

Organizational Resilience & Crisis Management Relationship on Hospitality Businesses

Tunahan PEKDEMİR^a Ebru GÜNLÜ KÜÇÜKALTAN^b

^aAnkara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Tourism Management Department, Ankara, Türkiye. tunahan.pekdemir@hbv.edu.tr

^bDokuz Eylül University, Tourism Management Department, İzmir, Türkiye. ebru.gunlu@deu.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Organizational Resilience
Crisis Management
Tourism
Hospitality Businesses

Received 4 November
2023

Revised 15 March 2024

Accepted 20 March 2024

Article Classification:

Research Article

Purpose – The main subject of the research is the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management. Organizational resilience, which is handled with its planned and adaptive dimensions, is referred to as the capacity that enables organizations to survive in harsh environmental conditions and to manage the crises encountered, is often on the agenda with crisis management. On the other hand, crisis management, which covers the processes before, during and after the crisis and is the subject of many researches in the literature, also underlines the organizational resilience in these processes. It is aimed that this research will contribute to the literature, since the studies examining the relationship between these two related concepts are few in quantity. The small number of studies examining the subject on hospitality businesses makes this research unique.

Design/methodology/approach – The universe of the research consists of top and middle level managers in 5-star hospitality businesses located in Ankara. Quantitative research method was used as the data collection method in the study, in which a sample of 193 managers was reached, and data were collected with these managers in 27 hospitality businesses through a semi-structured questionnaire.

Findings – In line with the findings, it was determined that there is a relationship between the concepts and that organizational resilience has an effect on pre- and post-crisis periods on the other hand, crisis period has an impact on adaptive resilience.

Discussion – Based on the results of the research, it has been deduced from the literature that organizational resilience is a higher-frame concept than crisis management at the same time, the concepts are intertwined and complementary in management process and that organizational resilience, in practice, must have certain requirements, especially experience in managing crises, and organizations that want to operate in the long term should not ignore resilience.

1. INTRODUCTION

In order for organizations to exist in changing environmental conditions, they must be in a constant state of change, be able to react to crises immediately, eliminate them, and learn from the process. Managing a crisis is like a cyclical process (Koronis & Ponis, 2018). An organization that can carry out this mentioned cycle can be considered resilient. The organizational resilience that needs to be addressed at this point can be explained as the capacity to overcome the destructive situation encountered and to move on (Linnenluecke & Griffiths, 2010).

It can be stated that the concept of resilience is becoming increasingly important today, but as a concept, it has not yet matured in the literature. The fact that the studies on organizational resilience have increased year by year indicates that the issue is gradually attracting attention (Tolay & Gülerüz, 2022). The topic remains on the agenda since it has not been studied sufficiently in the tourism sector, which has unique characteristics, the limited number of studies explaining the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management (Scarpino & Gretzel, 2014; Williams et al., 2017; Prayag, 2018; Prayag, 2023), and the increasing frequency of both internal and external crises affecting various sectors, including the tourism sector. Unlike many sectors, the tourism sector is more vulnerable to environmental influences and the resilience of the organization depends on the region in which it operates, that is, the destination (Orchiston & Espiner, 2017). On the other hand, since the touristic product consists mainly of service and the employee affects guest satisfaction and makes the organization internally fragile, resilience is not a desire but a necessity for tourism organizations. Resilient organizations can overcome the crises they encounter (Park & Seo, 2024). Due to the

Suggested Citation

Pekdemir, T., Günlü Küçükaltan, E. (2024). Organizational Resilience & Crisis Management Relationship on Hospitality Businesses, *Journal of Business Research-Turk*, 16 (1), 206-222..

lack of studies on the impact of organizational resilience on crisis management in the field, this study aims to fill the gap in the literature by examining the variables within the tourism discipline and determining how organizational resilience affects crisis management activities.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. *Organizational Resilience*

Organizational resilience is the organization's ability to quickly create and implement positive, adaptive behaviors in order to be exposed to minimal stress in emergencies (Mallak, 1998) and the organization's ability to face internal and/or external destructions and unexpected events in advance thanks to strategic awareness and linked organizational management (Annarelli & Nonino, 2016). Resilience, which is defined as organizational ability (Duchek, 2020), is formed by a combination of several elements. These elements are classified cognitively, behaviorally, and contextually and play a distinct but complementary role in the organization's response to unexpected developments (Lengnick-Hall & Beck, 2005; Lengnick-Hall & Beck, 2009). Resilience is also sized according to the process the organization is in. According to Hollnagel (2015), when regulations are enacted after events within the organization have occurred, the response can be described as reactive. On the other hand, when efforts are made to control the future before any events occur, in other words, when actions are taken proactively, it can be expressed as proactive. This view has similar characteristics to the reactive and proactive strategies applied by enterprises in the strategic management process. In this dimension, also referred to as planned and adaptive, planned resilience is shaped by activities before the crisis, while adaptive resilience is shaped by activities during and after the crisis (Lee et al., 2013; Orchiston et al., 2016).

In general, the concept of resilience in terms of reducing the sensitivities of organizations and increasing their resistance is undoubtedly of great importance in terms of the fragile tourism sector (Schwaiger et al., 2022). The tourism sector is adversely affected by situations such as natural disasters, global crises, war and terrorism, economic pressure, and global epidemic disease, and encounters negativities such as a decrease in the number of visitors, decrease in employment, losses in the profitability of organizations, decrease in national income, withdrawal from planned investments (Huang et al., 2008). The sensitive structure of the tourism sector and its vulnerability to various changes, consequently necessitating the enhancement of resilience in tourism organizations, has been a factor contributing to resilience studies in this field (Faulkner, 2001; Melian-Alzola et al., 2020).

The concept of resilience in the tourism literature is examined from different perspectives. Lew (2014) discussed resilience on a destination basis and social aspects, and in another study on the sustainability and resilience of tourism, resilience was examined with a focus on destination and economy (Tyrell & Johnston, 2008). Jiang et al. (2019), on the other hand, have examined the subject from the perspective of stakeholder relationships and have indicated that organizations can cope with challenging processes through strong stakeholder relationships. In another study emphasizing the importance of stakeholder relations, it was concluded that recreation enterprises have a higher level of situational awareness, unity of purpose, strategic partnership, and employee participation than hospitality businesses. The reason for this is explained by factors such as the diversity of services provided in the tourism sub-sectors, the tourist profile, and the diversity of stakeholders (Orchiston et al., 2012; Orchiston et al., 2016). The study conducted by Brown et al. (2019) on New Zealand hotel businesses concluded that social ties and employee participation are important for social capital and that social capital is related to resilience. In the study, where the importance of employees in building resilience was emphasized, the resilience-providing aspect of employee participation in planning activities was mentioned.

Tibay et al. (2018) stated in their study conducted in New Zealand that the primary factors influencing the resilience characteristics of hospitality businesses in the region were leadership and management, the core competencies of employees, planning and preparedness, and market sensitivity, respectively. The relationship between organizational resilience and performance was examined by Sobaih et al. (2021) in small-scale hospitality businesses operating in Cairo. In the study, where the planned and adaptive aspects of resilience were discussed, it was concluded that both aspects had a positive effect on performance and that performance played a role in the sustainable development of tourism. In a study conducted in New Orleans, the resilience of hotel businesses to natural disasters was examined, with a focus on explaining the subject through the 2008

Gustav Hurricane. It was seen that 80% of hotel businesses are prepared for disasters that may occur, and 92% of these businesses have a planning strategy, which has a share in resilience. It has also been determined that the inclusion of employees in the planning process has a positive effect on organizational resilience (Lamanna et al., 2012).

