

Evaluation of Various Leadership Philosophies in Reaction to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Morakinyo Patrick Ilo ¹, Dr. Humphrey Akanazu ²

¹ Eurasian Business Management & Administration (EMAS) Moscow, Russia

² Rome Business School Nigeria RBSN, Lagos, Nigeria

Abstract:- The study aims to analyze the effect of various leadership philosophies that governments and organizations have embraced in reaction to the COVID-19 pandemic. The study concluded that it is crucial to navigate global health emergencies with good decision-making, communication, policy execution, and teamwork. As a result, the study recommended that government and management should ensure a thorough and well-coordinated response to the pandemic depends on effective collaboration and coordination between government agencies, foreign partners, and other stakeholders. To exchange knowledge, resources, and best practices, governments have collaborated extensively with non-governmental organizations, public health agencies, and healthcare providers. This evaluation component evaluates the degree of interagency cooperation, international cooperation, and interaction with the private and non-governmental sectors. It looks at the systems for exchanging data, materials, and knowledge as well as the efficiency of collaborations and teamwork in combating the epidemic.

Keywords: Covid-19; Leadership; Government; Organization.

1. Introduction

The World Health Organization (WHO) deemed the COVID-19 pandemic a global health emergency in early 2020, which caused widespread disruptions to social structures, healthcare systems, and economies around the globe (WHO, 2020). According to Wasylyshy & Masterpasqua (2018), leaders from various sectors faced hitherto unheard-of difficulties in effectively handling the crisis and minimizing its complex effects. Organizations and governments responded to the epidemic in a variety of ways, which reflected differences in leadership styles and tactics (Sadiq et al., 2020). A few executives embraced participative, open, and proactive approaches that prioritized teamwork, dialogue, and quick decision-making. Others used techniques that were hierarchical, authoritative, or conservative, emphasizing centralized control and following predetermined procedures. The efficacy of crisis management techniques became a crucial topic in the midst of this variance in leadership philosophies (Diddi & Wei, 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated quick and flexible reactions, such as the distribution of healthcare resources, the creation of policies, the provision of financial support, and public outreach. Thus, comprehending the relationship between leadership philosophies and the results of crisis management in this singular global catastrophe has important ramifications for crisis readiness and leadership advancement in the future (Wasylyshyn & Masterpasqua, 2018).

2. Justification for the Study

Despite the COVID-19 crisis's severity and urgency, there are still few in-depth studies assessing how various leadership philosophies affect crisis management results. In order to prepare organizations and governments for future crises, it is imperative to identify effective leadership techniques that support flexible, resilient, and responsive crisis management strategies. By undertaking a methodical investigation various leadership styles displayed during the pandemic and its implications for crisis management, this study seeks to close the current research gap.

The study's primary goal is to classify and evaluate the various leadership philosophies that governments and organizations have embraced in reaction to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Evaluating the efficiency of various leadership philosophies in handling crises while taking public trust, resource allocation, communication effectiveness, and response agility into account.

To evaluate and contrast the results of various leadership philosophies in dealing with the complex issues the pandemic has brought forth.

Drawing from the study's findings, to offer evidence-based suggestions for leadership tactics that will work in upcoming crises.

By clarifying the connection between leadership styles and crisis management results, the study will provide empirical support to the field of leadership studies, particularly in crisis contexts. The research's conclusions will provide insightful information and recommendations to help practitioners, legislators, and organizational leaders improve their crisis response plans.

Gaining insight from the COVID-19 pandemic's leadership styles will help create more adaptable and resilient leadership frameworks for similar situations in the future.

3. Emphasis in Current Research: Evaluating Leadership Approaches and Crisis Handling Throughout COVID-19

Although many research works have looked at the function of leadership in crisis situations, there is a noticeable lack of thorough evaluations that methodically assess how well various leadership philosophies are able to handle the complex problems that the COVID-19 pandemic presents. Extant research offers valuable perspectives on leadership reactions in times of crisis (Stefan & Nazarov, 2020). Nevertheless, these studies frequently concentrate on particular facets of crisis management or leadership, and they lack thorough assessments that contrast and analyze the results of various leadership philosophies in the context of a single, worldwide crisis like COVID-19. Research on leadership strategies during the pandemic has shown the triumphs and failures of particular styles in particular industries. Nevertheless, these studies are often sector-specific and lack comparative or cross-sectoral assessments that could provide more comprehensive insights relevant to different organizational and governmental contexts.

