

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21454024

IMPLEMENTING CRISIS MANAGEMENT IN SAUDI ORGANIZATIONS: A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Najwa Mordhah^{1*}

¹Yanbu Industrial College, Yanbu Industrial City, Saudi Arabia. Email: mordhahn@rcjy.edu.sa,
najwaalmarri775@gmail.com

Received: 02/01/2026
Accepted: 11/01/2026

Corresponding Author: Najwa Mordhah
(mordhahn@rcjy.edu.sa,, najwaalmarri775@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the current state of crisis management practices in organizations within Saudi Arabia across five key dimensions. Data were collected through an online survey administered to employees from various sectors across the Kingdom, yielding 213 valid responses. Participants evaluated the extent to which each of the five dimensions of crisis management is implemented in their organizations. While crisis management has been widely examined in international contexts, there is a notable lack of empirical research that specifically addresses the Saudi organizational environment. The results of the study have shown that the status of crisis management in Saudi Arabia according to responses came at "moderate level" with (3.38) average arithmetic for the total dimensions means. The study's findings led to a proposed framework that highlights key areas for improvement. It focuses on four dimensions with moderate performance and information availability, which is currently below moderate. Implementing this framework can boost Saudi organizations' crisis preparedness, responsiveness, and strategic resilience.

KEYWORDS: Crisis Management, Saudi Organizations, Organizational Management, Descriptive Analysis, Saudi Arabia.

1. INTRODUCTION

The crises confronting today's public and private organizations are both numerous and varied. Although the dawn of the new decade was met with widespread optimism and hope, this enthusiasm was abruptly shattered by the unforeseen outbreak of the COVID-19 global pandemic (Marshall et al., 2020). As Fener and Cevik (2015) describe, a crisis is an unpredictable event that disrupts organizational operations and demands a proactive and immediate response. Modern organizations are increasingly exposed to instability and rapid change, often finding themselves unprepared for sudden disruptions and uncertain about which crises may arise next.

Despite COVID-19 being less lethal than other viruses such as Ebola, its rapid transmission rate led to a full-scale global pandemic (WHO, 2020). At the time of writing, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia had recorded over 370,000 cases and nearly 6,400 deaths, while globally, cases exceeded 106 million with more than two million fatalities. The virus—measuring less than one four-hundredth the width of a human hair—brought global systems to a standstill (Galloway, 2020). Organizations and individuals alike experienced profound uncertainty, loss of control, and widespread disruption. Many institutions faced severe turbulence, leading to downsizing or closure due to their inability to withstand the crisis. In such times, the importance of effective crisis management has never been more critical (Forster et al., 2020).

To contain the virus, governments implemented crisis management strategies that included strict social distancing, quarantines, workforce restructuring, and the enforcement of remote work. While these measures were essential to protect public health, they also triggered significant negative consequences beyond individual well-being. The pandemic impacted global and national economies, increased mortality rates, disrupted wealth distribution, and most notably, altered individual and societal behaviors (OECD, 2020; Lamsar, 2020).

It is essential to emphasize that organizations must possess the capability to respond effectively to unforeseen demands and circumstances in order to restore normal operations (Nemeth et al., 2011; Costella et al., 2009). In essence, they must strive for robust crisis management. Understanding international models of crisis management and exploring their practical implementation is vital. However, such efforts are insufficient without first examining the actual state and effectiveness of crisis management within a specific national context—such as Saudi Arabia. Therefore, this study aims to

assess how Saudi organizations manage crises in general according to key factors of crisis management and evaluate the extent to which these organizations have effectively navigated the challenges posed by a crisis.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous scholars have offered varying definitions of crisis management. Littlejohn (1983) defines it as a systematic approach designed to address crises by preventing their occurrence when possible, and by planning for unavoidable situations to control outcomes and minimize negative impacts. Similarly, Fink (1986) views crisis management as a pivotal moment in an organization's lifecycle, marking a decisive shift that can lead to either positive or negative outcomes. Jalda and Fourth (2010) further describe crisis management as a structured set of documented procedures aimed at effectively handling crises and emergencies while mitigating their adverse consequences.