2.2. Crisis Management

In the field of medical science, a crisis, described as the body's effort to recover from a disease by using its strength to overcome it, is considered a turning point (O'Connor, 1987). Originally used in the field of medicine, the concept of crisis was later adapted to social sciences, and the term began to be used in economic, political, social, and cultural contexts as well (Shrivastava, 1993). Organizations are trying to recover from the crisis, which can also be explained as an organizational disease that disrupts the normal activities of the organization, by keeping their immune systems strong, that is, by taking precautions against possible crises and by being prepared for the worst before the crisis occurs.

Crises are divided into two categories based on their sources: internal crises and external crises. It is possible to foresee and prevent crises arising from internal causes, but crises may arise as a result of not solving the problems (Seeger et al., 1998). On the other hand, in externally sourced crises, it is often not feasible for the organization to foresee and intervene in the crisis. Such crises are classified as economic, political and legal, natural environmental, technological, social and cultural, biological, and terrorism-related crises (Zhao & Li, 2023).

The first area where the concept of crisis management is used is political science. Crisis management was defined by President J. F. Kennedy, the President of the United States at the time, as “dealing with a serious and extraordinary situation” during the Cuban Missile Crisis between the USA and the USSR in 1962 (Glaesser, 2003). Crisis management can be defined as a systematic effort that is not limited to a specific time frame but is designed for a process. It involves examining data before a crisis occurs, planning, and taking preventive actions. It includes training employees to quickly recognize crisis signals and involves stakeholders to exhibit a collective response. When a crisis occurs, it involves acting calmly according to prepared plans to overcome the crisis, minimizing damages, and maximizing opportunities and advantages (Pearson & Clair, 1998; Santana, 2004; Şahin et al., 2015).

As in living life, crises generally exist on the axis of the stages of birth, growth/development, and ending. The stages of the crisis are prodromal, acute, chronic, and resolution (Seeger et al., 1998). According to Ritchie et al. (2011), this process can be broadly divided into three stages. The first stage is the pre-crisis phase, where preparation and planning activities take place. The second stage is the crisis phase, where crisis management strategies are implemented. The final stage is the post-crisis phase, where control, assessment, feedback, and learning occur, and trust is rebuilt between the organization and stakeholders.

Although it is considered a negative situation, crises also have positive aspects. The word crisis in Chinese (Wei-Ji) means opportunity and threat. The positive aspects of crises include the creation of new activities and gaining experience as a result of the crisis. These effects can be long-term or short-term (Okumuş et al., 2005).

In the study where the Covid-19 pandemic crisis was discussed from the perspective of hotel businesses, it was concluded that the hotel terminated its restaurant and bar services, the food and beverage needs of the guests were met through room service, therefore the hotel has the ability of elasticity, which is the sub-dimension of resilience. However, the presence of an element of elasticity does not mean that a proactive crisis management strategy is implemented (John-Eke & Bayo, 2021). To consider hotel businesses as resilient, they need to demonstrate a proactive attitude. The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015) emphasizes the importance of economic aspects such as cost and finance in strengthening organizational resilience in hotel businesses. However, it also assumes that these factors can be obstacles to organizational resilience. Therefore, it can be assumed that the economic policies of businesses in the crisis period are related to organizational resilience.

Jang et al. (2022) discussed specific organizational resources that contribute to ensuring organizational resilience in their study of airlines, which are vulnerable to crises. According to the researchers, these resources are categorized as physical, operational, customer-relational, and intangible resources. Physical and intangible

resources allow the organization to react quickly to the crisis. Interestingly, highly utilized operational resources play a more effective role in overcoming the crisis than customer relational resources.

In summary, tourism businesses, which are vulnerable to crises, should recognize and embrace the importance of organizational resilience in order to overcome crises and emerge from the process stronger; with the resilience ability they have developed before these undesirable processes. A hotel business with high organizational resilience can be prepared for any crisis that may occur and thus reduce the potential damage and continue on its way without losing its basic structure and function (Broker-Bulling, 2020). However, it can be noted that while it is important for hotel businesses, crisis management and organizational resilience studies in the field of tourism often take place at the destination or national level, and this is related to sustainability in tourism. It is clear that studies dealing with organizations specifically in these two concepts are insufficient and the subject needs to be examined (Cahyanto & Pennington-Gray, 2017; Williams et al., 2017; Prayag, 2018; Okafor et al., 2022). Considering that there may be a connection between the concepts, this connection is examined in the next section.

3. METHODS

3.1. Theoretical Basis of the Research and Developed Hypotheses

The study examines the relationship between the organizational resilience and crisis management of hospitality businesses that are sensitive to both internal and external crises and experience a decrease in demand due to crises (Elshaer & Saad, 2022). At the core of this relationship is the assumption that overcoming crises will make the organization resilient, and a resilient organization will be better equipped to overcome crises. In addition, while crisis management seems to be a short-term activity in the fight against crises, organizational resilience is considered as an investment in the future. Therefore, the inclusion of these two concepts in the strategic management process is significant for the continuity of the organization. Despite the emphasis on the necessity of examining them together in the literature (İnce et al., 2017; Melian-Alzola et al., 2020), and their significant importance, it can be said that there is a limited number of studies that explore the relationship between organizational resilience levels and crisis management in hospitality businesses. Based on all these considerations, the research hypotheses created are as follows.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between the organizational resilience levels of hospitality businesses and their crisis management activities.

H₁: There is a significant relationship between the organizational resilience levels of hospitality businesses and their crisis management activities.

H_{1a}: There is a significant relationship between planned resilience and pre-crisis management activities in hospitality businesses.

H_{1b}: There is a significant relationship between adaptive resilience and crisis period management activities in hospitality businesses.

H_{1c}: There is a significant relationship between adaptive resilience and post-crisis management activities in hospitality businesses.

Considering these reasons, the aim is to contribute to filling the existing gap in the literature and to provide guidance for hospitality businesses to increase their resilience levels within the scope of strategic management activities and to emphasize crisis management activities. This, in turn, can make them stronger in dealing with crises. It can be said that organizational resilience is the result of a combination of planned and adaptive activities, with planned resilience shaped by activities before a crisis, and adaptive resilience shaped by activities during and after a crisis (Lee et al., 2013; Orchiston et al., 2016). Short-term responses to crises may be considered ideal for crisis management, but they are not possible to provide long-term resilience (Linnenluecke & Griffiths, 2010). Therefore, it can be assumed that organizational resilience includes crisis management, while organizational resilience affects crisis management activities. Based on all these considerations, the research hypotheses created are as follows.

H₂: The organizational resilience levels of hospitality businesses affect their crisis management activities.

H_{2a}: The planned resilience levels of hospitality businesses affect their pre-crisis management activities.

H_{2b}: The adaptive resilience levels of hospitality businesses affect their crisis period management activities.

H_{2c}: The adaptive resilience levels of hospitality businesses affect their post-crisis management activities.

