

УДК 352/354(075.8)

DOI: 10.35432/tisb302023294755

Natalia Kolisnichenko

*Head of the Department of Social and Humanitarian Sciences
ESI of Public Service and Administration Odesa Polytechnic National University,
Doctor of Sciences in Public Administration, Full Professor,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1083-7990>
e-mail: ird@ukr.net*

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT IN POST-CRISIS TIMES: STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS AND CAPACITIES

The paper reveals the conceptual background for public management in post-crises times through strengthening institutions and capacities. It studies the interpretations of the term «crisis», «crisis management», «post-crisis management». It examines two post-crisis concepts: post-crisis discourse, which seeks to explain and justify past actions; post-crisis discourse of renewal, where the focus is on overcoming constraints caused by the crisis and exploring new possibilities. It follows the development of post-crisis theories from proactive crisis management to holistic approaches. It examines some crisis management models. It looks at crisis management and problem management as closely related and analyses both problem management and crisis management steps. It reveals crisis management key aspects regarding the issues of strengthening public management institutions and capacities.

Keywords: crisis, crisis management, post-crisis management, problem management, crisis management models, institution, capacity.

Наталія Колісніченко

*завідувач кафедри соціально-гуманітарних наук
Навчально-наукового інституту публічної служби та управління
Національного університету «Одеська політехніка», д.держ.упр., професор
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1083-7990>
e-mail: ird@ukr.net*

ПУБЛІЧНЕ УПРАВЛІННЯ В ПІСЛЯКРИЗОВИЙ ПЕРІОД: ЗМІЦНЕННЯ ІНСТИТУЦІЙ ТА ПОТЕНЦІАЛУ

Стаття розкриває концептуальне підґрунтя публічного управління в посткризові часи через зміцнення його інституцій та потенціалу. Досліджено трактування термінів «криза», «антикризове управління», «посткризове управління». Розглядаються дві посткризові концепції: посткризовий дискурс, який прагне пояснити та виправдати минулі дії; посткризовий дискурс оновлення, де фокус зосереджений на подоланні обмежень, спричинених кризою, та дослідженні нових можливостей. Прослідковується розвиток посткризових теорій від проактивного управління кризою до цілісних підходів. Розглядаються деякі моделі управління кризою. Порівнюється кризове управління та управління проблемами як тісно пов'язані між собою та аналізуються аспекти управління проблемами, та кроки управління кризами. Розкриваються ключові аспекти кризового менеджменту щодо питань зміцнення інституцій та потенціалу публічного управління.

Ключові слова: криза, антикризове управління, посткризове управління, проблемне управління, моделі антикризового управління, інститут, потенціал.

The formulation of the problem. As countries are increasingly becoming vulnerable to the consequences of various crises, there is also the efforts among their governments to enhance their capacities in public management. The governments are paying greater emphasis on strengthening institutional capacity and adopting recovery policies. The capacity for recovery has become an important priority for national governments in post-crises times. Besides, the scope of crises and post-crises management is also expanding to make the governmental actions effective and efficient.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Recent literature in the area implies the findings of such scholars as Fink S., Heath R., Millar D. and others who studied the principles of crisis management; Reynolds B., Seeger M. and others who reveal crisis management models; Coombs T., Seymour M., Moore S. who examine post-crisis issues of management. Among the Ukrainian researchers the issues of strengthening institutions and capacities were argued by Azarchenkova M., Kondratenko N. and others.

The aim and tasks of the paper. The aim of the paper is to reveal the conceptual background for public management in post-crises times through strengthening institutions and capacities.

The main body of the paper and the obtained results. Crises can arise for various reasons, such as natural disasters, man-made accidents, financial failures, reputational problems, security crises, etc.

