



African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management

ajthm.eanso.org

Volume 4, Issue 1, 2025

Print ISSN: 2790-9603 | Online ISSN: 2790-9611

Title DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37284/2790-9611>



Original Article

Crisis Management and Resilience in Hospitality and Tourism Consulting

Christopher Paapa^{1*} & Dr. Stephen Kamau Nguthi, PhD¹

¹ Kabale University, P. O. Box 317, Kabale, Uganda.

² Maseno University, P. O. Box 333-40105, Maseno, Kenya.

* Author for Correspondence Email: cpaapa@kab.ac.ug

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3203>

Date Published: ABSTRACT

24 June 2025

Keywords:

Risk Assessment,
Mitigation Strategies,
Crisis
Communication
Planning,
Business Continuity
Planning,
Natural Disasters,
Pandemics,
Economic
Downturns,
Long-Term
Resilience.

This review paper critically examines how hospitality and tourism organisations and destinations have prepared for and responded to crises ranging from natural disasters and pandemics to economic crises and reputational threats, applying consulting interventions in this process. The purpose of the study was to synthesise theoretical ideologies and empirical evidence that would shed light on the strategic role of consulting in fostering crisis preparedness and resilience. The methodology entails an integrative review of the literature (Involves the systematic gathering, analysing, and synthesising of a diverse range of existing literature from multiple sources), including peer-reviewed academic journal articles, industry reports, and case studies. Key topics considered are crisis communication planning, risk assessment and mitigation, business continuity, and long-term resilience. The results show that while awareness about crisis planning has been growing, the actual application seems to be used largely for post-crisis intervention rather than for pre-crisis planning. Consulting practices have been useful in bridging theory and practice, particularly in risk assessment, communication planning, and continuity frameworks. Still, there exist disparities in the application of these practices from region to region and from firm to firm. The theoretical contribution stems from blending chaos theory, contingency theory, and resilience theory to explain organisational behaviour during crises. Practically, it provides a conceptual framework aimed at consultants and managers so that they might align along certain structured, though flexible, formats during crisis management. At a policy level, the review calls for destination-level policy reform to integrate resilience throughout national and regional tourism strategies. The review also emphasises the importance of consulting in bolstering adaptive capacity, institutional learning, and resilience-building in the hospitality and tourism industries. This serves to shed light on some practical suggestions for academics, practitioners, and policymakers.

APA CITATION

Paapa, C. & Nguthi, S. K. (2025). Crisis Management and Resilience in Hospitality and Tourism Consulting. *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 4(1), 246-259. <https://doi.org/10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3203>.

CHICAGO CITATION

Paapa, Christopher and Stephen Kamau Nguthi. 2025. "Crisis Management and Resilience in Hospitality and Tourism Consulting". *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management* 4 (1), 246-259. <https://doi.org/10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3203>.

HARVARD CITATION

Paapa, C. & Nguthi, S. K. (2025) "Crisis Management and Resilience in Hospitality and Tourism Consulting" *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 4(1), pp. 246-259. doi: 10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3203

IEEE CITATION

C. Paapa & S. K. Nguthi "Crisis Management and Resilience in Hospitality and Tourism Consulting", *AJTHM*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 246-259, Jun. 2025.

MLA CITATION

Paapa, Christopher & Stephen Kamau Nguthi. "Crisis Management and Resilience in Hospitality and Tourism Consulting". *African Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 4, no. 1, Jun. 2025, pp. 246-259, doi:10.37284/ajthm.4.1.3203

INTRODUCTION

Due to its dependency on external factors such as environmental stability, political harmony, and mobility of customers, the global hospitality and tourism industry is inherently vulnerable to various crises. A time of disasters alternating from natural to man-made is now occurring more frequently and with greater intensity, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, pandemics such as COVID-19, economic recessions, and reputational threats-again negative publicity and cyber-attacks-crisis management and resilience strategies must be in place (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). Consulting is now promoted to maintain the operational continuity and service excellence on the side of organisations and destinations going through a crisis.

Crisis management refers to the systematic prevention, preparedness, response, and post-event recovery from incidents that disrupt the functioning of an organisation or tarnish its reputation (Kashyap & Saini, 2023). Meanwhile, resilience in hospitality and tourism refers to the ability to absorb shocks, adapt to disruptions, and come out stronger after disruptions (Prayag, 2018). Consultants, with their outside views and their expertise in specific domains, can assist organisations in developing focused strategies that are suitable for their particular vulnerabilities and enhance their adaptive capacity.

Despite the increasing importance of management and resilience, the theoretical and practical means necessary for sound rendering continue to be disjointed. Thus, with this review-laden paper, we have attempted to survey the literature base to establish whether and how theory informs practice and to determine how present-day consulting methods can contribute to improving sectoral

resilience and where they fall short. The study concentrates on two fronts: first, the examination of risk assessment and mitigation strategies, crisis communication, and second, business continuity planning as prime empirical arenas, and the evaluation of building long-term resilience.

This paper proceeds to focus on the theoretical ideologies behind crisis management in hospitality and tourism, followed by empirical reviews focusing on risk assessment and mitigation strategies, communication, continuity planning, and a resilience-building strategy, along with pointing out gaps in the literature. Discussions of contributions to theory, practice, and policy, along with expected implications to consulting, formed the concluding chapter while setting up a firm base for moving ever onwards in discourse on crisis management and resilience in hospitality and tourism consulting.