On the other hand, it can be assumed that crisis management has an impact on organizational resilience based on the assumption that the sub-units that make up the unit will maintain the existence of the unit. Based on these considerations, the research hypotheses created are as follows.

H₃: Crisis management activities of hospitality businesses affect their organizational resilience levels.

H_{3a}: Pre-crisis management activities of hospitality businesses affect their planned resilience levels.

H_{3b}: Crisis period management activities of hospitality businesses affect their adaptive resilience levels.

H_{3c}: Post-crisis management activities of hospitality businesses affect their adaptive resilience levels.

3.2. Sample, Data Collection Tool and Method of the Research

The study has been prepared to determine whether there is a relationship between the crisis management activities of hospitality businesses and their organizational resilience levels. To examine the relationship between variables, a survey questionnaire consisting of 3 sections and 38 statements with a 5-point Likert scale rating was used. In the first section of the questionnaire, there are 7 statements related to participants' demographic characteristics such as gender, age, education, and years of service. The second section includes the organizational resilience scale developed by Orchiston et al., (2016), and the third section includes the crisis management scale developed by Aksu & Deveci (2009). Since a study with the translated statements of the organizational resilience scale into Turkish could not be found, the scale was translated into Turkish with the help of three researchers who have knowledge in the field and a linguist. Since the scales used in the study have previously demonstrated their validity and reliability in other studies, their internal validity can be considered as proven. However, since it was tested in different cultures and samples, the structure validity was tested.

The universe of the study consists of the senior and mid-level managers of 5-star hospitality businesses operating in Ankara. The choice to define the study universe as Ankara is due to the city's prominence in terms of business and city tourism. The reason for selecting 5-star hospitality businesses is based on the assumption that these businesses have a higher level of institutionalization in crisis management compared to less-starred businesses. The inclusion of general managers, assistant general managers, and department managers, that is, senior and mid-level managers, in the study is based on the fact that these positions are responsible for implementing strategic management practices (Seçilmiş & Sarı, 2010; Ghazi, 2017). Based on data from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 27 hospitality businesses with Tourism Business Licenses and five stars have been identified in Ankara, and individuals and institutions within the scope of the study population have been determined. The estimated number of managers in 5-star hospitality businesses in Ankara was assumed to be 10 (Avcı, 2015), and $[27 \times 10]$ was calculated as 270. The sample size to represent this universe was calculated with 95% reliability and 5% margin of error. According to the results of the calculation, the number of samples was found to be 158 (Yamane, 2006). The data collection process, which was carried out using the convenience sampling method, was terminated by obtaining 193 questionnaires, and analyses were performed.

3.3. Data Analysis

The Cronbach Alpha value obtained for the organizational resilience scale was found to be 0.92, planned resilience sub-dimension was found to be 0.94 and adaptive resilience sub-dimension was 0.78. The Cronbach Alpha value of the crisis management scale was 0.97, 0.94 for the pre-crisis period sub-dimension, 0.80 for the crisis period sub-dimension, and 0.95 for the post-crisis period sub-dimension. According to the values obtained, both scales can be considered reliable (Kılıç, 2016).

The organizational resilience scale consists of 13 statements. As a result of the factor analysis, the Bartlett Test result was determined as 1488,349 and the p-significance value was determined as .000. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample value was found as .934. In addition, it was determined that the scale consisted of 13 statements and 2 sub-dimensions and that these sub-dimensions explained 56.34% of the total variance. According to Yaşlıoğlu (2017), when the sample number is below 200, the factor load of each of the expressions on the scale should be above 0.40. The 13th statement in the scale was removed from the scale because its factor loading was below 0.4. The crisis management scale consists of 18 statements. As a result of the factor analysis, the Bartlett Test result was determined as 2719,188 and the p-significance value was determined as .000. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample value was found as .951. In addition, it was determined that the scale

consisting of 18 items consisted of 3 sub-dimensions and that these sub-dimensions explained 66.91% of the total variance. The KMO values obtained within the scope of the study are expressed as "perfect" by Hutcheson and Sofroniou (cited in Field, 2009). Furthermore, the Bartlett Test resulted in $p < 0.05$, indicating that the correlations between the items are sufficiently large for Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The total variance values explained were found to be over 55%. Yaşlıoğlu (2017) emphasizes that the factor structure of this value explains more than half of the total variable variance, that is, it should exceed 50%.

The data obtained in the study were computerized and arranged with Microsoft Excel package software and analyzed with SPSS 20 statistical software. Before starting the analysis, the suitability of the numerical data to the normal distribution was examined by Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Shapiro Wilk and Skewness and Kurtosis tests, and Histogram and Q-Q Plot plots. As a result of the analysis, it was concluded that the data did not show normal distribution. Categorical data is presented with frequency and percentage values, while numerical data, which does not meet the normality assumption, is presented with median, minimum, and maximum values. During data analysis, when the data shows normal distribution, the "Mann-Whitney U test" is used for comparing two independent groups, the "Kruskal-Wallis" test is used when there are more than two independent groups, and the "Spearman Correlation Coefficient Test" is used to determine the correlation between variables. The significance level for all tests was accepted as $p < 0.05$.

4. FINDINGS

When the demographic characteristics of the participants were examined, it was determined that the majority of them were between the ages of 30-39 (41.8%) and 40-49 (35.2%), majority of senior and mid-level managers in 5-star hospitality businesses in Ankara are female (61.8%), and more than half of them have an education level at the undergraduate level (65.5%) in line with their duties. Considering that the number of people in a certain position will decrease as the hierarchy increases, 89.7% of the managers are in the position of department manager. These department managers are distributed in various departments as follows: 10.9% in food and beverage services, 9.1% in housekeeping, 6.7% in human resources, 12.1% in front desk, and 12.1% in sales and marketing departments.

When the experiences of the managers participating in the study were examined, it was determined that those with sectoral experience in the range of 5-15 years represent the majority (48.5%). Therefore, it can be stated that managers are "young and dynamic" in the professional sense. Those whose term of office in the organization they are currently in the range of 5-15 years correspond to 49.1% and represent the majority. Their tenure in the current organization includes tenures in different departments and/or different positions. Finally, when the experience of the participants in their current position is examined, similarly, the majority (61.2%) have been working in their current position for 5-15 years. In line with this information, it can be stated that the majority of the managers participating in the study have a good level of professional experience.

Table 1: Analysis Results Regarding the Difference between Sectoral Experience and Organizational Resilience and Crisis Management.