A substantial body of research agrees that crisis management typically unfolds in three key stages (Coombs & Laufer, 2018; Bundy et al., 2016; Jia et al., 2012; Wang, 2009):

- Pre-crisis phase: Involves identifying potential threats and developing comprehensive crisis response plans.

- Crisis phase: Focuses on managing the crisis as it unfolds, ensuring timely and effective action.

- Post-crisis phase: Entails implementing recovery strategies and corrective measures to restore stakeholder confidence and organizational stability.

Crisis situations differ significantly from routine organizational operations. They pose serious threats to an organization's viability and demand rapid, high-stakes decision-making under uncertainty. The unpredictable and non-routine nature of crises can overwhelm even the most seasoned leaders, highlighting the necessity for crisis leaders to be adaptable, composed, and capable of making rational decisions under pressure. As Muffett-Willett and Kruse (2008) emphasize, failure to process critical information or acting irrationally during a crisis can exacerbate the situation. Therefore, crisis leaders must be agile, flexible, and prepared to make difficult decisions in unfamiliar and high-pressure environments.

Developing effective crisis leaders requires more than theoretical training. First, organizations must recognize that leadership in crisis cannot be cultivated solely through workshops. Supervisors should identify individuals who are both willing and ready to undergo rigorous training, while also setting

realistic expectations. Second, potential crisis leaders must be exposed to demanding and high-stress environments early in their careers. This exposure builds resilience and prepares them for real-world crises with higher stakes. Third, effective crisis leaders must be active listeners and continuous learners. They should seek insights from those directly involved in crisis situations and remain open to diverse perspectives across organizational levels. Given the complexity and unpredictability of crises, collaboration with experts from various disciplines is often essential (D'Auria & De Smet, 2020).

In addition to experiential learning, crisis leaders should engage in ongoing study and reflection to deepen their understanding of crisis dynamics. Developing the ability to absorb and process information quickly enhances their capacity to perform under pressure (Bergmann & Muller 2021). Ultimately, crisis leaders must be prepared to make critical decisions with limited information and time—especially when others hesitate. As Muffett-Willett and Kruse (2008) note, when effective crisis leaders are at the helm, organizations are more likely to minimize losses and recover swiftly. The difference between failure and resilience often lies in the preparedness and decisiveness of those leading during turbulent times.

Crisis management is far more complex than it may initially appear. It cannot rely solely on the capabilities of individual leaders to navigate turbulent situations and make critical decisions. Instead, crisis management is a continuous, multidimensional process that requires coordinated efforts across various organizational levels. Scholars have identified several key dimensions that form the foundation of effective crisis management.

Planning is the cornerstone of crisis management. It involves establishing proactive measures and predictive mechanisms to prevent crises or, at the very least, mitigate their negative consequences and reduce the element of surprise when they occur (Rao et al., 2007, p. 108). Numerous studies emphasize the importance of incorporating the following elements into crisis planning (Antušák, 2013; Crandall, Parnell, & Spillan, 2013; Alqubati, 2018; Abdualrahman, 2018):

- Leveraging the expertise of experienced personnel to manage crises effectively
- Conducting thorough analyses of internal and external environments to identify potential crisis triggers
- Allocating a dedicated budget for strategic crisis planning
- Implementing preventive tools such as early

warning systems and alert protocols

- Developing and rehearsing crisis response scenarios
- Regularly reviewing and updating crisis management plans to ensure preparedness for future events

The second dimension is the management of information, which plays a vital role in equipping top management with timely and accurate data to support decision-making during crises (Abdul Razzaq, 2011). This requires the establishment of a comprehensive database that captures the nature and dynamics of potential crises. Organizations must continuously enhance their information systems to support rational decision-making. These systems should be integrated with decision-making centers, categorized based on organizational needs, and capable of forecasting potential crises. To achieve this, top management must invest in both technological infrastructure (e.g., computers, software) and skilled personnel capable of managing and interpreting crisis-related data.

Effective communication is another critical dimension of crisis management. It involves the timely exchange of relevant information to ensure that decision-makers are well-informed about the crisis and its developments (Al-Hamidi, 2010). A robust communication system should facilitate both horizontal and vertical information flow within the organization. This enables leaders to maintain accurate, consistent, and timely communication, which is essential for minimizing the escalation of crisis impacts. Moreover, top management should clearly designate individuals responsible for internal and external communication during crises (Merriman, 2008; Alqubati, 2018).