A brief overview of the paper's structure is provided, where the paper opens with an Introduction that defines crisis management and resilience, setting the scene to explore the threats posed by crises to the hospitality and tourism sectors. Next comes the Theoretical Ideologies, which apply chaos, contingency, and resilience theories to tourism and hospitality. In the Empirical Review, the paper examines risk mitigation, crisis communication, business continuity, and resilience measures, integrating case studies while identifying practical gaps. The Summary of Literature Review and Gaps synthesises findings and identifies gaps that remain. Contributions to Theory, Practice, and Policy explains the effects of the paper, followed by Recommendations for Consulting Practice, which provides applied solutions. The Conclusion section ends the paper by summarising the

significant findings and issuing recommendations that call for targeted reforms, along with a complete list of References.

Theoretical Ideologies Underpinning the Study.

Understanding crisis management and resilience in hospitality and tourism must be situated with proper theoretical ideologies giving insight into the dynamics of uncertainty, organisational behaviour, and systemic response. These mainly include chaos theory, contingency theory, and resilience theory.

The Lorenz (1963, 2017) Chaos theory brings to attention the unpredictable and nonlinear nature of crises. It suggests that even the smallest disruptions can cause substantial impacts in complex systems such as tourism destinations and hospitality enterprises (Faulkner, 2001). This view helps to appreciate the limitations of any attempts at exact prediction and strategic planning and so encourages more adaptive and flexible responses to crises.

Contingency theory by Fiedler (1967) supports the idea that there is no single generic crisis management approach; the entire strategy should be contingent upon the specific context, including the type of crisis, organisational structure, and its external environment (Fink, 1986). This theory thus upholds the contention that any consulting practice must be tailored to the needs and capabilities of individual organisations rather than relying on generic models.

Meanwhile, resilience theory, initially proposed by Holling (1973), helps in understanding how organisations bounce back to recover and adapt after a crisis. It emphasises the role of learning, flexibility, and redundancy in building long-term resilience (Folke, 2006).

Resilience theory, when applied to the hospitality industry, investigates how hotels can survive shocks like pandemics, natural disasters, and economic downturns (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). In order to maintain operations in the event of a crisis, hotels must be resilient through adaptable planning, resource management, and adaptive

practices (Shi et al., 2021). For hotels to successfully handle unforeseen challenges, flexibility and adaptability are essential qualities (Hussain & Malik, 2022). From this theory, particular consulting views are invaluable toward building resilient business models and recovery strategies that are sustainable.

Theoretically, these ideologies provide a richer backdrop for understanding the complex interplay of crisis events and organisational responses. They form a starting point for the consultant when dealing with stakeholders in the hospitality and tourism fields toward developing adaptive and context-sensitive system-wide strategies for crisis management and resilience building.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategies in Hospitality and Tourism

Risk assessment and mitigation constitute the foundation of crisis management in the hospitality and tourism sector due to the susceptibility of the industry to external shocks such as natural disasters, terrorism, outbreaks, and economic fluctuations (Leonov et al., 2024). Some empirical research highlights the significance of systematic risk identification, risk impact evaluation, and pre-emptive risk mitigation measures to protect the operations and stakeholders of tourism ecosystems (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019; Paraskevas & Altinay, 2013).

Studies show that many hospitality and tourism organisations have put comprehensive risk management frameworks in place, especially in the event of disasters or unstable political situations (Gupta et al., 2025). For instance, tourism in New Zealand employs a dynamic risk management procedure including stakeholder mapping, hazard analysis, and business continuity planning (Danzi et al., 2020). This contrasts with being proactive versus reactive, unlike many developing economies where risk assessments are often unplanned and non-standardised (Liu et al., 2019).

Literature on mitigation strategies refers to both structural and operational adjustments. Structural

measures may include investments in disaster-proof infrastructure, such as tsunami-proof resorts or earthquake-proof buildings (de Ruiter et al., 2021). Operationally, most firms have implemented programs for training in crisis response, diversification of supply chains, and formalising emergency procedures that cover health, safety, and evacuation (Ratushnyi, 2025). Besides these measures, new technologies such as GIS mapping and predictive analytics are becoming more popular for anticipating hazards and reducing exposure (Daud et al., 2024).

On the other hand, inconsistencies and gaps are revealed by empirical research. SMEs, which constitute the majority of the tourism sector, often lack the resources or expertise to carry out risk assessments and create mitigation plans properly (Turgay & Aydin, 2023). Research conducted in Southeast Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa has also indicated minimal adoption of formalised risk frameworks, with the majority of firms utilising informal networks or experience as their principal instruments of defence (Tichaawa & Moyo, 2019).

Moreover, researchers stress the importance of multi-stakeholder collaboration in risk mitigation. Public-private partnerships and destination-wide risk platforms have proven to be useful in preparedness promotion. An example would be the Queensland Tourism Crisis Management Framework, where government agencies co-create and support tools for risk assessment alongside tourism operators (Turnour et al., 2024; Rezaei Hajiabadi & Mohammad Shafiee, 2024). Even though such models exist, regional fragmentation of governance structures and uneven institutional support hamper their smooth implementation.

In conclusion, while empirical studies underscore the importance of risk assessment and mitigation for hospitality and tourism resilience, they also highlight persistent shortcomings, especially among SMEs and in low-resource contexts. There is increasing agreement on the need for standardised, cross-sectoral, and ICT-enabled approaches supported by both public and private stakeholders to engender systemic resilience to forthcoming crises.