Sectoral experience		Planned Resilience	Adaptive Resilience	Pre-Crisis Period	Crisis Period	Post-Crisis Period
5-15 years	Mean	33.63	16.06	37.45	8.34	29.91
	Std. Deviation	6.757	2.552	6.908	1.622	5.340
	Median	35.00	16.00	39.00	8.00	30.00
	Minimum	8	10	13	2	7
	Maximum	42	20	48	10	35
	Mean	35.41	16.61	40.22	8.95	31.34
16-25 years	Std. Deviation	5.439	2.498	5.964	1.188	4.340
	Median	36.95	17.00	4.67	9.00	32.00
	Minimum	19	11	9	6	13
	Maximum	40	24	49	10	39
	Mean	37.00	17.48	41.00	9.48	33.90

26 years and more	Std. Deviation	3.993	2.462	5.936	1.504	4.647
	Median	38.00	17.00	41.00	10.00	34.00
	Minimum	28	13	30	6	28
	Maximum	44	21	57	14	49
	Total	Mean	34.74	20.43	38.93	8.72
Total	Std. Deviation	6.059	3.000	6.561	1.500	5.030
	Median	36.00	21.00	40.00	9.00	32.00
	Minimum	8	11	9	2	7
	Maximum	44	26	57	14	49
	P value	0.04*	0.10	0.017*	0.003*	0.011*

When the analysis results regarding the difference between participants' sectoral experience and organizational resilience and crisis management are examined, statistically significant differences were found between sectoral experience and planned resilience ($p=0.04$), the pre-crisis period (0.017), the crisis period ($p=0.003$), and the post-crisis period ($p=0.011$). As the duration of sectoral experience increases, it is observed that the mean scores for planned resilience, the pre-crisis period, the crisis period, and the post-crisis period also increase (Table 1). According to the results of the post-hoc analysis, the source of the differences for each variable comes from individuals with 5-15 years of experience and those with 26 years and more of experience.

Table 2: Analysis Results for the Difference between Experience in the Current Position and Organizational Resilience and Crisis Management

Experience in the current position		Planned Resilience	Adaptive Resilience	Pre-Crisis Period	Crisis Period	Post-Crisis Period
Less than 5 years	Mean	33.09	15.58	37.85	8.48	29.06
	Std. Deviation	6.257	2.278	6.713	1.349	5.074
	Median	33.00	15.00	39.00	8.00	29.00
	Minimum	16	10	19	5	16
	Maximum	40	20	47	10	35
5-15 years	Mean	34.86	16.42	38.64	8.65	31.10
	Std. Deviation	6.132	2.601	7.045	1.640	5.317
	Median	37.00	17.00	40.00	8.00	33.00
	Minimum	8	10	9	2	7
	Maximum	44	24	57	14	49
More than 16 years	Mean	36.10	17.52	41.03	9.19	32.61
	Std. Deviation	5.350	2.322	3.962	1.046	3.127
	Median	38.00	17.00	42.00	10.00	34.00
	Minimum	19	11	31	6	27
	Maximum	41	22	45	10	40
P value	0.049*	0.006*	0.1	0.06	0.016*	

When the results of the analysis of the difference between the participants' experiences in the current position and organizational resilience and crisis management were examined, a statistically significant difference was found between the experience in the current position and planned resilience ($p=0.04$), adaptive resilience (0.006) and the post-crisis period ($p=0.016$). As the duration of experience in the current position increases, planned resilience, adaptive resilience, and post-crisis period also increase (Table 2). According to the results of the post-hoc analysis, the source of the difference in each variable is individuals working less than 5 years and 16 years and above.

Table 3: Correlation Analysis of the Relationship between Organizational Resilience and Crisis Management

Organizational Resilience	Crisis Management	
	Correlation Coefficient	.805**
	P value	<.001

In Table 3, the correlation analysis of the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management is included. A positive and high correlation was found between organizational resilience and crisis management ($R=0.80$). As organizational resilience increases, crisis management activities also increase. In the light of this finding, the H_0 hypothesis was rejected, the H_1 hypothesis was accepted.

Table 4: Correlation Analysis of the Relationship between Planned Resilience and Crisis Management

		Planned Resilience	Pre-Crisis Period	Crisis Period	Post-Crisis Period
Planned Resilience	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.648**	.596**	.580**
	P value		<.001	<.001	<.001
Pre-Crisis Period	Correlation Coefficient		1.000	.614**	.676**
	P value			<.001	<.001
Crisis Period	Correlation Coefficient			1.000	.692**
	P value				<.001

When Table 4 is examined, it is observed that the p-values are <0.001 . Correlation coefficients are positive numbers. It can be stated that there is a positive linear relationship between the variables. When the planned resilience and the pre-crisis period were examined, it was determined that the correlation coefficient was 0.648. There is a positive relationship between the two variables. As planned resilience increases, pre-crisis management also increases. In the light of this finding, the H_{1a} hypothesis was accepted.

Table 5: Correlation Analysis of the Relationship between Adaptive Resilience and Crisis Management

		Adaptive Resilience	Pre-Crisis Period	Crisis Period	Post-Crisis Period
Adaptive Resilience	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.580**	.502**	.530**
	P value		<.001	<.001	<.001
Pre-Crisis Period	Correlation Coefficient		1.000	.614**	.676**
	P value			<.001	<.001
Crisis Period	Correlation Coefficient			1.000	.692**
	P value				<.001

When adaptive resilience and pre-crisis period, crisis period, and post-crisis period are examined, it is seen that the correlation coefficients are 0.58, 0.50, and 0.53, respectively. There is a moderately positive relationship

between the variables. As adaptive resilience increases, pre-crisis management, crisis-period management, and post-crisis management also increase. In the light of this finding, the H_{1b} and H_{1c} hypothesis was accepted.

Table 6: Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Organizational Resilience and Crisis Management

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Standard Error	Coefficients		
1	(Fixed)	15.233	3.700	Beta	4.117	<.001
	Organizational Resilience	1.149	.066	.805	17.333	<.001

*Dependent Variable = Crisis Management

In the regression analysis of the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management, the p-value was found to be <0.001. According to the obtained P value, organizational resilience affects crisis management. The B value was found to be 1.14. This value shows that organizational resilience has a positive impact on crisis management. The R-value in the table (correlation coefficient=0.80) shows a high positive relationship between crisis management and organizational resilience. The R Square value was determined as 0.64. Organizational resilience explains crisis management to the extent of 64%. When the effect of crisis management on organizational resilience was examined, the B value was found to be .54 and it was found that organizational resilience had a higher level of effect on crisis management. In the light of this finding, the H_2 hypothesis was accepted, the H_3 hypothesis was rejected.

Table 7: Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Planned Resilience and Pre-Crisis Period

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Standard Error	Beta		
1	(Fixed)	10.523	1.961	Beta	5.367	<.001
	Planned Resilience	0.818	.056	.755	14.707	<.001

*Dependent Variable = Pre-Crisis Period

In the regression analysis of the relationship between planned resilience and the pre-crisis period, the p-value was found to be <0.001. According to the obtained P value, planned resilience affects pre-crisis management. The B value was found to be 0.81. This value shows that planned resilience had a positive impact on the pre-crisis period. The R-value in the table (correlation coefficient=0.75) shows a high positive relationship between the pre-crisis period and planned resilience. The R Square value was determined as 0.57. Planned resilience explains pre-crisis period management to the extent of 57%. When examining the impact of planned resilience on the pre-crisis period, a B value of 0.69 was found, indicating that planned resilience has a higher level of effect on the pre-crisis period. In the light of this finding, the H_{2a} hypothesis was accepted, the H_{3a} hypothesis was rejected.