Additionally, although research has highlighted the value of flexible, agile leadership during crises (Wilson, 2020), it frequently falls short of providing a comprehensive assessment of the flexibility and agility of different leadership philosophies in light of the pandemic's quickly evolving circumstances. Comprehensive studies that explore the ways in which various leadership philosophies help or impede flexibility, agility, and resilience in crisis management are crucial.

The lack of actual data explicitly connecting leadership philosophies to COVID-19 pandemic crisis management results represents another gap. Although there are theoretical frameworks for leadership styles, there aren't many empirical researches that thoroughly examine how different leadership styles affect crisis management outcomes like public trust, resource allocation, response effectiveness, and communication efficacy.

Furthermore, there is a dearth of longitudinal research that examine the long-term effects of leadership philosophies utilized during the pandemic on organizational or governmental resilience, despite the fact that several studies have concentrated on the influence of crisis management techniques on immediate results (Williams et al., 2017).

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed a number of different leadership philosophies, each with a unique crisis management methodology. Participatory leadership placed a strong emphasis on stakeholder cooperation, communication, and shared decision-making (Aldunce et al., 2021). This approach encouraged flexible solutions and staff engagement by encouraging a sense of ownership and shared responsibility in resolving the issue.

Democratic leaders promote team members' engagement and include them in decision-making. They encourage a sense of shared responsibility and ownership by soliciting feedback from others and appreciating their

contributions (Williams et al., 2017). Using a system of rewards and penalties, transactional leaders concentrate on upholding order and accomplishing short-term goals. They stress precise guidelines and penalties for noncompliance.

Leaders that embody transformational qualities inspire and encourage their people to reach great feats. They effectively explain their well-defined future vision and enable team members to make noteworthy contributions (Wilson, 2020). Visionary and motivating, transformational leadership fostered creativity and followership. By emphasizing a common goal for conquering obstacles, these leaders inspired stakeholders to welcome change and make innovative contributions to the resolution of crises.

On the other hand, some countries or organizations tended to have more authoritarian or directive leadership philosophies (Pizzolitto et al., 2023). These methods were characterized by centralized decision-making and hierarchical hierarchies. Even though this approach allowed for quick decision-making, it occasionally hindered inclusive involvement and decreased flexibility in the face of quickly shifting conditions. There have also been instances of laissez-faire leadership, which is defined by little direction or intervention (Lundmark et al., 2022). This approach frequently led to uncertainty, poor coordination, and a delay in decision-making. Sometimes it made crisis response less effective since there was no clear direction or strong leadership support.

Furthermore, in laissez-faire environments, a lack of clear direction from leaders occasionally resulted in a delay in or deficiency in reactions to new difficulties (Norris et al., 2021). Laissez-faire leadership may have hindered important modifications and prompt interventions in the dynamic context of a pandemic, where quick decisions and flexible approaches were essential.

Additionally, it's possible that the laissez-faire policy affected staff morale and motivation during the pandemic. Workers may have thought that managers were not providing them with enough guidance or support, which reduced engagement and raised concerns about the future (Ahsan et al., 2023). This can have resulted in a decline in innovation and productivity inside businesses or government agencies. Laissez-faire leaders give their team members a lot of autonomy while offering little guidance. When asked, they might provide direction, but they usually let team members handle their own tasks (Ahmed et al., 2021).

During the COVID-19 epidemic, a laissez-faire leadership style demonstrated shortcomings in crisis management. Its passive style, characterized by little direction and involvement, led to uncertainty, slow reactions, and possible difficulties in sustaining staff engagement and morale (Nangia & Arora et al., 2021). The absence of proactive leadership participation in this method may have impeded efficient crisis management during a situation that required quick and flexible decision-making.

These leadership philosophies had a wide range of effects on the results of crisis management. During the crisis, employee morale, creativity, and adaptability all increased under transformational leadership approaches (Alharafsheh et al., 2023). Such leadership exhibited greater resilience and long-term performance in organizations.