Summary Table of Key Findings and Frameworks

Key Theme	Findings / Insights	Examples Frameworks	/ Gaps / Limitations
1. Importance of Risk Assessment	Identification of risks, evaluation of their impacts, and the implementation of proactive measures are basic principles for the managing of crises.	Ritchie & Jiang (2019); Paraskevas & Altinay (2013)	Absence of standardisation in emerging economies (Liu et al., 2019)
2. Risk Management Frameworks	In some nations, the systems are dynamic in nature, always adjusting to the situation at hand so that hazard analysis and hazard continuity planning can go together very fluidly.	Stakeholder mapping of New Zealand and hazard analysis (Danzi et al., 2020)	Many systems in the global south and developing nations are very much reactive and unstructured.
3. Structural Mitigation Strategies	Building disaster-resilient infrastructure is an investment that reduces long-term risk.	Tsunami and earthquake-resistant resorts (de Ruiter et al., 2021).	Cost-intensive; often inaccessible to SMEs
4. Operational Mitigation Strategies	Broad crisis training, supply chain diversification, and formal emergency protocols are now more commonly applied.	Crisis management programs and evacuation plans (Ratushnyi, 2020)	Small business has very limited resources and capital.

Key Theme	Findings / Insights	Examples Frameworks	Gaps / Limitations
5. Use of Technology	The use of ICT tools such as GIS and predictive analytics aids in forecast hazard anticipation and risk communication.	The GIS mapping and tools are reporting data (Daud et al., 2024)	Adoption is still limited by costs and technical limitations
6. SME Vulnerabilities	It is because of the small firms' insufficient skills and money.	Case studies from Sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia (Tichaawa & Moyo, 2019)	Systemic under-resource management with minimal formal planning for risk.
7. Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration	Effective models must have government, private companies, and local stakeholders working together in harmony.	Queensland Tourism Crisis Management Framework (Turnour et al., 2024)	Lack of coordination in the governance structure and regional disparity in support.
8. Future Direction	Emphasis is given to standardisation, cross-sector integration, and the integration of smart technologies.	Calls for ICT-enabled, inclusive risk strategies (Leonov et al., 2024; Gupta et al., 2025)	Focus on policy-driven frameworks and stronger public-private synchronization

Crisis Communication Planning

Crisis communication planning is the cornerstone of effective crisis management in hospitality and tourism. Empirical studies emphasise that clear, timely, and transparent communication may considerably alleviate a crisis and speed recovery (Björck et al., 2024; Beirman, 2021). Destinations and hospitality firms have increasingly realised the value of having a pre-existing communication framework in the aftermath of crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic and natural calamities like hurricanes and wildfires. These frameworks would protect the organisational image as well as uphold stakeholder faith, namely, employees, guests, investors, and the media (Casal-Ribeiro et al., 2023; Faulkner, 2013)

There have been studies showing that an organisation that practices proactive communication, involving frequent updates, empathetic approaches, and truthful information, is better prepared to shape public perception during crisis events (Muriuki et al., 2024; Hidayat et al., 2023; Zhong et al., 2021). Pennington-Gray & Kim (2024) found that the U.S. tourism destinations that had a clearly defined crisis communication plan fared well during the H1N1 outbreak, with great use of social media and

official websites to communicate safety measures and travel updates. Silase & Neh (2025) went on to note that post-COVID-19 pandemic communication strategies comprised collaboration between government agencies, private stakeholders, and media in restoring confidence to travellers.

Despite such ideals, some empirical findings pinpoint several glaring flaws. Most SMEs in the hospitality business lack a formalised crisis communication plan; rather, they choose the unplanned, reactive path (Riyadi, 2023). Furthermore, reliance on digital communication avenues during crises starkly highlights a digital divide; whereas larger organisations incorporate AI and analytics into their communication plans, smaller organisations are still battling just to be aware of going online or answer basic queries (Sigala, 2020).

Best practices gleaned from empirical evidence favour crisis communication as an ongoing training subject within an organisation, maintaining updated stakeholder base files, and conducting regular simulations (Schroeder & Pennington-Gray, 2015). More importantly, real-time monitoring tools and a centralised crisis communication team inspire agility and

coordination in response (Makhanya & Vezi-Magigaba, 2025). There has also been a push increasingly for scenario planning and stakeholder mapping methods to pre-empt the varied communication needs of the stakeholder groups.

One of the most important digital media used in crises is social media. Social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook have been used by hospitality organisations to deliver live updates to their guests and stakeholders. In some respects, Marriott International has effectively made use of these channels during the pandemic in updating the public on fast-changing policies on cancellation, hygiene standards, and temporary closures (Sigala, 2020). This transparent, digital communication, having been maintained through the crisis, has helped to sustain customer loyalty and public trust both for the informational and the emotional purposes (Mizrachi & Fuchs, 2016). It's two-way communication further augmented the usefulness as it allowed concerned stakeholders to express particular concerns and for the organisation to change its messages depending on public sentiment.

In addition to social media communication, chatbots have become an AI-driven essential means of crisis communication. Among the hotel brands, Marriott was deploying chatbots during the COVID-19 pandemic to give 24-hour support and instantaneous answers about safety protocols and booking flexibility. That eased the burden on frontline personnel as well as Baltic continuity in communicating with guests (Gretzel et al., 2020; Sigala, 2020). Owing to their scalability and consistency, the systems were especially valuable to deal with a surge in guest inquiries in large-scale crises. From a consulting perspective, implementing AI solutions gave a replicable digital resilience model that aligns technical capacity with operational demand.