Table 8: Regression Analysis of the Relationship between Adaptive Resilience and Crisis Period

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Standard Error	Coefficients		
1	(Fixed)	10.584	1.144	Beta	9.252	<.001
	Crisis Period	1.129	.129	.565	8.732	<.001

*Dependent Variable = Adaptive Resilience

In the regression analysis of the relationship between adaptive resilience and the crisis period, the P value was found <0.001. According to the obtained P value, the crisis period affects adaptive resilience. The B value was

found to be 1.12. This shows that the crisis period has a positive effect on adaptive resilience. The R-value in the table (correlation coefficient = 0.56) shows that there is a high level of positive relationship between the crisis period and adaptive resilience. The R Square value was determined as 0.31. Adaptive resilience explains the crisis period to the extent of 31%. When examining the impact of adaptive resilience on the crisis period, a B value of 0.28 was found, indicating that the crisis period has a higher level of effect on adaptive resilience. In the light of this finding, the H_{2b} hypothesis was rejected, the H_{3b} hypothesis was accepted.

Table 9: Regression Analysis of the Effect of Adaptive Resilience on the Post-Crisis Period

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Standard Error	Beta		
1 (Fixed)	10.237	2.158		4.744	<.001
Adaptive Resilience	1.015	.105	.605	9.713	<.001

*Dependent Variable = Post-Crisis Period

In the regression analysis of the relationship between adaptive resilience and the post-crisis period, the p-value was found to be <0.001. In this case, adaptive resilience can be interpreted as affecting the post-crisis period. The B value was found to be 1.01. This value shows that adaptive resilience has a positive impact on post-crisis management. The R-value in the table (correlation coefficient=0.60) shows a high positive relationship between crisis management and adaptive resilience. The R Square value was determined as 0.36. Adaptive resilience explains the post-crisis period to the extent of 36%. When the effect of the post-crisis period on adaptive resilience was examined, the B value was found to be .36 and it was found that adaptive resilience had a higher level of effect on the post-crisis period. In the light of this finding, the H_{2c} hypothesis was accepted, the H_{3c} hypothesis was rejected.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The concepts of crisis and crisis management, which constantly maintain their place on the agenda, are among the most important facts of our time. Crisis management, which is also becoming more important in scientific terms, is the subject of many studies. There are different opinions about the relationship between organizational resilience, which is a new subject for research, and crisis management. Organizational resilience is the organization's effort to advance both when things are going well and during challenging periods (Seville, 2009). The effort to overcome these difficult processes expresses the crisis management dimension and the effort to reach forward means to increase the power by turning the crisis into an opportunity (Vargo & Seville, 2011). Sitkin (as cited in Veil, 2011) emphasizes the importance of turning crises into opportunities and suggests that without negative experiences, organizational resilience will decrease. Ketter (2022) states that the concepts are complementary and link crisis management to short-term intensive treatment and organizational resilience to medium- and long-term treatment. Williams et al. (2017) state that the concepts are different aspects of the same challenge, but the studies examined together are not sufficient. Gerçek & Yılmaz-Börekçi (2019) state that resilience is the capacity of the organization to withstand destructive events. When these destructive situations are considered crises, it is fair to state that organizational resilience and crisis management are related to each other.

However, despite their conceptual connection and co-occurrence, there is limited research in the field of tourism that examines organizational resilience and crisis management together. Existing studies predominantly focus on crisis management, and the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management is not sufficiently explored in studies (Prayag, 2018; Prayag et al., 2023). All tourism businesses, especially hospitality businesses that want to survive in changing environmental conditions, need crisis management practices supported by organizational resilience strategies (Scarpino & Gretzel, 2014). However, it is emphasized that the subject should be examined within the tourism sector and specifically within the important subsector of hospitality businesses (Prayag, 2018; Otu & Makichi, 2021). In this study, the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management is examined in line with the current views. In this section of the study, the findings obtained from the quantitative data will be evaluated and interpreted.

When examining the differences between the experiences of the managers participating in the study and organizational resilience and crisis management, statistically significant differences were found between sectoral experience with the planned dimension of resilience and the entire crisis management process. As the experience of managers in the sector increased, planned resilience, pre-crisis period, crisis period and post-crisis period mean scores also increased. It can be stated that the negative conditions that managers face during their stay in the sector positively affect the crisis management process and allow the organization they are involved into carry out planning activities to increase resilience. What is important here is that the duties of managers in different organizations and different positions during their time in the sector have a role in this increase. This situation may suggest that the experience gained by managers in dealing with various crises in different roles during their time in the sector positively influences the crisis management process and provides managers with different perspectives on crisis management. The fact that the sectoral experiences of the managers have an impact on the planning activities carried out before the crisis, the effort to act during the crisis process and to end the crisis, to review the causes of the crisis when the crisis ends, to strengthen the weaknesses of the organization and to continue the pre-crisis activities. Hall & Williams (cited in Nyaupane et al., 2020) suggest that a manager's management skills, age, and experience increase the likelihood of coping with future crises.

When the experience of the managers in the current position was examined, it was determined that as the duration of experience in the current position increased, the planned and adaptive dimensions of organizational resilience and the post-crisis period mean scores also increased. The experience gained by an individual as a manager, both in different organizations and in the organization, they are currently working for, can influence the resilience of the organization in terms of both planning activities and the capacity to adapt to changing conditions. Fielder (1994) suggests that individuals with sufficient leadership experience tend to perform more effectively, especially in crisis conditions where stress is at its peak. Leadership and management are among the significant factors in increasing organizational resilience (Tibay et al., 2018). As a result, it can be stated that the experience gained by the individual in the managerial position affects the crisis management activities and the resilience of the organization.

Organizational efforts in crisis management and organizational resilience are fundamentally intertwined and interdependent (Tasic et al., 2020). The interdependence between these concepts can be explained using the metaphor of a camera lens (Kennedy et al., 2003). In crisis management, the camera lens focuses on a specific point, while in organizational resilience, it covers the whole picture from a broader perspective. Based on this, in this study, crisis management and organizational resilience were considered as related concepts, with organizational resilience being at a higher level than crisis management and thus influencing crisis management. On the other hand, it was assumed that the existence of the whole depends on the existence of the unit, and crisis management affects organizational resilience. The results of the analysis performed are as follows.

In the study, the correlation coefficient expressing the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management is observed to be 0.80. There is a positive relationship between the variables. As the level of resilience of the organization increases, crisis management activities also increase. In the conducted regression analysis, $p < 0.001$, $B = 1.14$, and R (correlation coefficient) = 0.80 were found. Therefore, it was determined that there was a positive and high-level relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management. According to the obtained R Square value, the concepts explain each other by 64%. The existing literature also emphasizes the relationship between variables (Linnenluecke & Griffiths, 2010; Williams et al., 2017). Channa et al. (2019) found a positive relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management in their study on textile firms. Based on the existing literature and the results obtained in this study, a positive relationship between variables has been identified, and hypotheses H_0 and H_3 have been rejected, while hypotheses H_1 and H_2 have been accepted.

Planned resilience refers to roadmaps created by organizations before a crisis occurs in order to prevent or minimize the impact of the crisis. (Barasa et al., 2018). McManus et al. (2008) emphasize the importance of planning in ensuring organizational resilience. The planning activities carried out allow the organization to examine itself before the crisis occurs and to correct its deficiencies. The initial phase of crisis management, which is characterized as preparing for a crisis, is the first condition for an organization to be resilient.