Autocratic methods occasionally resulted in quick but possibly narrow conclusions, which limited flexibility and creativity. Employee disengagement may result in lower engagement and morale, which could affect an organization's long-term resilience (Houlihan, 2020). Autocratic leaders demand rigorous obedience to their directives and make choices on their own. They might not involve team members in decision-making processes and have a tendency towards centralized control.

Even though laissez-faire leadership promoted autonomy, it frequently led to imprecise plans and slow reactions, which might have worsened the effects of crises. This strategy found it difficult to offer the direction and cooperation needed for efficient crisis management (Leary & Miller, 2021).

By encouraging cooperation, flexibility, and staff engagement, participatory and transformational leadership philosophies proved to be more successful in navigating the complexity of the COVID-19 situation (Santoso et al., 2022). Negatively affecting the effectiveness of crisis management, autocratic and laissez-faire approaches shown limits in promoting flexibility and inclusive decision-making.

4. Choosing an Effective Leadership Style

A leader's personality, the nature of the assignment, and the traits of the team members are some of the variables that affect how effective their leadership style is. There is no one-size-fits-all method to leadership, and successful leaders frequently modify their approach to fit the demands of the moment (Gal-Arieli et al., 2020). In situations where the task is clearly defined and demands exact execution, an autocratic or transactional approach may be more suitable. A democratic or transformative style could work better when the task is complicated and calls for creativity or innovation. When the members are self-motivated and have a lot of experience, a more lax approach might be appropriate. A democratic or autocratic approach might work better when team members are less experienced or need more direction (Jaafar et al., 2021). More suited for an autocratic or transactional style if you're inherently forceful and decisive. If you are a cooperative person who listens well, you might be more suited for a democratic or transformational style.

Successful leaders are flexible in their thinking and understand the need to modify their approach depending on the circumstances and the members of their team. Depending on the situation, they may employ a mix of approaches, and as the team develops and the task changes, they may modify their strategy. An organization's leadership style is a major factor in its success. Successful leaders encourage, inspire, and mentor their groups to accomplish shared objectives (Kilag et al., 2023). Based on the assignment, the team, and their own advantages and disadvantages, they select and modify their style of leadership. Leaders can cultivate a positive and productive work environment that encourages innovation, collaboration, and success by comprehending and utilising effective leadership styles.

5. Evaluation of Governmental Leadership Approaches to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Governments around the world have been forced by the COVID-19 pandemic to act quickly and decisively in order to stop the virus's spread and lessen its negative effects on the general public's health and the global economy. An analysis of government leadership tactics during the epidemic aims to look at the methods governments used to deal with the situation. Analyzing decision-making procedures, communication tactics, the application of policies, and cooperative efforts are all part of this thorough evaluation.

An assessment of governmental leadership techniques during the COVID-19 epidemic must take into account the policy actions and decision-making procedures of the government. The aforementioned procedures encompass a sequence of measures designed to devise, execute, and modify policies with the objective of tackling the public health emergency and its ramifications for the economy. A thorough description of government policy responses and decision-making procedures may be found below:

i. Information Gathering and Evaluation:

Governments collect information from a range of sources, such as international organizations, scientific studies, and public health authorities, in order to comprehend the socioeconomic effects, transmission dynamics, and epidemiological patterns of COVID-19. Analyzing data entails determining vulnerable people, projecting future events, and gauging the pandemic's intensity (Islam et al., 2020).

ii. Evaluation of Risk and Development of Scenarios:

Governments perform risk assessments based on the gathered data to assess the pandemic's possible health dangers and socioeconomic effects. Scenario planning is a step in this process that helps you build reaction tactics by foreseeing various scenarios. Governments evaluate the possibility and seriousness of different situations, taking into account variables including the pace of transmission, the availability of healthcare, and the resilience of society (Rocha et al., 2021).

iii. Professional Advice and Consultation:

To help them make decisions, governments confer with epidemiologists, public health professionals, and other experts. Advice from experts sheds light on the mechanics of transmission, epidemiological trends, and the efficacy of public health initiatives. Experts assist governments in comprehending scientific data, weighing the

advantages and disadvantages of various policy options, and developing evidence-based plans (Armstrong et al., 2013).

iv. Development and Execution of Policy:

Governments create policies and take action to stop the spread of COVID-19, safeguard public health, and assist impacted communities based on data analysis, risk assessment, and professional advice. Policies could demand the use of masks, travel restrictions, isolation and quarantine procedures, social distancing measures, campaigns for immunization and financial stimulus packages. Legislative actions, presidential orders, and administrative directives with precise implementation dates and instructions are used to carry out policies (De Bruin et al., 2020).

v. Consultation and Public Engagement:

In order to convey policy decisions, get input, and foster public compliance and confidence, governments interact with the public, stakeholders, and communities. In order to effectively engage the public, it is necessary to dispel myths and worries, address concerns raised by the epidemic, and get feedback from those who may be impacted. Public service announcements, social media, news conferences, community forums, and social media are just a few of the ways via which governments interact with the public (Hyland-Wood et al., 2021).

vi. Monitoring and Evaluation:

To determine the efficacy of policies and interventions and make necessary adjustments to plans, governments keep an eye on how they are being implemented. Tracking key indicators is a component of monitoring such as hospitalization rates, vaccine coverage, and infection rates, in order to assess the effectiveness of policy initiatives. Analyzing policy interventions' results, pointing out their advantages and disadvantages, and offering suggestions for improvement are all part of evaluation. To assess the efficacy of policy responses and make well-informed decisions, governments consult stakeholders, analyze data, and monitor performance indicators (Zheng et al., 2020).

In general, the government's responses to the COVID-19 pandemic and decision-making procedures involve a methodical approach to data collection, risk assessments, expert consultation, the formulation of evidence-based policies, public engagement, and outcome monitoring. In order to preserve public health, minimize the crisis' socioeconomic effects, and make difficult decisions while navigating the pandemic's complexities, effective leadership is crucial.

During the COVID-19 epidemic, public involvement and government communication tactics are essential elements of effective leadership. In order to maintain openness and cooperation, these tactics include interacting with stakeholders, building public confidence, and providing timely and accurate information. The following is a thorough description of public involvement and government communication strategies:

i. Transparent and Clear Communication:

Governments make sure that information is easily understood by all sections of the public by communicating with them in a clear, succinct, and jargon-free manner. Governments should be transparent and provide information on recent developments, policy choices, and public health advice. Building public trust in government actions and reducing uncertainty and disinformation are all made possible by clear communication (Kirkpatrick, 2023).

ii. Prompt Information Dissemination:

To keep the public informed about the changing COVID-19 situation, governments place a high priority on prompt information dissemination. Providing information on the number of cases is one way to do this. Public health recommendations, immunization campaigns, and accessibility to testing. Prompt communication promotes adherence to public health initiatives and assists people in making decisions about their health and safety (Wu et al., 2022).

iii. Communication via Multiple Channels:

To effectively reach various population segments, governments employ a range of communication outlets. This include digital outlets like social media, official websites, and mobile applications, as well as conventional media like radio, television, newspapers, and press releases. Governments make sure that information reaches a variety of audiences, including those with restricted access to technology, by utilizing a variety of channels (Islam et al., 2020).

iv. Health Promotion Initiatives:

Public health campaigns are initiated by governments to increase public knowledge of COVID-19 preventive strategies, immunization initiatives, and available resources. These advertisements employ messaging that is geared at particular target audiences, including vulnerable communities, young individuals, and the elderly. Public health campaigns might involve community outreach programs, social media campaigns, posters, and ads.

v. Participation in the Community:

In order to address particular issues and adapt communication tactics to regional contexts, governments interact with communities and local stakeholders. To enhance health literacy, address cultural sensitivity, and spread information, this entails working with grassroots organizations, religious institutions, community leaders, and non-profits. Participation in the community promotes trust and guarantees that public health messages are understood by a variety of communities (Lassi et al., 2021).

vi. Two-Way Communication:

Public-private dialogue is promoted by governments, enabling people to share their thoughts, concerns, and questions regarding COVID-19 policies and actions. This could entail creating online forums, email addresses, and hotlines where people can ask questions and get prompt answers from public servants. Transparency, accountability, and public involvement in decision-making processes are all facilitated by two-way communication (Criado & Guevara-Gómez, 2021).

vii. Planning Communications During Crisis:

To foresee problems, correct misinformation, and efficiently handle public health catastrophes, governments create extensive crisis communication plans. These plans describe public perception management techniques, major stakeholder roles and duties, and communication procedures. In the face of uncertainty and misfortune, crisis communication preparation assists governments in preserving public confidence and legitimacy (Su et al., 2021).