In enhancing crisis response, mobile applications have promoted a great shift. In Singapore, the tourism-based industry collaborated with tech developers to roll out TraceTogether and SG Clean apps for contact tracing and

communications about compliance with health guidelines (Yeh, 2021; Gössling et al., 2020). These Apps Greenway visibility for travellers, assured consultants with a real-time framework to assess the preparedness of operational health safety systems and recommended adjustments to the protocols. The double use of these tools as public health utilities and communication devices exhibits the synergy that digital technology can bring into crisis situations.

An interesting occurrence was the use of social media monitoring to prompt engagement. Amid the 2019-2020 Australian bushfires, Tourism Australia used digital platforms both to communicate verified updates and safety information, as well as for sentiment analysis to adjust messaging in real-time (Gardiner et al., 2023; Villacé-Molinero et al., 2021). This adaptability in communication afforded tourism consultants the ability to link perceptions of the public crisis, thus keeping tourism from falling into reputation traps. It was another example of how advancing the use of data-based insights can help with crisis responses from a reactive approach to anticipatory resilience planning.

In essence, while crisis communication planning is gaining importance, empirical evidence shows that the hospitality and tourism industry at large continues to implement the crisis communication plan unevenly. It remains a pressing demand to push the communication planning further with capacity-building, technology investment, and stakeholder inclusivity.

Business Continuity Planning

Business continuity planning (BCP) has emerged as one of the major configurations in an organisation's overall resilience strategy when facing big-force events such as natural disasters, pandemics, cyberattacks, and economic shocks. Empirical research also pointed out that, in fact, generally, tourism and hospitality enterprises have generally lacked significant continuity mechanisms, leaving them particularly exposed during sudden disruptions (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). In recent times, however—especially post-COVID-19—the crises contributed to a paradigm

shift where organisations took a set of measures to be proactively engaged more formally with continuity plans.

It is argued that the hotel industry shows that BCP integrates crisis scenario planning and cross-functional risk assessment with the setting of recovery timeframe and communication channels. Alonso et al. (2020) found that SMEs that had engaged in business continuity activities before the pandemic were more agile operationally and had a higher longevity rate during the extended lockdowns. On the other hand, Alan et al. (2006) found that BCP plans helped Hong Kong's major chain hotels retain their essential functions, handle staff logistics, and communicate with stakeholders during the SARS outbreak in 2003. The Potential for SARS to Disrupt Tourism. Despite this, the SARS "epidemic" in early 2003 was a potentially catastrophic event for the global community and its tourism sector, as it came so soon after previous crises and was initially a disease that no one knew existed (Cooper, 2017).

A common empirical finding was that BCP is most effective when backed by leadership commitment and organizational learning capacity; organizations that had experienced and survived previous crises tended to institutionalize such lessons learned through the development of modular continuity plans, training of their workforce, and investment in digital transformation (Giousmpasoglou et al., 2021). The tourism industry has also capitalised on the arrangement of public-private partnerships to co-develop regional-level frameworks for continuity, particularly in destinations vulnerable to natural disasters (Olsen et al., 2023).

Empirical evidence further reveals gaps, notwithstanding the progress made. Most organisations maintain a mostly reactive stance, and SMEs in developing economies are rarely equipped either with the technical know-how or financial ability to go for a full-scale BCP (Paraskevas & Altinay, 2013; Kirant Yozcu & Cetin, 2019). Yet, there is still poor alignment between the current BCP schemes and the ever-

changing expectations of stakeholders, including the guests, suppliers, and local communities.

The evidence from the empirical literature showed that BCP plans need to be adaptive, systems-based, and aimed not only at saving operations but also at brand reputation and customer trust (Prayag, 2020). Continuity planning integrated with crisis communication and resilience-building strategies is increasingly being recognised as a best practice (Liu-Lastres, 2022).

Strategies for Building Long-Term Resilience

Building long-term resilience in the tourism and hospitality industry requires proactive and adaptive strategies on the integrative side, as opposed to merely relying on reactive crisis responses. Empirical studies bring forth the idea that adopting a holistic approach that considers an element of organisational learning, diversification, stakeholder engagement, and adaptive capacity achieves the most resilience (Garrido-Moreno et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2019; 2015; Prayag, 2018). Many destinations and firms that have remained steadfast through frequent crises, such as natural disasters in the Caribbean islands, political unrest in the Middle East, or pandemics across the globe, indicate that resilience is established over time through institutionalized measures rather than through panic responses (Bergami et al., 2022; Prayag, 2023). Resilience is often established by diversification of products, markets, and sources of income. For example, with the emergence of COVID-19, many hotels shifted the emphasis of their marketing and operations from international tourism to domestic tourism, packaging co-working facilities, and creating programs for wellness tourism to diversify their risk of depending on vulnerable market segments (Sigala, 2020; Prayag, 2023). Complementing this, destinations themselves have energised community-based tourism and agro-tourism programs to act as shock absorbers in times of international travel restrictions and thus bolster local value chains (Espiner et al., 2017).

Organisational learning and scenario planning are another element that enhances resilience.