Accordingly, correlation and regression analysis were performed on the assumption that the planned dimension of organizational resilience and pre-crisis management activities were related. As a result of the analysis, a positive linear relationship was determined between the variables, and the correlation coefficient was determined as 0.64. From this point of view, parallel to the increase in the planned dimension of resilience, there is also an increase in management in the pre-crisis period. The results of the regression analysis show that $p < 0.001$, and $B = 0.81$. It was concluded that planned resilience had a positive effect on the pre-crisis period. In addition, based on the R Square value determined, it can be stated that planned resilience explains the pre-crisis period by 57%. Similar to the result obtained in this study, Liu-Lastres & Cahyanto (2023) concluded in their study on recreation organizations that there is a relationship between planned resilience and pre-crisis management activities. As a result of the analysis, hypothesis H_{3a} has been rejected, while hypotheses H_{1a} and H_{2a} have been accepted.

Planned resilience can sometimes fall short when the organization is struggling with the crisis conditions it is in (Bryce et al., 2020). Due to the uniqueness of crises, the plans carried out cannot be fully functional during the crisis. The organization needs to act within the conditions it is in. Adaptation, which can be explained as an adaptation to existing environmental conditions, is an organizational ability (McAslan, 2010) and another sub-dimension of organizational resilience. Therefore, it can be assumed that adaptive resilience is linked to practices carried out during the crisis period. Based on the assumption, correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between variables and regression analysis was performed to measure their effects. The correlation analysis resulted in $p < 0.001$, with an R-value of 0.502. A moderately positive relationship can be mentioned between the variables. The B value (1.12) shows that the crisis period has an effect on adaptive resilience and explains it by 31% (R Square = 0.31). As a result of the analysis, hypothesis H_{2b} has been rejected, while hypotheses H_{1b} and H_{3b} have been accepted.

Adaptive resilience can be described as an ability that is formed through an organization's appropriate responses to crisis conditions. Lee et al. (2013) argue that adaptive resilience, which is seen as a capability, emerged in the post-crisis period. Considering the efforts of organizations to heal and learn from the crisis at the end of the crisis and the desire to adapt the organization to the changing conditions, it can be assumed that adaptive resilience is formed in the post-crisis period. In this regard, correlation and regression analysis were performed. The correlation analysis resulted in $p < 0.001$, with an R-value of 0.53. A moderately positive relationship can be mentioned between the variables. The B value (1,015) shows that adaptive resilience has an effect on the post-crisis period and explains it by 36% (R Square = 0.61). The obtained results are parallel to the views of Lee et al. (2013). As a result of the analysis, hypothesis H_{3c} has been rejected, while hypotheses H_{1c} and H_{2c} have been accepted.

In summary, with the analyses carried out, it was concluded that organizational resilience affects crisis management. The tourism sector, characterized by its sensitivity to rapidly changing demand and the complexity of the integrated services it offers, includes the hospitality businesses as one of its main activities. When considering the topic specifically within the context of the hospitality businesses, it's important to note that the tourist product is inherently complex but also the service offered in the hospitality businesses has a complex structure within itself, that is, multiple departments working in coordination to provide a cohesive and abstract product to tourists. This complexity can make the hospitality businesses more susceptible to the effects of environmental changes and disruptions. According to Pearson & Mitroff (1993), the organization can only be resilient through a process of crisis management, which includes signal detection before the crisis occurs, rapid intervention and recovery in the next stage, and learning activities after the crisis ends.

5.1. Implications for the Literature

When the relationship between the concepts is evaluated in light of the available information, it would be appropriate to define both concepts as the reaction to conditions and/or situations that will interrupt the normal activities of the organization. However, it can be said that this description, which can be evaluated superficially, leads to the interchangeability of concepts. In light of the information in the literature, it is seen that the concepts have a complementary role in the continuity of organizational activities. Organizational resilience levels are crucial in organizations' responses to crises (Kaçmaz, 2021).

As a result of the analysis, it was concluded that organizational resilience affects crisis management activities. As explained with the metaphor of a camera lens (Kennedy et al., 2003) in the literature, organizational resilience approaches the subject from a broader perspective, while crisis management tackles it from a narrower and more intensive standpoint. Based on the literature and the findings of the study, it would be appropriate to state that organizational resilience is in a higher perspective than crisis management and that organizational resilience affects crisis management activities. To illustrate the point with an example, when considering the existence of an organization from the perspective of a family business, crisis management can be likened to the activities displayed by the third-generation manager to ensure the organization's continuity. In this example, organizational resilience, on the other hand, is the inherent dynamics and culture of the organization that enable it to be passed down to the third generation and even future generations, evolving over time as a process. While short-term existence is possible with crisis management, organizational resilience is important when considered in the long term.

On the other hand, it was concluded that crisis-era management activities affected the adaptive resilience of organizations. Crisis management, which is expressed as short-term compared to organizational resilience, shapes long-term organizational resilience as a result of activities carried out during the crisis, within a specific time frame. In summary, long-term existence is possible within the framework of short-term activities.

Organizational resilience is a vital factor that allows crisis management activities and crisis management. According to the results of the study conducted by Ma & Zhang (2022), the resilience capacities of organizations make it possible to implement reactive and proactive crisis management activities. Concepts play a key role in the existence of organizations. When considering the situation from the perspective of vulnerable hospitality businesses, it can be considered a necessity to take organizational resilience into account within management activities. Investments made by hospitality businesses for resilience protect against crises (Kaçmaz & Üngüren, 2022). However, considering the organization as resilient on its own will not fully ensure organizational resilience.

5.2. Practical Implications

In the presentation of the touristic product, which is a whole, more than one actor plays a role in the organization. Due to this aspect of the touristic product, it is not possible to separate the service offered in hospitality businesses, and it cannot be considered that food and beverage service and recreational activity are independent of each other. According to the study findings, no difference was detected between organizational resilience and crisis management and the departments where managers are involved. Thus, it can be stated that all departments contribute to the organizational resilience. Therefore, in order to ensure resilience in the organization, managers must act as a whole. Considering that the manager's experience has a share in organizational resilience and crisis management, it should act by considering the past experiences of managers in planning activities. Most importantly, in order to manage crises successfully, managers should carry out activities to increase the resilience of organizations. In order to survive in the turbulent environmental conditions of recent times, return to their pre-crisis normalcy, and even conclude the process advantageously by leaving the old normal behind, tourism businesses must first and foremost enhance their resilience capacities. Because a resilient individual means a resilient personnel. Resilient personnel, in turn, make the organization resilient (Prayag, 2018). Based on the study results, it can be stated that the responsibility of managers is to utilize the knowledge they acquire through education and professional experience to enhance the organization's resilience. Hospitality businesses with high organizational resilience can make crisis management planning more comfortable, and appropriate steps can be taken against the crisis whose effects are felt, and they can adapt to new conditions by drawing lessons after the end of the crisis.

5.3. Recommendations for Future Studies

Since the touristic product is offered by the joint action of more than one enterprise, the resilience of the stakeholders may affect the resilience of the organization positively or negatively. It is recommended that future studies involve discussing the organizational resilience levels of hospitality businesses with their stakeholders. Another recommendation is related to the findings of this study, which indicate the relevance of managerial characteristics to organizational resilience and crisis management. For future studies, it is recommended to conduct a more in-depth examination of the relationship between managerial personality

traits and the concepts. Additionally, exploring the role of risk management in the relationship between organizational resilience and crisis management, as well as examining the connection between organizational resilience as a continuous renewal process of the organization and incremental and radical innovation, is also recommended. As mentioned earlier, the study was carried out to cover hospitality businesses operating in the field of urban tourism. It may be recommended to repeat future studies on hospitality businesses that offer services for different types of tourism (winter, thermal, congress, etc.).