In order to battle the COVID-19 epidemic, government communication tactics and public engagement initiatives are essential for fostering public confidence, distributing factual information, and rallying community support. Encouraging vaccination uptake, maintaining public health measures' compliance, and building resilience in the case of a public health emergency all depend on effective communication.

6. Evaluation of Organizational Leadership Approaches to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Comprehensive tactics and procedures are included in COVID-19 crisis management plans and protocols in order to lessen the pandemic's effects on public health systems, businesses, organizations, and communities. Usually, these strategies include a number of essential elements:

i. Evaluation and Tracking of Risks:

Plans for crisis management start with a comprehensive risk assessment to determine how COVID-19 might affect the company's operations, finances, supply chains, and workers' health and safety, among other areas. To identify developing dangers and modify response tactics appropriately, it is imperative to continuously monitor the dynamic situation, including updates from government agencies and health authorities (Menoni & Schwarze, 2020).

ii. Modes of Communication:

During a crisis, maintaining transparency, addressing stakeholder concerns, and ensuring timely information distribution all depend on effective communication. Plans for crisis management encompass communication procedures for both internal and external parties involved, including staff members, clients, vendors, financiers, and the press. During trying moments, clear and consistent message promotes cooperation, reduces anxiety, and builds trust (Wang et al., 2021).

iii. Employee Health and Safety Measures:

In COVID-19 crisis management strategies, safeguarding the health and safety of employees is of utmost importance. To reduce the danger of viral transmission, organisations employ protocols for personal protective equipment (PPE), social distancing, health screenings, and remote work arrangements. Employee adherence to safety protocols and resolution of any issues is facilitated by frequent updates, training sessions, and support resources (Hu et al., 2021).

iv. Company Continuity and Resilience:

Plans for crisis management incorporate techniques for continuing vital companies operations and services while minimizing COVID-19-related interruptions. Developing remote work capabilities, broadening supply chains, giving top priority to essential tasks, and creating backup plans for vital resources like staffing, technological infrastructure, and logistics are a few examples of what this might entail (Rapaccini et al., 2020). The efficacy of business continuity procedures is ensured by routine testing and exercises.

v. Financial and Operational Planning:

According to Hofmann et al. (2021), COVID-19 crisis management plans address the financial and operational difficulties brought on by the pandemic, including cash flow restrictions, revenue losses, and supply chain interruptions. To maintain operational resilience and financial stability, organisations create budget changes, backup plans, and risk mitigation techniques. To obtain support programmes and resources, cooperation with insurance, government agencies, and financial consultants can be required.

vi. Partnerships and Stakeholder Engagement:

Crisis management initiatives require close cooperation with external stakeholders, such as governmental bodies, public health authorities, trade groups, and neighbourhood organisations. In order to solve shared difficulties and promote community resilience, organisations collaborate, exchange best practices, and pool resources. Strong relationships with stakeholders are essential for enhancing crisis response and readiness (Arslan et al., 2021).

vii. Recovery and Education After the Crisis:

Plans for crisis management incorporate provisions for learning and recuperation following a crisis, which aids in organisational growth and adaption. Organisations carry out thorough reviews and assessments as the pandemic's acute phase passes in order to pinpoint lessons learnt, assess the efficacy of responses, and put improvements into place for upcoming crises (Batorski, 2021). Organisational preparation and resilience are strengthened by this process of ongoing learning and adaptation.

All things considered, COVID-19 crisis management procedures and plans are intricate and dynamic, necessitating proactive risk management, clear communication, employee support, business continuity plans, stakeholder cooperation, and constant learning and modification. Organisations may successfully traverse the pandemic's obstacles and emerge stronger and more resilient in the face of future crises by placing a high priority on safety, resilience, and agility.