Leadership is a pivotal dimension in crisis management. Effective crisis leaders exhibit key personal traits such as initiative, risk tolerance, assertiveness, and optimism (Auda, 2008). They must demonstrate rational, composed, and emotionally intelligent leadership, capable of mobilizing organizational resources and guiding teams through non-routine challenges. Crisis leaders are expected to analyze complex problems, determine the appropriate timing for intervention, and maintain high levels of transparency and morale. Their ability to engage employees in collaborative problem-solving, while managing time-sensitive decisions, is essential for navigating crises successfully.

Team formation is a fundamental component of crisis management. Crisis response teams should be composed of individuals selected based on their competencies and crisis-handling capabilities. These

teams must receive specialized training and have clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Regular monitoring and support from top management are necessary to ensure team readiness and cohesion (Vašíčková, 2019; Alqubati, 2018).

According to Vašíčková (2019), numerous studies have explored crisis management across various variables and stages, yet they converge on a common objective: to manage potential crises effectively. As a

result, several models and frameworks have been developed. However, what is truly needed are proactive, integrated models that treat crisis management as a dynamic and ongoing process. The most effective approaches are those that incorporate the core dimensions outlined above—planning, information, communication, leadership, and teamwork—as the foundational pillars of crisis preparedness and response.



Figure 1: Dimensions of Crisis Management Process.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative research design utilizing a survey-based approach. A quantitative design is particularly suitable for describing sample characteristics, testing hypotheses, and examining relationships between variables (Simon & Francis, 2001). While it is a foundational principle in scientific research to study the entire population, surveying all employees across Saudi organizations is impractical. Therefore, the researcher relied on a representative sample, acknowledging that studying a sample can yield results as accurate – if not more so – than attempting to survey the entire population (Atiah, 1985).

The target population for this study includes employees working in Saudi organizations across all sectors—public, private, or mixed—and in various regions of the Kingdom. These organizations span multiple service domains, including education, healthcare, commerce, and industry.

The survey instrument used in this study was adapted from validated questionnaires developed by Alqubati (2018) and Abdualrahman (2018), both of

which assess the same five dimensions of crisis management adopted in this research. The selection of this instrument was based on its prior use in empirical studies conducted in Arab cultural contexts, such as Jordan and Yemen, which share cultural similarities with Saudi Arabia. The reliability and validity of the instrument have been well established, with reported Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.85 to 0.95. As Field (2005) notes, utilizing existing validated instruments enhances the reliability of the research and contributes to cost and time efficiency.

To ensure the reliability of the instrument in the current context, the researcher calculated Cronbach's alpha for each dimension. According to Hair et al. (1995), a Cronbach's alpha value above 0.70 indicates acceptable reliability. In this study, all five dimensions demonstrated high internal consistency, with alpha values exceeding 0.94.

The final questionnaire consisted of 34 items measuring five core dimensions of crisis management: planning, leadership, crisis management team, communication, and information. Each item was rated on a five-point

Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). To ensure clarity and content validity, the questionnaire and a summary of the study's objectives were reviewed by a panel of experts prior to distribution.

For data analysis, the researcher employed descriptive statistics, including percentages and averages, to assess the level of implementation for each crisis management dimension. Additionally, descriptive measures were used to profile the sample in terms of organizational type, size, geographic location, and service sector. The analysis also included calculations of means and standard deviations to provide a comprehensive overview of the sample characteristics and responses.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Level of Crisis Management in Saudi Organizations:

The researcher calculated means and standard deviations to assess the level of each crisis management dimension from the participants'

perspectives. All dimensions were measured using a five-point Likert scale. The following sections present the results for each dimension.

1. Planning

As shown in Table 1, participants reported that their organizations implement crisis-related planning at a moderate level. Specifically, organizations moderately engage in activities such as sharing crisis plans with employees, consulting experts, analyzing internal and external environments, employing scenario forecasting, and using preventive measures (e.g., early warning systems) to reduce the likelihood of crises. However, participants indicated lower levels of planning in areas such as allocating sufficient budgets for crisis preparedness and conducting frequent monitoring or plan reviews. The overall mean score for the planning dimension was 3.10, indicating that organizations demonstrate a moderate level of planning capability in preparing for and addressing crises.