Research studies have found that firms with mechanisms for learning after a crisis, such as after-action reviews and knowledge management systems, recover faster and adapt more efficiently during subsequent crises (Evenseth et al., 2022; Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). In such organisations, understanding is embedded in the corporate culture, so that flexible decision making and rapid adjustments to the operating model define organisational processes.

Equally important is the resilience of human capital. With investments in employee welfare, cross-training, and leadership development, frontline management and workers remain sufficiently prepared for volatility. According to Kibe & Giourgali (2023) and Ugboego et al. (2022), hotels placing emphasis on staff development maintain service quality during disruptions and, in turn, enhance retention and morale, which is vital in recovery.

A long-term resilience enabler is thus also represented by the technology and innovation front. Real-time data analysis, digital guest engagement tools, and mobile platforms for services are just a few examples of how businesses stayed afloat and kept being responsive during crises (Maitra et al., 2024; He et al., 2023). At this moment, digital transformation is considered not only as a tool for recovery but as an asset for resilience that adds to service flexibility and customer trust.

In conclusion, the literature highlights intentional organisational behaviour that supports long-term resilience. Although empirical instances diverge by context, there is a common thread of successful approaches that reflect attention to financial, human, technological, and natural environment considerations within a systems-thinking context. Future studies could then build on this by exploring how resilience indicators may be integrated into operational key performance metrics under hospitality product segments.

Summary of Literature Review and Gaps in Current Practice

Literature has stressed that risk assessment and mitigation are essential aspects in the hospitality and tourism sectors that are prone to crises such as disasters, terrorism, economic shocks, etc. (Leonov et al., 2024; Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). The studies validly emphasise structured risk frameworks, technological tools, and both structural and operational measures for crisis preparedness (Paraskevas & Altinay, 2013; de Ruiter et al., 2021; Daud et al., 2024). While developed regions show some form of proactive planning and public-private partnership model, as can be found in the Queensland framework (Turnour et al., 2024), huge gaps abound in developing contexts, including SMEs' lack of formalised risk assessment, reliance on informal practices, weak institutional coordination, etc. (Turgay & Aydin, 2023; Tichaawa & Moyo, 2019). Hence, the literature indicates the glaring need for standardised, ICT, and inclusively oriented risk governance frameworks that bridge the disparities in preparedness that exist between regions and organisational sizes.

In contrast, literature has presented crisis communication planning as a crucial ingredient for any hospitality and tourism crisis management effort, with an emphasis on the need for flexible, timely, transparent, and empathetic communication to maintain trust and initiate recovery (Björck et al., 2024; Beirman, 2021; Casal-Ribeiro et al., 2023). Studies reveal that by engaging stakeholders and utilising digital means of communication, resilience may be enhanced against pandemics and natural disasters (Muriuki et al., 2024; Pennington-Gray & Kim, 2024; Silase & Neh, 2025). Yet, alarming gaps remain in research and current practice: for example, SMEs tend not to possess formal communication structures but use reactive measures instead (Riyadi, 2023). Moreover, the absence of digital readiness continues as a barrier to fair implementation, with many vendors at the bottom of the supply chain lagging in technological adoption (Sigala, 2020). Also, even though various best practices exist, such as real-time

monitoring, scenario planning, or training exercises, the uptake across the industry remains patchy (Schroeder & Pennington-Gray, 2015; Makhanya & Vezi-Magigaba, 2025). These gaps illustrate the need for capacity-building, investments in digital infrastructure, and stakeholder engagement to be more inclusive.

Business Continuity Planning has a lot of literature that places its centrality within enhancing organisational resilience against major disruptions such as those caused by pandemics, natural forces, or cyber threats (Ritchie & Jiang, 2019). It is said that in post-crisis development, especially after COVID-19, efforts have encouraged a more structured BCP approach; however, within the tourism and hospitality sectors, especially in SMEs, the preparedness is still lagging due to limited technical and financial capacities (Paraskevas & Altinay, 2013; Kirant Yozcu & Cetin, 2019). Literature states that BCP is most successful if leadership, organisational learning, and collaboration across sectors are integrated (Giousmpasoglou et al., 2021; Olsen et al., 2023), with particular BCP benefits demonstrated during crises like SARS and COVID-19 (Alan et al., 2006; Alonso et al., 2020). Existing gaps include that many of the firms remain reactive, and even the current BCPs are not well aligned with the ever-changing needs of stakeholders, nor do they make the best use of emerging technologies to build better adaptability (Prayag, 2020; Liu-Lastres, 2022). Future researches are therefore required to explore how AI and blockchain could be integrated into continuity programs to address these persistent implementation and innovation gaps.

The review has noted that long-term resilience in tourism and hospitality is built through a more proactive, system-oriented approach, encompassing organisational learning, diversification, stakeholder engagement, and adaptive capacity (Garrido-Moreno et al., 2024; Prayag, 2018; Jiang et al., 2015, 2019). Case studies empirically demonstrate that destinations or firms institutionalizing resilience by, for instance, having diversified income sources, conducting scenario planning, or investing in

human capital and digital innovation, generally pull through crises more competently when compared against those confronted by natural disasters, pandemics, or political unrest (Bergami et al., 2022; Sigala, 2020; Ritchie & Jiang, 2019; Ugboego et al., 2022). Despite such findings, gaps abound regarding the timely appropriation of resilience-based strategies into regular performance metrics and operational KPIs across hospitality sectors. Furthermore, there are no universally recognised instruments in the literature to assess resilience outcomes or analyse these comparatively across geographical or organisational contexts, warranting further studies into embedding resilience indicators within strategic management frameworks.