A crisis is interpreted as a sharp change in the usual state of things, a breakdown, or an aggravation of the situation [3]. Modern dictionaries define the term «crisis» as a moment that separates everything that was before from what will be after; a turning point, a critical juncture; a very dangerous situation full of threats that requires an immediate solution [4]. Undoubtedly, a crisis is a specific moment that can be either positive or negative. The negativity of a crisis arises under the condition of low readiness (or lack of readiness) for various crisis situations. Crises of different nature complement and intensify each other, acquiring a synergistic effect. They grow as a result of interaction, due to the lack of efficient management, ultimately leading to the destruction of the system.

Ukrainian and foreign scholars provide numerous interpretations of crises, crisis phenomena, and their classifications. They also formulate approaches to solving crisis phenomena or preventing them [1]. The approaches which present the post-crisis phase as a period focused primarily on response tactics are numerous. For example, T. Coombs [8, p. 135–139] refers to post-crisis management as what the management says and does after the crisis. Similarly, B. Reynolds and M. Seeger [14] characterize the post-crisis period as a time of assessment, learning, and the formation of a new understanding of risk and risk avoidance. According to them, in many cases, the post-crisis is also a period when the media and the public become more critical and dubious about the cause of the crisis, the appropriateness of the responses, and who will take the blame and responsibility [14, p. 50].

In contrast to this largely reactionary approach, there is also a more forward-looking view that refers to the «crisis after the crisis», where what are seen as «consequences» may actually be the core of the crisis in political or institutional terms. As an example of an eruption situation, when the dust begins to settle, the aftershocks are often more destructive and costly to the organization in the long run than the initial crisis [15, p. 5]. This can be avoided if senior management includes emergency and post-crisis recovery planning in their management strategies as a core part of their overall goals. Therefore, it is important to consider the long-term impact on the organization/institution when responding to a crisis.

The researchers formulated two related but different concepts:

- 1) post-crisis discourse, which seeks to explain and justify past actions;
- 2) the post-crisis discourse of renewal, where the focus is on overcoming constraints caused by the crisis and exploring new possibilities (see [7]).

Defining the latter concept, the renewal discourse is explained by the restoration of the past image through post-crisis innovations and the adaptation of the institution. Organizational rhetoric

notes that the renewal model emphasizes the temporary response of institutional leaders to devastating disasters, such as fires and floods, before restructuring and recovering from the crisis. This concept of management strategy in response to a crisis forms the basis of modern scientific views.

Penrose J. [13] was one of the first to present pre- and post-crisis management as a unified concept. According to him, in the past, pre-crisis and post-crisis actions were not consolidated into one whole. However, these activities are grouped together and should be considered as a whole, not as separate sets of activities. Proactive crisis management naturally influences recovery measures, which are vital in implementing a crisis mitigation strategy. Proactive planning is also critical. The relationship between activities before and after the crisis holds the same importance in both recovery and the implementation of proactive actions [13, p. 166]. Penrose J. emphasized that relying solely on post-crisis management strategies will not suffice. It is better to prepare for the next crisis. By acknowledging the close correlation between pre- and post-crisis activities, he concluded that any organization recognizing the dual nature of a crisis will have a greater propensity for proactive planning and recovery, leading to more effective crisis management. To fully appreciate this holistic approach and its implications for conceptualizing post-crisis issues, it is necessary to examine some crisis management models.

In the presentation of the crisis management process, two different forces typically blur the nature and scope of the long-term post-crisis environment and alter the meaning of various types of management activities - namely, linear and non-linear approaches.

Much of the literature is devoted to a linear approach with a strong emphasis on tactical actions designed to move as quickly as possible toward the resolution/recovery phase (for example, see [15]). The pioneer of crisis management, S. Fink [9], identified four stages of crisis action - prodromal, acute, chronic, and resolution, which were innovative at the time and became a template for subsequent linear models. Fink S. went even further and presented a second representation [9, p. 27] in which all four stages appear together, duplicating again and again in a repeated cycle.

Building on the important research work of S. Fink in 1986, other researchers have developed a more comprehensive model of achieving post-crisis governance that compasses a defensive phase (including media control); the consolidation phase (involving victim compensation, financial restructuring, and market calming); and an offensive phase (encompassing management review, personnel changes, and marketing).