Table 2: First Dimension (Planning).

Planning Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The organization shares its plan to deal with crises.	3.28	1.265	213
The organization benefits from experienced people to control crises.	3.33	1.326	213
The top management analyzes the internal environment to control the problems that cause crises.	3.26	1.250	213
The top management analyzes the external environment to control the problems that cause crises.	3.05	1.269	213
The top management allocates an independent budget for the strategic planning process for crises.	2.75	1.387	213
The top management uses preventive methods (early warning and warning instructions) to prevent the crisis before it occurs.	3.16	1.309	213
The top management prepares scenarios to deal with crises.	3.15	1.265	213
The crisis management plan is periodically reviewed in order to control and deal with future crises.	2.97	1.395	213

Table 3: Summary Planning Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.119	2.751	3.329	.577	1.210	.037	8
Item Variances	1.715	1.563	1.947	.384	1.246	.023	8

2-Leadership:

This dimension was assessed using nine items. As shown in Table 3, the mean scores for all items fall within the moderate range. Notably, participants rated leadership rationality, emotional control, and the presence of personal traits that support effective crisis management slightly higher than the other

components. In contrast, transparency and employee participation in crisis-related decision-making received the lowest ratings, suggesting these practices are less common in the participants' organizations. The overall mean score for this dimension was 3.2, indicating that organizations demonstrate a moderate level of leadership effectiveness in managing crises.

Table 4: Second Dimension: Leadership.

Leadership Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
------------------	------	----------------	---

The manager has personal characteristics that qualify him to control the crisis.	3.41	1.169	213
The manager has rational, and non-emotional leadership with others to face crises.	3.43	1.174	213
The leader is keen to mobilize the potential energies to perform non-routine work to avoid and confront the crisis.	3.30	1.312	213
The manager employs the available capabilities to successfully handle the crisis.	3.34	1.229	213
Leaders appreciate the right time to intervene in crisis management.	3.19	1.206	213
The manager has the ability to analyze problems and manage crises.	3.17	1.271	213
The manager cares to raise morale and reduce tension.	3.15	1.239	213
The manager is concerned with the element of transparency and the participation of workers to solve the crisis.	3.04	1.400	213
The manager pays attention to the time element when dealing with crises.	3.15	1.280	213

Table 4: Summary of Leadership Item Statistics.

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.243	3.038	3.427	.390	1.128	.018	9
Item Variances	1.575	1.366	1.961	.595	1.435	.035	9

3-Crisis Management Team

The crisis management team represents one of the core dimensions of effective crisis management. Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the participants' assessment of this dimension within Saudi organizations. Across the five items used to measure this construct, the existence of crisis management teams received the highest rating ($M = 3.45$). This was followed by moderate ratings for selecting team members based on competencies and for top management's periodic monitoring and follow-up of crisis management

teams.

However, two critical components, providing training for team members and assigning clear roles and responsibilities, received noticeably lower scores ($M = 2.94$ and $M = 2.63$, respectively). These results suggest that while crisis management teams are present, they lack essential structural and developmental support. The overall mean score for this dimension was 3.1, indicating a moderate level of implementation of crisis management teams within the participating organizations.

Table 5: Third Dimension (Crisis Management Team) Statistics.

Crisis Management Team Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The top management forms teamwork to face various crises.	3.45	1.268	213
The top management works to assign human competencies capable of dealing with various crises.	3.28	1.291	213
The top management organizes training workshops to deal with crises.	2.63	1.288	213
The top management assigns the roles of crisis management team members.	2.94	1.295	213
The top management periodically follows up on the teamwork.	3.08	1.252	213

Table 6: Summary of Crisis Management Team Statistics.

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
--	------	---------	---------	-------	-------------------	----------	------------

Item Means	3.078	2.634	3.446	.812	1.308	.098	5
Item Variances	1.635	1.568	1.676	.108	1.069	.002	5

4- *Communication*

This dimension is measured by five items and table 8 shows the overall level of communication in

the Saudi organization from the participants' point of view is moderate (M=3.3). Table 7 reflects the level of each item as the following:

Table 7: Fourth Dimension (Communication) Statistics.