From the above literature, it is now apparent that despite the significant theoretical and empirical leaps forward, major gaps remain in moving knowledge into practice, including inadequate stakeholder engagement, lack of localised crisis management frameworks, and insufficient use of technology, with only limited integration of crisis learning into long-term strategies. Filling these gaps demands a cooperative multidisciplinary spirit, inclusive policymaking, and a greater realisation of consultancy so that frameworks may be translated into strategic, actionable plans tailored to specific contexts.

Contribution to Theory, Consulting Practice, and Policy

Contribution to Theory:

The literature about resilience has gone ahead and extended some aspects of resilience theory by stating that systematic, proactive risk assessment, crisis communication, and BCP lead to organisational adaptation in hospitality and tourism, especially against the unpredictable crises central to chaos theory. The study brings in contingency theory as well to show that response mechanisms are effective by default but need to be determined on a case-by-case basis in terms of organisational size, degree of regional development, and digital capacity. Thus, validation of the theories comes through empirical evidence, uniting one structure of risk framework

and collaboration among stakeholders and technological tools with better outcomes of crises. However, theoretical gaps about the integration of resilience into concrete performance indicators and location-dependent limits of the frameworks in constrained environments still remain and could hence be further discussed to deal with inequalities of preparedness and adaptive capacities across varied hospitality settings.

Contribution to Consulting Practice:

The research offers various takeaways to consulting practice in terms of increasing the preparedness of organisations by considering structured risk assessments, business continuity planning, and crisis communication frameworks. Hence, consulting becomes the impetus to assist organisations, especially SMEs, in creating formalised, ICT-enabled-inclusive arrangements for crisis strategies. The literature presents best practices and tools like scenario planning, real-time monitoring, digital communications, and senior leadership development, thus arming consultants with a knowledge base sufficient to vary the interventions across the different organisational settings. Secondly, consulting practice also draws from the identification of persisting gaps in implementation and thus directs attention toward areas where capacity building, training, and digital support are most needed.

Contribution to Policy:

For policy, the literature informs about the need for standard cross-sectoral risk governance frameworks that are simultaneously context mindful and technologically adaptive. Evidence from developed jurisdictions like Queensland shows how public-private partnerships and policy-driven collaboration embed resilience into destination and enterprise planning. The deficiencies seen in the SME sector and in developing regions stress the utmost urgency for involving policy instruments to foster digital inclusion, institutional coordination, and resilience performance metrics. The policy makers are urged to intervene in infrastructure development, create enabling environments for

BCP adoption, and inculcate resilience indicators into tourism regulation and funding frameworks for maintaining equitable and sustainable crisis preparedness across the sector.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the literature offers a consistent message: An effective crisis management, along with resilience in the long run, must prevail in the hospitality and tourism sectors, which translates into addressing all risks comprehensively, establishing a responsive crisis communication system, embarking upon business continuity planning, and instituting proactive resilience-building intervention strategies. There has been greater awareness, and the best practices are very much in place, particularly in the developed world, yet major gaps in implementation persist. Especially in the case of SMEs in developing-country settings. These constitute gaps such as infrequent use of formal risk and communication frameworks, non-integration of technology, and weak institutional coordination. Although diversification, stakeholder engagement, digital tools, and organisational learning have empirical support concerning their benefits, there currently exist no proper standardised approaches in the sector to account for and institutionalise resilience within their day-to-day operational processes. Hence, prioritisation should be given to capacity-building, inclusive policy frameworks, investment in digital infrastructure, and resilience metrics as found in ongoing recovery to impart agility, equity, and sustainability throughout the hospitality and tourism sector worldwide.

Recommendations for Consulting Practice

Develop Context-Sensitive, ICT-Enabled Risk Assessment and Management Frameworks. Consultants should develop and implement risk management frameworks that are contextually designed to address the needs of SMEs and organisations in developing regions. These frameworks must adequately leverage ICT tools, formalise risk procedures, foster institutional coordination, and ensure stakeholder engagement within an inclusive arrangement. Consultants should actively encourage public-private

partnerships as well as the transfer of best practices from more resilient regions to areas that may not possess preparedness capabilities.

Enhance Crisis Communication Strategies. Consultants need to support hospitality and tourism organisations, especially SMEs, in the creation of solid and forward-looking crisis communication plans. This encompasses establishing formal communication frameworks; harnessing digital tools; and facilitating scenario-based communication training that gives special consideration to the existing resource and digital gaps, so that the option for resilience remains inclusive and equitable.

Focus on Customised Support for Business Continuity Planning (BCP). Generic recommendations for BCP should be left behind in favour of innovative, industry-focused solutions. Consultants should help their clients include proactive approaches, new technologies (such as AI), and stakeholder collaboration in the development of BCP. Work should also include generating leadership commitment and nurturing inter-organisational networks for resilience.

Develop Resilience Assessment Tools by Sector. Practical tools for assessing and monitoring resilience for hospitality and tourism enterprises should be developed. These assessments need to be adaptable, measurable, and embedded in regular business processes. By operationalising theoretical resilience concepts, consultants will assist in aligning performance management systems with resilience objectives.