REFERENCES

- Aksu, A. & Deveci, S. (2009). İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Kriz Yönetimi Becerileri. *Education Sciences*, 4(2), 448-464.
- Annarelli, A. & Nonino, F. (2016). Strategic and Operational Management of Organizational Resilience: Current State of Research and Future Directions. *The International Journal of Management Science*, 62, 1-18.
- Avcı, N. (2015). Otel İşletmelerinde Yönetici Yetkinliklerinin Analizi: İzmir Örneği. *Anatolia Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 26(1): 7-16.
- Barasa, E., Mbau, R. & Gilson, L. (2018). What Is Resilience and How Can It Be Nurtured? A Systematic Review of Empirical Literature on Organizational Resilience. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 7(6), 491-503.
- Broker-Bulling, F. (2020). Analyzing the Resilience of Tourism Stakeholders During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case Study of Bend, Oregon. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet Teknisk-Naturvetenskapling Fakultet.
- Brown, A. N., Rovins, J. E., Feldman-Jensen, S., Orchiston, C. & Johnston, D. (2019). Measuring Disaster Resilience within the Hotel Sector: an Exploratory Survey of Wellington and Hawke's Bay, New Zealand Hotel Staff and Managers. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 33, 108-121.
- Bryce, C., Ring, P., Ashby, S. & Wardman, J. K. (2020). Resilience In the Face of Uncertainty: Early Lessons From the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Risk Research*, 23(7), 880-887.
- Cahyanto, I. & Pennington-Gray, L. (2017). Toward A Comprehensive Destination Crisis Resilience Framework. 2017 International Travel and Tourism Research Association Conference. Canada Quebec. <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2047&context=ttra> (Date of Access: 17.07.2023).
- Channa, N. A., Shah, S. M. M. & Ghumro, N. H. (2019). Uncovering the Link Between Strategic Human Resource Management and Crisis Management: Mediating Role of Organizational Resilience. *Annals of Contemporary Developments in Management & HR*, 1(2): 15-27,
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational Resilience: A Capability-Based Conceptualization. *Business Research* 13, 215-246.
- Elshaer, I. A. & Saad, S.K. (2022). Entrepreneurial resilience and business continuity in the tourism and hospitality industry: the role of adaptive performance and institutional orientation. *Tourism Review*, 77(5), 1365-1384.
- Faulkner, B. (2001). Towards a Framework for Tourism Disaster Management. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 135-147.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS 3rd Ed*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fielder, F. E. (1994). *Leadership Experience and Leadership Performance*. Seattle: Washington University.
- Gerçek, M. & Yılmaz-Börekçi, D. (2019). Bireysel Yine/Yenilenmeyi (Rezilyansı/Dayanıklılığı) Destekleyici İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Uygulamalarına İlişkin Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması. *Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 20(45), 17-37.

- Ghazi, K. M. (2017). The Impact of Strategic Planning on Crisis Management Styles in the 5-star Hotels. *Alexandria University Journal of The Faculty of Tourism and Hotels*, 14(1): 11-29.
- Glaesser, D. (2003). *Crisis Management in the Tourism Industry*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hollnagel, E. (2015). RAG – Resilience Analysis Grid <https://erikhollnagel.com/onewebmedia/RAG%20Outline%20V2.pdf> (Date of Access: 17.07.2023).
- Huang, Y., Tseng, Y. & Petrick, J. F. (2008). Crisis Management Planning to Restore Tourism After Disasters A Case Study from Taiwan. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 24(2), 203-221.
- İnce, H, İmamoğlu, S, Z, Karaköse, M, A. & Türkcan, H. (2017). The Search for Understanding Organizational Resilience. *ISMC 2017 13th International Strategic Management Conference*, 6-8 June 2017, Gebze, Türkiye. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324210429_The_Search_For_Understanding_Organizational_Resilience, (Date of Access: 2.7.2023).
- Jang, S., Park, J. S. & Choi, Y. S. (2022). Organizational Resource and Organizational Resilience in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 93(2): 1-5.
- Jiang, Y., Ritchie, B. W. & Benckendorff, P. (2017). Bibliometric Visualisation: an Application in Tourism Crisis and Disaster Management Research. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(16), 1-33.
- John-Eke, E. C. & Bayo, P. L. (2021). Crisis Management and Corporate Resilience in Hotel Presidential: The Theoretical Perspective. *IIARD International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 7(3), 21-34.
- Kaçmaz, Y. Y. (2021). Öğrenen Örgütlerin Kurumsallaşma Aracılığı ile Örgütsel Dayanıklılık Üzerindeki Etkisi: Alanya’da Konaklama İşletmeleri Yöneticileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. (Unpublished Phd Thesis). Alanya: Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University.
- Kaçmaz, Y. Y. & Üngüren, E. (2022). Konaklama İşletmeleri Açısından Örgütsel Dayanıklılığın Stratejik Rolü, Karabulut, Ş. (Ed.), *Bilimsel Gelişmeler Işığında Yönetim ve Strateji Araştırmaları*, Bursa: Ekin Yayınevi, 109-120.
- Kennedy, P., Perrottet, C. & Thomas C. (2003). Scenario Planning After 9/11: Managing the Impact of a Catastrophic Event. *Strategy & Leadership*, 31(1), 4-13.
- Ketter, E. (2022). Bouncing Back or Bouncing Forward? Tourism Destinations’ Crisis Resilience and Crisis Management Tactics. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 31, 3103-3118.
- Koronis, E. & Ponis, S. (2018). A Strategic Approach to Crisis Management and Organizational Resilience. *Journal of Business Strategy*. 39 (1), 32-42.
- Kılıç, S. (2016). Cronbach’ın Alfa Güvenirlik Katsayısı. *Journal of Mood Disorders*, 6(1), 47-48.
- Lamanna, Z., Williams, K. H. & Childers, C. (2012). An Assessment of Resilience: Disaster Management and Recovery for Greater New Orleans’ Hotels, *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 11(3), 210-224.
- Lee, A.V., Vargo, J. & Seville, E. (2013). Developing a Tool to Measure and Compare Organizations’ Resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 14(1), 29-41.
- Lengnick-Hall, & Beck, T. E. (2005). Adaptive Fit Versus Robust Transformation: How Organizations Respond to Environmental Change. *Journal of Management*, 31(5), 738-757.
- Lengnick-Hall, C.A. & Beck, T.E. (2009). Resilience Capacity and Strategic Agility: Prerequisites for Thriving in A Dynamic Environment, Nemeth, C., Hollnagel, E., Dekker, S. (Ed.), *Resilience Engineering perspectives*, 2nd ed. Ashgate, Aldershot, UK. 410-428.
- Lew, A. A. (2013). Scale, change and resilience in community tourism planning. *Tourism Geographies*, 16, 14-22.
- Linnenluecke, M. & Griffiths, A. (2010). Beyond adaptation: resilience for business in light of climate change and weather extremes. *International Association for Business and Society*, 49 (3), 477-511.