Communication Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
There are means of communication that provide the top management with information in the appropriate quantity and quality for making decisions.	3.35	1.259	213
The top management provides a communication system that allows the exchange of information related to the crisis between workers on a horizontal and vertical level.	3.30	1.319	213
The top management conducts communication accurately and periodically to limit the aggravation of the crisis damages.	3.12	1.312	213
The top management determines the individuals that will be communicated with and communicate with others during the crisis.	3.46	1.215	213
The top management uses appropriate information technologies and means of communication during a crisis.	3.44	1.252	213

Table 8: Summary of Communication Statistics.

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.332	3.122	3.455	.333	1.107	.018	5
Item Variances	1.618	1.476	1.739	.264	1.179	.012	5

5- *Availability of information:*

Information availability is a critical dimension of crisis management, as it supports top management in making timely and informed decisions. Table 9 presents the results for this dimension across five components. The statistics indicate that top management demonstrates a generally moderate commitment to developing and utilizing information systems for crisis management, with most mean scores clustering around the mid-range (2.90–2.94). Specifically, efforts such as linking information systems with decision-making centers (2.92), providing crisis-relevant databases (2.91), and categorizing information based on needs (2.91) reflect a consistent but not strongly advanced level of

implementation. Similarly, the continuous enhancement of information systems to support rational decision-making (2.90) and the provision of qualified human resources (2.94) suggest acceptable but improvable performance. Notably, the highest score (3.28) is associated with the provision of physical resources such as computers and software, indicating that tangible infrastructure is prioritized more than strategic or predictive capabilities. In contrast, the lowest score (2.62) relates to the use of information systems for crisis prediction, highlighting a significant gap in proactive preparedness. Overall, while foundational elements are present, the organization appears to emphasize operational support over advanced, forward-looking crisis management practices.

Table 9: Fifth Dimension (Availability of information).

Availability Information Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The top management is keen to provide a database that understands the nature of the crisis to be used in dealing with the crisis.	2.91	1.248	213
The top management is keen to continuously boost information systems with data that rationalizes decisions related to the crisis.	2.90	1.262	213
The top management links the information system with decision-making centers.	2.92	1.247	213
The top management categorizes the information according to the needs.	2.91	1.188	213

The top management is keen to provide information systems that would contribute to predicting crises.	2.62	1.281	213
The top management provides physical capabilities such as computers and software to deal with the information system.	3.28	1.200	213
The top management provides a qualified human element to deal with information in crisis situations.	2.94	1.311	213

Table 10: Summary of Availability of information Statistics.

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.926	2.624	3.282	.657	1.250	.037	7
Item Variances	1.559	1.412	1.718	.306	1.217	.012	7

5. DISCUSSION

There is no doubt that contemporary crises are far from traditional in nature; they are complex, unpredictable, and difficult to anticipate or plan for in advance (Lasmar & Rita, 2020). Unlike conventional crises, today's challenges are multifaceted and diverse, requiring each government or organization to adopt a tailored approach that aligns with its unique conditions, surrounding circumstances, and available resources. While organizations may differ in their specific strategies for managing crises, the core focus of crisis management remains consistent across most institutions. These shared principles are typically reflected in the key dimensions of crisis management previously discussed (Tanifuji, 2000; Branicki, 2020).

The current study aimed at identifying the status of Crisis Management at Saudi Arabia. In order to

achieve the objectives of the study, the Sample of the study consisted of (213) members who were participated to answer an existing questionnaire that has been verified and validated. Participants were asked to assess the level of implementation for each of the five crisis management dimensions. Although numerous international studies have explored crisis management across different cultural contexts, empirical research focusing specifically on the Saudi context remains limited.

The findings of this study indicate that, overall, Saudi organizations demonstrate moderate levels of crisis management capability from the participants' perspectives. All dimensions scored within the moderate range except for information availability, which received a mean score below 3, placing it in the below-moderate category. The following table provides a summary of the mean scores for each dimension:

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics of Crisis Management Dimensions.

