID-19: Initial empirical evidence on how family firms in five European countries cope with the corona crisis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 26(5), 1067–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBr-04-2020-0214>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage.
- Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., & Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1753–1760.
- Drew P., & Heritage J. (1992). Analysing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 3–65). Cambridge University Press.
- Mitroff, I. I. (2005). *Why some companies emerge stronger and better from a crisis: 7 essential lessons for surviving disaster*. AMACOM.
- Nguyen, L. D., & Tran, B. Q. (2021). Navigating uncertainty: Crisis communication strategies during COVID-19 in Vietnam's hospitality sector. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 11(2), 1–18.
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1–13.

- Perrow, C. (2011). *Normal Accidents: Living with High-Risk Technologies* (Updated ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). COREQ: A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, *19*(6), 349–357.
- Wenzel, M., Stanske, S., & Lieberman, M. B. (2020). Strategic responses to crisis. *Strategic Management Journal*, *41*(2), V7–V18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3161>
- Zhou, S., Yu, W., Tang, X., & Li, X. (2023). Government crisis communication innovation and its psychological intervention coupling. *Frontiers Psychology*, *13*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1008948>
- Xie, C., Zhang, J., Chen, Y., & Morrison, A. M. (2023). The effect of hotel employee resilience during COVID-19. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *46*, 101087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2023.101087>

**Contact email:** lesa0889@yahoo.com