- Liu-Lastres, B. ve Cahyanto, I., R. (2023). Are We Always Ready? Examining Event Professionals Approaches to Risk and Crisis Management and Resilience. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 46, 1-11.
- Ma, B. & Zhang, J. (2022). Tie Strength, Organizational Resilience and Enterprise Crisis Management: An Empirical Study in Pandemic Time. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 81
- Mallak, L. A. (1998). Measuring Resilience in Health Care Provider Organizations. *Health Manpower Management*, 24(4), 148-152.
- McAslan, A. (2010). *Organizational Resilience: Understanding the Concept and its Application*. <https://www.flinders.edu.au/content/dam/documents/research/torrens-resilience-institute/organisational-resilience.pdf>, (Date of Access: 07.07.2023).
- McManus, S, Seville, E, Vargo, J. & Brunson, D. (2008). Facilitated Process for Improving Organizational Resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, 9(2), 81-90.
- Melian-Alzola, L., Fernandez-Monroy, M. & Hidalgo-Penate, M. (2020). Hotels in Contexts of Uncertainty: Measuring Organisational Resilience. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 36, 1-14.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Prayag, G, Godwyll, J. & White, D. (2020). Toward a Resilient Organization: Analysis of Employee Skills and Organization Adaptive Traits. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(4), 658-677.
- O'Connor, J. (1987). *The Meaning of Crisis: A Theoretical Introduction 1st Ed*. New Jersey: Blackwell Pub.
- Okafor, L. E., Khalid, U. & Burzynska, K. (2022). Does the Level of a Country's Resilience Moderate the Link Between the Tourism Industry and the Economic Policy Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic?. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(2): 303-318.
- Okumuş, F., Altınay, M. & Araslı, H. (2005). The Impact of Turkey's Economic Crisis of February 2001 On The Tourism Industry In Northern Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 26, 95-104.
- Orchiston, C., Vargo, J. & Seville, E. (2012). Outcomes of the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence for Tourism Businesses. <https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/items/cf1c09f6-bfa7-4bee-9408-0181f7ebac0d> (Date of Access: 11.07.2023).
- Orchiston, C., Prayag, G. & Brown, C. (2016). Organizational Resilience in the Tourism Sector. *Annals of Tourism Research* 56(1), 128-163.
- Orchiston, C. & Espiner, S. (2017). Fast and slow resilience in the New Zealand tourism industry, A. A. Lew & Joseph Cheer, (Ed.), *Understanding tourism resilience and adaptation to environmental change*. London: Routledge, 102-126.
- Otu, K. A. & Makichi, C., N. (2021). Resilience Capabilities of Managers in Crisis Management The Study of Swedish Sit-in Restaurants. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Linköping: Linköping University Department of Management and Engineering.
- Park J. & Seo, R. A. (2024). Contingent value of bricolage strategy on smes' organizational resilience: lessons from the covid-19 pandemic. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 11(263).
- Pearson, C. M. & Clair, J. A. (1998). Reframing Crisis Management. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(1), 59-76.
- Pearson, C. M. & Mitroff, I. I. (1993). From Crisis Prone to Crisis Prepared: A Framework for Crisis Management. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 7(1), 48- 59.
- Prayag, G. (2018). Symbiotic relationship or not? Understanding resilience and crisis management in tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25, 133-135.
- Prayag, G. (2023). Tourism resilience in the 'new normal': Beyond jingle and jangle fallacies?. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 54, 513-520.
- Prayag, G., Jiang, Y., Chowdhury, M., Hossain, M. I. & Akter, N. (2023). Building Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Resilience in Tourism Firms During COVID-19: A Staged Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 00(0).

- Ritchie, B. W., Bentley, G., Koruth, T. & Wang, J. (2011). Proactive Crisis Planning: Lessons for the Accommodation Industry. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 11(3), 367-386.
- Santana, G. (2004). Crisis Management and Tourism Beyond the Rhetoric. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 15(4), 299-321.
- Scarpino, M. & Gretzel, U. (2014). Conceptualising organisational resilience in tourism crisis management, Ritchie, B.W. & Campiranon, K. (Ed.), *Tourism crisis and disaster management in the asia-pacific*, Wallingford: CABI Publishing, 15-32.
- Schwaiger, K., Zehrer, A. & Braun, B. (2022). Organizational resilience in hospitality family businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative approach. *Tourism Review*, 77(1), 163-176.
- Seçilmiş, C. & Sarı, Y. (2010). Kriz Dönemlerinde Konaklama İşletmelerinin Kriz Yönetimi Uygulamaları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1): 501-520.
- Seeger, M. W., Sellnow, T. L. & Ulmer, R. R. (1998) Communication, Organization, and Crisis. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 21(1), 231-276.
- Seville, E. (2009). Resilience: Great Concept but What Does It Mean for Organizations. *Tephra*, 22, 9-15.
- Shrivastava, P. (1993). 93. Crisis Theory/Practice: Toward a Sustainable Future. *Industrial & Environmental Crisis Quarterly*, 7, 23-42.
- Sobaih, A. E. E., Elshaer, I., Hasanein, A. M. & Abdelaziz, A. S. (2021). Responses to COVID-19: The Role of Performance in the Relationship Between Small Hospitality Enterprises' Resilience and Sustainable Tourism Development. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 94, 1-11.
- Şahin, S., Ulubeyli, S. & Kazaza, A. (2015). Innovative Crisis Management in Construction: Approaches and the Process. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 2298-2305.
- Tasic, J., Amir, S., Tan, J. & Khader, M. (2020). A Multilevel Framework to Enhance Organizational Resilience. *Journal of Risk Research*, 23(6): 713-738.
- The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015). *Developing Strategies to Strengthen The Resilience Of Hotels To Disasters*. https://www.unisdr.org/files/45258_scopingstudyhotelresilientinitiativ.pdf (Date of Access: 09.07.2023).
- Tibay, V., Miller, J., Chang-Richards, A. Egbelakin, T., Seville, E. & Wilkinson, S. (2018). Business Resilience: A Study of Auckland Hospitality Sector. *Procedia Engineering*, 212(6), 1217-1224.
- Tolay, E. & Güleriyüz, E. (2022). Yönetim Alanındaki Örgütsel Dayanıklılık Makalelerinin Bibliyometrik Analizi. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14 (4), 3033-3052.
- Tyrell, T. J. & Johnston, R. J. (2008). Tourism Sustainability, Resiliency and Dynamics: Towards A More Comprehensive Perspective. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(1), 14-24.
- Williams, T. A., Gruber, D. A., Sutcliffe, K. M., Shepherd, D. A. & Yanfei Zhao, E. (2017). Organizational response to adversity: Fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11 (2), 733-769.
- Vargo, J. & Seville E. (2011). Crisis Strategic Planning for SMEs: Finding the Silver Lining. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(28), 5619-5635.
- Veil, S. R. (2011). Mindful Learning in Crisis Management. *Journal of Business Communication*, 48(2), 116-147.
- Yamane, T. (2006). *Temel Örneklem Yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık.
- Yaşlıoğlu, M. M. (2017). Sosyal Bilimlerde Faktör Analizi ve Geçerlilik: Keşfedici ve Doğrulayıcı Faktör Analizlerinin Kullanılması. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 46(Special Issue), 74-85.
- Zhao, R. & Li, L. (2023). Pressure, state and response: configurational analysis of organizational resilience in tourism businesses following the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 10, 370.