CM-Dimensions	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PLANNING	3.12	1.137	213
LEADERSHIP	3.24	1.154	213
TEAMWORK	3.08	1.161	213
COMMUNICATION	3.33	1.181	213
AVAILABILITY OF INF	2.93	1.112	213
Average	3.14		

Results of this study also showed that most of the participants scored a lower level of availability of the information comparing with other dimensions. To be specific, only one of this dimension components scored moderate which is the top management provides physical resources. However, the majority of the participants believe that their organizations might have lack of having a database that facilitates understanding the nature of crisis, predicting crisis and then link the information system with decision

making centers. Also it is indicated that the level of categorizing the information according to the need and having qualified human resources who are able to deal and interpret the information in crisis are below moderate.

On the other hand, communication is the strongest dimension, indicating that organizations maintain good communication systems, especially during emergencies. However, communication could be strengthened through more frequent drills

and consistent message testing.

The planning dimension scored moderately, indicating that organizations conduct some crisis planning activities but lack comprehensive preparation. Weaknesses include irregular review of crisis plans and inadequate budgeting for crisis preparedness. Nevertheless, leadership demonstrated moderate effectiveness. Leaders in many organizations exhibit rational decision-making but show minimal transparency and limited employee involvement. Although crisis teams exist in most organizations, they lack sufficient training and role clarity. This deficiency may hinder effective coordination during real crises.

5.1. Proposed Framework

A proposed framework is designed to enhance crisis preparedness and response within Saudi organizations by addressing the strengths and weaknesses revealed in the study. It integrates the five critical dimensions evaluated, Planning, Leadership, Crisis Management Teams, Communication, and Information Availability, and provides actionable strategies for improvement. The framework of crisis management is as the following:

1. Strategic Crisis Planning:

The top management should benefit from experienced people and share the plane with the employees to enhance their awareness.

5.1.1 Establish a Comprehensive Crisis Plan

- Develop an integrated crisis management plan covering identification, prevention, response, and recovery.
- Include risk assessments, scenario analyses, and crisis forecasting models.
- Ensure alignment with international standards such as (ISO 22301, ISO 31000).

5.1.2 Regular Monitoring and Updating

- Review and update crisis plans annually.
- Conduct periodic audits to evaluate effectiveness and detect gaps.
- Incorporate lessons learned from previous crises, such as COVID-19.

5.1.3 Allocate Dedicated Budget

- Set aside funds specifically for crisis preparedness, training, and emergency resources.
- Ensure financial readiness for sudden disruptions.

5.2. Crisis Leadership Enhancement Framework

5.2.1 Build Competency-Based Leadership

- Offer specialized training in crisis leadership, emotional control, ethical decision-making, and stress management.
- Develop leaders' skills in strategic thinking

and rapid decision-making.

5.2.2 Promote Transparent Leadership

- Encourage leaders to communicate crisis information openly and honestly.
- Involve employees in crisis discussions and solutions to build trust.

5.2.3 Empower Decentralized Decisions

- Allow qualified mid-level managers to make critical decisions during crises.
- Establish clear authority levels to avoid delays.

5.3. Crisis Management Team (CMT) Development Framework

3.1 Structured Team Formation

- Form a multidisciplinary crisis management team with clearly defined roles.
- Select team members based on competencies, experience, and crisis-handling skills.

5.3.2 Role Clarity and Accountability

- Develop a responsibility matrix that assigns tasks before, during, and after crises.
- Ensure all team members know their exact duties.

5.3.3 Continuous Training and Simulation

- Conduct regular training sessions using crisis simulation exercises.
- Implement drills and tabletop scenarios to test team coordination.
- Evaluate team performance and identify improvement areas.

5.4. Organizational Communication Framework

5.4.1 Build a Crisis Communication System

- Establish a structured internal and external communication protocol.
- Ensure clear chains of communication during emergencies.
- Use multiple platforms (email, SMS, apps, intranet) to disseminate information.

5.4.2 Designate Communication Officers

- Appoint trained personnel to act as official spokespersons.
- Provide media training for communication officers.

5.4.3 Maintain Real-Time Communication Flow

- Use digital tools for real-time updates.
- Ensure communication is accurate, consistent, and timely.

5.5. Information Availability and Decision-Support Framework

5.5.1 Establish a Crisis Information Database

- Create centralized digital repositories that store critical data related to risks, resources, and

previous crises.