Similarly, T. Coombs [6] wrote extensively about crisis management as a continuous process and emphasized that, even though the institution can return to normal work, the crisis still consists of three sub-phases - further communication, cooperation in the investigation, and tracking of crises.

However, even such an extended analysis is limited to the elements of traditionally defined crisis management. Such management is not fully presented as a coherent structure in the wider continuum of management activity. An updated holistic approach to crisis management includes long-term issues.

Jacques T. [12] formulated a comprehensive interdisciplinary model for long-term post-crisis impact. Being positioned within the framework of a joint relational cycle that integrates both problem management and crisis management, the post-crisis phase consists of three separate clusters of activities: recovery, assessment/modification, and the resolution of post-crisis influences.

Post-crisis recovery extends beyond returning to regular operations; it involves evaluating and modifying processes, considering what could be done differently. Elements of evaluation and modification include root cause analysis, process analysis, and change implementation. The post-crisis phase is described as an «opportunity».

There is much literature on post-crisis management. The lasting impact of crises is unquestionable. Studies in the USA and Europe have shown that 80% of companies without a developed and tested plan of action for emergency situations went out of business within 2 years after a serious disaster [5]. Analysis of various practices reveals that this impact often stems not

from the crisis event itself but from the company's long-term inability to manage post-crisis problems.

The best way to manage crises is to understand and address the underlying problems. Crisis management and problem management are closely related; some crises have the potential to become problems, and vice versa. In rare cases, a problem can even threaten the existence of an institution. The problem can result from a combination of crises/risks or lead to such a phenomenon [10, p. 245].

Problem management, sometimes also referred to as conflict management or complex situation management, is the process of identifying, analyzing, solving, and controlling problems or conflicts that arise in various areas of life, including personal, professional, and business contexts. The main goal of problem management is to find optimal solutions for overcoming difficult situations and achieving set goals.

Problem management includes the following steps:

1. Identifying the problem. This may involve gathering information, observing, and communicating with parties involved in the problem situation.
2. Problem analysis. After identifying the problem, it is important to carefully analyze its roots, causes, impact on various aspects, and possible consequences.
3. Development of a solution strategy. Based on the analysis, it is important to develop an action plan to solve the problem. This strategy may include various steps and tools to achieve the goal.
4. Implementation of the decision. This stage involves the implementation of an action plan and the execution of a solution to solve the problem.
5. Control and assessment. After the implementation of the solution, it is crucial to monitor the results and evaluate their effectiveness. If the solution does not produce the desired results, adjustments can be made.

Problem management can be applied in various fields such as business, government, and personal life. Effective problem management helps in achieving set goals, maintaining stability, and improving processes in any field.

Post-crisis problems can manifest in different forms. As R. Heath said, a crisis can be an event that creates a problem or supports a problem or strengthens it [11, p. 289].

The main steps of problem management are recognition, strategy development, implementation and evaluation, which can be quite effective in pre-crisis or crisis periods. After a crisis, the nature of any indirect problem may be self-evident.

The tool for solving post-crisis problems is clear: it is necessary to investigate and rethink the established models of problem management. Crisis management faces challenges when public management scholars and practitioners seek a definitive «solution» instead of recognizing the persistent nature of some crises and the potential long-term impact of the problem.

It is crucial to note that crisis management is the process of adopting and implementing strategic actions and measures to respond to extraordinary or critical events that threaten the normal functioning of organizations, societies, or individuals.

Crisis management encompasses the following key aspects:

1. Definition of a crisis as identification and recognition of a crisis situation or threat. This includes monitoring and analyzing information about events and their possible consequences.
2. Analysis and assessment of the scale and seriousness of the crisis situation. This includes identifying potential risks and threats that may affect the organization or community.
3. Action planning as development of a strategy and action plan to resolve the crisis. This involves making necessary decisions, developing communication strategies, and appointing responsible persons.
4. Implementation of the plan as executing planned actions and implementing measures to overcome the crisis situation.