Support Long-Term Resilience Planning; Consultants must transition from offering reactive crisis support to the application of long-term systemic resilience considerations in organisations. It involves embedding organisational learning, strategic diversification, stakeholder engagement, and digital innovation into the core business model. Also, they should spearhead the development of a paradoxical set of standardised yet flexible resilience metrics, thereby enabling continuous improvement and tracking of performance.

REFERENCES

- Alan, C. B., So, S., & Sin, L. (2006). Crisis management and recovery: How restaurants in Hong Kong responded to SARS. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 25(1), 3–11.
- Alonso, A. D., Kok, S. K., Bressan, A., O'Shea, M., Sakellarios, N., Koresis, A., Solis, M. A. B., & Santoni, L. J. (2020). COVID-19, aftermath, impacts, and hospitality firms: An international perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 91, 102654.
- Beirman, D. (2021). *Tourism crises and destination recovery*.
- Bergami, M., Corsino, M., Daoood, A., & Giuri, P. (2022). Being resilient for society: evidence from companies that leveraged their resources and capabilities to fight the COVID-19 crisis. *R&D Management*, 52(2), 235–254.
- Björck, A., Bläse, R., & Bastida, P. (2024). Becoming crisis-ready: A systematic literature review on corporate crisis readiness and the process to achieving it. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 32(3), e12614.
- Cooper, M. (2017). Japanese tourism and the SARS epidemic of 2003. In *Tourism Crises* (pp. 129–144). Routledge.
- Danzi, L., Orchiston, C., Higham, J., & Baggio, R. (2020). Tourism Disaster Management: A Social Network Analysis of Nature-based Destinations in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Travel Research*, 00472875241268623.
- Daud, M., Ugliotti, F. M., & Osello, A. (2024). Comprehensive analysis of the use of Web-GIS for natural hazard management: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 16(10), 4238.
- de Ruiter, M. C., de Bruijn, J. A., Englhardt, J., Daniell, J. E., de Moel, H., & Ward, P. J. (2021). The synergies of structural disaster

- risk reduction measures: Comparing floods and earthquakes. *Earth's Future*, 9(1), e2020EF001531.
- Espiner, S., Orchiston, C., & Higham, J. (2017). Resilience and sustainability: A complementary relationship? Towards a practical conceptual model for the sustainability–resilience nexus in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(10), 1385–1400.
- Evenseth, L. L., Sydnese, M., & Gausdal, A. H. (2022). Building organizational resilience through organizational learning: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Communication*, 7, 837386.
- Faulkner, B. (2013). Towards a framework for tourism disaster management. In *Managing tourist health and safety in the new millennium* (pp. 155–176). Routledge.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory Of Leadership Effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill Series In Management.
- Fink, S. (1986). Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable. (*No Title*).
- Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 253–267.
- Gardiner, S., Chen, J., Abreu Novais, M., Dupré, K., & Castley, J. G. (2023). Analyzing and leveraging social media disaster communication of natural hazards: community sentiment and messaging regarding the Australian 2019/20 bushfires. *Societies*, 13(6), 138.
- Garrido-Moreno, A., Martín-Rojas, R., & García-Morales, V. J. (2024). The key role of innovation and organizational resilience in improving business performance: A mixed-methods approach. *International Journal of Information Management*, 77, 102777.
- Giousmpasoglou, C., Marinakou, E., & Zopiatis, A. (2021). Hospitality managers in turbulent times: the COVID-19 crisis. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(4), 1297–1318.
- Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: a rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1–20.
- Gretzel, U., Fuchs, M., Baggio, R., Hoepken, W., Law, R., Neidhardt, J., Pesonen, J., Zanker, M., & Xiang, Z. (2020). e-Tourism beyond COVID-19: a call for transformative research. *Information Technology & Tourism*, 22, 187–203.
- Gupta, S., Kushwaha, P. S., Badhera, U., & Singh, R. K. (2025). Managing tourism and hospitality industry during pandemic: analysis of challenges and strategies for survival. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 32(4), 1360–1386.
- He, Z., Huang, H., Choi, H., & Bilgihan, A. (2023). Building organizational resilience with digital transformation. *Journal of Service Management*, 34(1), 147–171.
- Hidayat, M., Pinariya, J. M., Yulianti, W., & Maarif, S. (2023). Crisis Communication Management in Building Tourism Resilience in Bali Province During the Pandemic of COVID-19. *International Journal of Professional Business Review: Int. J. Prof. Bus. Rev.*, 8(7), 29.
- Holling, C. S. (1973). *Resilience and stability of ecological systems*. International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis Laxenburg.
- Hussain, M., & Malik, M. (2022). How do dynamic capabilities enable hotels to be agile and resilient? A mediation and moderation analysis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 106, 103266.
- Jiang, Y., Ritchie, B. W., & Verreynne, M. (2019). Building tourism organizational resilience to crises and disasters: A dynamic capabilities view. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(6), 882–900.