- Ensure databases are accessible to authorized users at all times.

5.5.2 Adopt Predictive and Analytical Tools

- Use data analytics, dashboards, and early-warning indicators to forecast potential crises.
- Integrate data from internal and external sources (e.g., health agencies, market trends).

5.5.3 Hire Skilled Personnel

- Employ information management specialists, data analysts, and IT crisis coordinators.
- Train staff on data interpretation and evidence-based decision-making.

5.5.4 Ensure Adequate Technological Resources

- Provide modern software, hardware, and secure communication tools.
- Maintain backup systems to ensure information continuity during crises.

It is important to emphasize that the five dimensions are not independent; rather, they are fully integrated and work in an interconnected cycle, as illustrated in the Integrated Crisis Management Response Model. In this model, planning establishes the foundation by providing structure and preparedness, while leadership plays a central role in guiding decision-making and ensuring organizational alignment. Crisis teams then translate these plans into coordinated actions during critical situations. At the same time, communication maintains clarity and cohesion across all organizational levels, ensuring that information flows effectively. Supporting all these dimensions is information availability, which provides accurate and timely insights that enhance responsiveness and enable informed decision-making throughout the crisis management process.

Figure 2: Integrated Crisis Management Response Model



6. CONCLUSION

The results reveal that crisis management in Saudi organizations is functioning at a moderate level, indicating partial readiness but also highlighting critical gaps. Planning processes show reasonable implementation, yet deficiencies remain in allocating resources and conducting regular plan reviews. Leadership is also moderately effective, with strengths in rational decision-making but weaknesses in transparency and employee participation. Crisis management teams are present in most organizations; however, limited training and unclear role assignments reduce their operational

effectiveness. Communication emerged as the strongest dimension, supported by the availability of digital channels and coordinated messaging during crises.

The most significant challenge identified is the low level of information availability, which scored below the moderate range. This dimension directly impacts decision-making, situational awareness, and the ability to formulate timely and effective responses. Without accurate and accessible crisis-related data, organizations struggle to activate their plans, coordinate teams, and communicate effectively.

Based on these findings, the study proposes a

comprehensive crisis management framework that emphasizes continuous improvement across all dimensions. In particular, strengthening information availability is critical, as it serves as the foundation for effective planning, leadership, crisis team operations, and communication. Enhancing training programs, developing integrated digital systems, and promoting transparency alongside participatory leadership can significantly improve crisis preparedness and organizational resilience. As illustrated in the Integrated Crisis Management Response Model, information availability represents the cornerstone of the entire crisis management process. Therefore, the relatively lower results associated with this dimension should be considered a critical warning sign, highlighting the need for immediate and focused organizational attention.

In conclusion, while Saudi organizations demonstrate commitment to managing crises, there is a clear need for systemic, data-driven, and proactive crisis management models. By adopting the proposed framework and investing in strategic improvements across the five dimensions, organizations can transition from reactive crisis response to a more robust, resilient, and sustainable crisis management culture. This will not only strengthen organizational performance during

emergencies but also support national goals for stability, agility, and resilience in an increasingly uncertain global environment.