5. Constant monitoring of the situation and response to changes during the crisis, adjusting the plan if necessary.

6. Communication and cooperation as ensuring effective communication with all stakeholders, including the public, partners, regulators, and employees. Cooperation with other organizations or agencies can also be an important component of crisis management.

7. Recovery and learning from experience as after the end of the crisis situation, it is important to evaluate and analyze the events in order to learn from the experience and take measures for future preparation and prevention of similar situations.

Effective crisis and post-crisis management helps to reduce threats and maintain stability during emergency situations, in particular the state of war in which Ukraine is now.

To timely prevent the onset of a crisis and its negative consequences, it is necessary to pre-determine a list of measures, the implementation of which will ensure timely response to potential crisis situations. Generally, crisis management itself is an effective tool through which systems can promptly introduce efficient management procedures.

The post-crisis period is a crucial aspect of recovery and preparation for similar situations in the future. For instance, in this context, it involves a series of actions and measures to ensure the physical and psychological well-being of individuals after a crisis.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Post-crisis management can be applied in a variety of areas, including business, government, public sector institutions, and even at the personal management level. It encompasses: the identification and recognition of a crisis situation or threat which involves identifying and acknowledging a crisis situation or potential threat; analysis and assessment of the scale and seriousness of the crisis situation and identifying potential risks and evaluating the magnitude and severity of the crisis, considering its impact on various aspects; development of a strategy and action plan to resolve the crisis, involving the creation of a comprehensive plan of actions to address the situation; execution of the planned actions and implementation of measures to overcome the crisis situation; constant monitoring of the situation and response to changes during the crisis; ensuring effective communication with all stakeholders, including the public, partners, regulators, and employees as well as collaboration with other institutions or agencies; recovery and learning from the experience to enhance future crisis management strategies.

References

1. Бізонич Д. Дослідження поняття кризи у контексті антикризового державного менеджменту в системі житлово-комунального господарства України. Державне управління: удосконалення та розвиток. 9. 2020. URL: www.dy.nauka.com.ua/pdf/9_2020/57.pdf
2. Кондратенко Н. Азарченкова М. Дослідження кризових явищ та проблеми антикризового управління в Україні. Збірник наукових праць ВНАУ. Серія: Економічні науки. №3 (80). 2013. С. 122-129.
3. Тлумачний словник. URL: <http://lcorp.ulif.org.ua/dictua>
4. Фінансово-економічний словник : словник-довідник / кол. авт. : Юнін О. С., Круглова О. О., Савельєва М. О. та ін. Дніпро : Видавець Біла К. О., 2018. 164 с.
5. Brown M. The disaster business. Management Today. October. 1993. P. 42–48.
6. Coombs T.W. Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing and Responding. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA. 1999. 304 p.
7. Coombs T.W. West Pharmaceutical's explosion: structuring crisis discourse knowledge. Public Relations Review. 30(4). 2005. P. 467–473.
8. Coombs T. W. Attribution theory as a guide for post-crisis communication research. Public Relations. 33 (2). 2007. P. 135–139.
9. Fink S. Crisis Management: Planning for the Inevitable. American Management Association: New York. 1986. 332 p.
10. Heath RL, Millar DP. A rhetorical approach to crisis management: management,

communication processes and strategic responses. In *Responding to Crisis: A Rhetorical Approach to Crisis Management*, Heath RL, Millar DP (eds). Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ. 2005. P. 1-17.

11. Heath R.L. *Strategic Issues Management: Organizations and Public Policy Challenges*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA. 2009. 412 p.

12. Jaques T. Issue management and crisis management: an integrated, non-linear, relational construct. *Public Relations Review*. 33 (2). 2007. P. 147–157.

13. Penrose J. The role of perception in crisis planning. *Public Relations Review*. 26 (2). 2000. P. 155– 171.

14. Reynolds B., Seeger M.W. Crisis and emergency risk communication as an interactive model. *Journal of Health Communication*. 10 (1). 2005. P. 43–55.

15. Seymour M., Moore S. *Effective Crisis Management: Worldwide Principles and Practice*. Cassell: London. 2000. 220 p.