- Kashyap, K., & Saini, N. (2023). The Understanding of Crisis Management in Organization: A Review. *Journal of Psychosocial Wellbeing*, 4(2), 40–46.
- Kibe, N. P., & Giourgali, A. (2023). Building Resilient Hotel Workforce in the Era of Uncertainties: A Literature Approach. *International Conference of the International Association of Cultural and Digital Tourism*, 257–274.
- Kirant Yozcu, O., & Cetin, G. (2019). A strategic approach to managing risk and crisis at tourist destinations. *Tourist Destination Management: Instruments, Products, and Case Studies*, 273–287.
- Leonov, Y., Parubets, O., Portnoi, Y., Zaloha, Z., & Sukhai, O. (2024). Tourism risk analysis and mitigation: Strategies for managing risks in a dynamic tourism environment. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 7(10), 2024243.
- Liu-Lastres, B. (2022). Beyond simple messaging: A review of crisis communication research in hospitality and tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 34(5), 1959–1983.
- Liu, Y., Cheng, P., & OuYang, Z. (2019). Disaster risk, risk management, and tourism competitiveness: A cross-nation analysis. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(6), 855–867.
- Lorenz, E. N. (2017). Deterministic Nonperiodic Flow 1. In *Universality in Chaos, 2nd edition* (pp. 367–378). Routledge.
- Maitra, R., Roy, B., & Maitra, R. (2024). Increasing Tourism Resilience with Digital Engagement in the Hotel Industry. In *Tourism and COVID-19: Impacts, Responses, and Realignments* (pp. 93–101). CABI GB.
- Makhanya, M. T. B., & Vezi-Magigaba, M. F. (2025). Holacracy and Crisis Management: Leveraging Self-Organisation for Effective Crisis Response and Organisational Resilience. In *Crisis Management Dynamics-Strategies, Challenges, and Best Practices*. IntechOpen.
- Mizrachi, I., & Fuchs, G. (2016). Should we cancel? An examination of risk handling in travel social media before visiting ebola-free destinations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 28, 59–65.
- Muriuki, R. M., Inimah, G. M., & Muchunku-Mwenda, I. (2024). Communication Strategies Used during a Crisis in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry in Naivasha Sub-County. *International Journal of Communication and Public Relation*, 9(3), 71–87.
- Olsen, M., Oskarsson, P.-A., Hallberg, N., Granåsen, M., & Nordström, J. (2023). Exploring collaborative crisis management: A model of essential capabilities. *Safety Science*, 162, 106092.
- Paraskevas, A., & Altinay, L. (2013). Signal detection as the first line of defence in tourism crisis management. *Tourism Management*, 34, 158–171.
- Pennington-Gray, L., & Kim, M. (2024). How Have Predictors of Engagement in Tourism Crisis Planning and Preparedness Changed in More Than a Decade? *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 65(3), 354–361.
- Prayag, G. (2018). Symbiotic relationship or not? Understanding resilience and crisis management in tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25, 133–135.
- Prayag, G. (2020). Time for reset? COVID-19 and tourism resilience. *Tourism Review International*, 24(2–3), 179–184.
- Prayag, G. (2023). Tourism resilience in the ‘new normal’: Beyond jingle and jangle fallacies? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 54, 513–520.
- Ratushnyi, V. (2025). Determinants of Safe Evacuation of Large Production Factories. *Evaluation Of Drills Organized By*

- Institutions Responsible For Civil Protection*, 95.
- Rezaei Hajiabadi, J., & Mohammad Shafiee, M. (2024). Value Co-creation to Reduce the Effects of Pandemics in Tourism Destinations: Evidence and Experiences. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 1–30.
- Ritchie, B. W., & Jiang, Y. (2019). A review of research on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management: Launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on tourism risk, crisis and disaster management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 79, 102812.
- Riyadi, A. (2023). *The impact of crisis management on brand reputation and brand positioning towards the performance of upscale hotels in the post-COVID-19 era*. Universiti Teknologi MARA (Kampus Puncak Alam).
- Schroeder, A., & Pennington-Gray, L. (2015). The role of social media in international tourist's decision making. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(5), 584–595.
- Shi, F., Shi, D., Weaver, D., & Samaniego Chavez, C. E. (2021). Adapt to not just survive but thrive: resilience strategies of five-star hotels at difficult times. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(9), 2886–2906.
- Sigala, M. (2020). Tourism and COVID-19: Impacts and implications for advancing and resetting industry and research. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 312–321.
- Silase, L. F., & Neh, T. S. (2025). Tourism And Crisis Management: Strategies For Resilience And Recovery In The Face Of Disasters. *European Journal Of Tourism and Hospitality Industry Studies*, 1(1).
- Tichaawa, T. M., & Moyo, S. (2019). Urban resident perceptions of the impacts of tourism development in Zimbabwe. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-Economic Series*, 43, 25–44.
- Turgay, S., & Aydin, A. (2023). Tich. *Financial Engineering and Risk Management*, 4(1).
- Turnour, J., Foth, M., & Murray, K. (2024). *Carpentaria Collectives: Indigenous Engagement Framework for Carpentaria Shire Council*.
- Ugboego, C. A., Edeh, F. O., Amarachi, O., Ikechukwu, O. C., & Adama, L. (2022). Talent Management and Resilience Of Hospitality Industries Amid Post-Covid-19. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 11(2).
- Villacé-Molinero, T., Fernández-Muñoz, J. J., Orea-Giner, A., & Fuentes-Moraleda, L. (2021). Understanding the new post-COVID-19 risk scenario: Outlooks and challenges for a new era of tourism. *Tourism Management*, 86, 104324.
- Yeh, S.-S. (2021). Tourism recovery strategy against COVID-19 pandemic. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 46(2), 188–194.
- Zhong, L., Sun, S., Law, R., & Li, X. (2021). Tourism crisis management: Evidence from COVID-19. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 24(19), 2671–2682.