Based on the findings of this study and the identified gaps in crisis management practices within Saudi organizations, several opportunities emerge for future research. While this study included participants from multiple sectors, future research should examine crisis management practices within specific industries. Research is needed to assess the impact of training, simulations, and scenario-based exercises on building stronger crisis management teams and improving organizational response capabilities. Moreover, while communication scored relatively high in this study, qualitative research (interviews, focus groups) could offer deeper insights into communication barriers, message clarity, and stakeholder perceptions during crises. Future research can explore as well how improvements in crisis management dimensions contribute to broader organizational resilience, sustainability, and long-term performance. Finally, Regional differences and organizational size may influence resource availability, organizational maturity, and crisis response strategies. Comparative studies would offer valuable insights for policymakers and organizational leaders.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Razzaq, A. (2011). The role of information systems in crisis management: A theoretical framework. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 1(2), 108–115.
- Al-Hamidi, F. M. (2010). Crisis communication strategies in public institutions: A case study from Yemen. *International Journal of Humanities and Information Technology*, 10 (5), 1–15.
- Antušák, E., & Vilášek, J. (2013). *Základy teorie krizového managementu* [Basics of the theory of crisis management]. Karolinum Press.
- Atiah, A. (1985). *Sampling in social research*. King Saud University Press.
- Auda, A. (2008). Leadership in crisis situations: Characteristics and competencies. *Journal of Crisis and Risk Management*, 6 (2), 45–59.
- Bergmann, Julian & Müller, Patrick (2021) Failing forward in the EU's common security and defense policy: the integration of EU crisis management, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28:10, 1669-1687, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2021.1954064
- Branicki, L. (2020). COVID-19, ethics of care and feminist crisis management. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 27 (5), 872–883. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12491>
- Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2016). Crises and crisis management: Integration, interpretation, and research development. *Journal of Management*, 43 (6), 1661–1692. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316680030>
- Coombs, W. T., & Laufer, D. (2018). Global crisis management – Current research and future directions. *Journal of International Management*, 24 (3), 199–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2017.12.003>
- Costella, M. F., Saurin, T. A., & de Macedo Guimarães, L. B. (2009). A method for assessing health and safety management systems from the resilience engineering perspective. *Safety Science*, 47 (8), 1056–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2008.11.006>
- Crandall, W., Parnell, J. A., & Spillan, J. E. (2013). *Crisis management: Leading in the new strategy landscape* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- D'Auria, G., & De Smet, A. (2020). Leadership in a crisis: Responding to the coronavirus outbreak and future challenges. McKinsey & Company. <https://www.mckinsey.com>
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Fener, T., & Cevik, T. (2015). Leadership in crisis management: Separation of leadership and executive concepts. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26, 695–701. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00817-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00817-5)
- Fink, S. (1986). *Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable*. AMACOM.
- Forster, B. B., Patlas, M. N., & Lexa, F. J. (2020). Crisis leadership during and following COVID-19. *Canadian Association of Radiologists Journal*, 71 (4), 421–422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0846537120926752>
- Galloway, S. (2020). *Post Corona: From crisis to opportunity*. Bantam Press. https://books.google.com/books/about/Post_Corona.html?id=OIXbzQEACAAJ
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (4th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Jia, H., Winseck, D., & Comor, E. (2012). Crisis communication and social media: A review. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 12 (4), 326–335.
- Lamsar, Y. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on global behavior and economic systems. World Health Organization & FAO Joint Statement. <https://www.who.int/news/item/13-10-2020-impact-of-covid-19-on-people-s-livelihoods-their-health-and-our-food-systems>
- Lasmar, J. M., & Rita, R. (2020). Coronavirus, global risk and the new international crisis management model. *Conjuntura Internacional*, 17 (3), 47–61. <https://www.academia.edu/79757147>
- 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>
- Leonard, H. B., Howitt, A. M., & Giles, D. W. (2020). Crisis management for leaders coping with COVID-19. Harvard Kennedy School, Program on Crisis Leadership. https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/research-initiatives/crisisleadership/files/PCL_Crisis-Management-for-COVID_Web20200428.pdf
- Littlejohn, R. F. (1983). *Crisis management: A team approach*. American Management Associations.
- Merriman, N. (2008). *Crisis communication: Practical PR strategies for reputation management and company survival*. Kogan Page.
- Muffett-Willett, S. L., & Kruse, S. D. (2008). Crisis leadership: Past research and future directions. *Journal of Business Continuity & Emergency Planning*, 3 (3), 248–258.
- OECD. (2020). *OECD Economic Outlook, Volume 2020 Issue 2*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-economic-outlook/volume-2020/issue-2_39a88ab1-en.html
- Rao, H. R., Sharman, R., & Upadhyaya, S. J. (2007). Coordination in emergency response management. *Communications of the ACM*, 50 (3), 44–49. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1226736.1226765>
- Simon, M., & Francis, J. (2001). *Quantitative research methods for social sciences*. Oxford University Press.
- Tanifuji, M. (2000). Crisis management in Japan: Lessons from the Kobe earthquake. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 1 (2), 155–176.
- Vašíčková, V. (2019). 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>
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2020, March 11). WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 – 11 March 2020. <https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>