7. Success Factors for Managing Pandemic

Decision-Making Processes:

Managing a public health emergency such as the COVID-19 pandemic requires the application of effective decision-making techniques. As conditions have changed, governments have had to act quickly and frequently

with difficulty. This evaluation component evaluates how suitable, timely, and evidence-based policy responses are. It looks at how governments used data analytics, expert opinion, and scientific evidence to make choices. In addition, the evaluation of decision-making processes' inclusivity and transparency takes into account the degree of public engagement and the participation of pertinent stakeholders (Rubin et al., 2021).

Communication Strategies

Ensuring public health policies are adhered to and public trust is upheld need open and honest communication. Governments have had to disseminate information that changes quickly, like vaccination programs, containment strategies, and infection rates. This evaluation's component examines how well government communication plans worked throughout the pandemic. It evaluates the timeliness, correctness, and clarity of government communications, such as risk assessments, containment strategy updates, and public health advice. Evaluations are also conducted on stakeholder and public participation, as well as the use of technology and media to disseminate information (Sarfi et al., 2023).

Policy Implementation

Implementing policies entails converting decisions into workable steps that successfully handle the difficulties the pandemic presents. Governments have taken a number of steps to stop the spread of COVID-19 and lessen its effects, such as testing plans, vaccine drives, and lockdowns. The effectiveness of government actions in attaining their intended goals is evaluated in this evaluation component. It looks at how government agencies coordinate their efforts, how resources are distributed, and what kinds of checks and balances are in place to make sure public health standards are followed. Evaluation is also done on how flexible and adaptive government actions are in response to shifting conditions and new problems (Janssen & Van der Voort, 2020).

Collaboration and Coordination: A thorough and well-coordinated response to the pandemic depends on effective collaboration and coordination between government agencies, foreign partners, and other stakeholders. To exchange knowledge, resources, and best practices, governments have collaborated extensively with non-governmental organizations, public health agencies, and healthcare providers. This evaluation component evaluates the degree of interagency cooperation, international cooperation, and interaction with the private and non-governmental sectors. It looks at the systems for exchanging data, materials, and knowledge as well as the efficiency of collaborations and teamwork in combating the epidemic (Kessa et al., 2021).

8. Case Study Analysis

The review may involve case studies of certain nations or regions with varying pandemic experiences in order to offer specific examples and insights (Ivanov, 2020). These case studies make it possible to examine important choices, communication tactics, the application of policies, and cooperative efforts in particular situations in great detail.

9. Conclusion

To sum up, the assessment sheds light on how well government and organizational leadership strategies addressed the COVID-19 pandemic. It emphasizes how crucial it is to navigate global health emergencies with good decision-making, communication, policy execution, and teamwork.

The evaluation results are examined in relation to the previously mentioned assessment criteria. The identification of success factors, obstacles, and lessons learned is done, with consideration given to the implications for pandemic preparedness and crisis management in the future.

10. Recommendation

Recommendations are made to improve governmental leadership in crisis situations based on the evaluation's findings, with a focus on the importance of readiness, adaptability, and international cooperation. These suggestions are meant to improve global health security and provide guidance for future pandemic management plans.

Declaration of Competing Interest:

No conflicts declared.

References

- [1] Ahmed Iqbal, Z., Abid, G., Arshad, M., Ashfaq, F., Athar, M. A., & Hassan, Q. (2021). Impact of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership on thriving at work: The moderating role of conscientiousness. *European journal of investigation in health, psychology and education*, 11(3), 667-685.
- [2] Ahsan, M. J., & Khalid, M. H. (2023). Laissez-Faire Leadership. In *Leadership Approaches in Global Hospitality and Tourism* (pp. 61-72). IGI Global.
- [3] Aldunce, P., Beilin, R., Handmer, J., & Howden, M. (2021). Stakeholder participation in building resilience to disasters in a changing climate. In *Environmental Hazards and Resilience* (pp. 164-179). Routledge.
- [4] Alharafsheh, M., Alghizzawi, M., Ezmigna, I., Al Darwish, M., & Alawneh, E. (2023). The Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Public Sector Employees Job Satisfaction During COVID-19. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 8(6), e01535-e01535.
- [5] Armstrong, R., Waters, E., Dobbins, M., Anderson, L., Moore, L., Petticrew, M., ... & Swinburn, B. (2013). Knowledge translation strategies to improve the use of evidence in public health decision making in local government: intervention design and implementation plan. *Implementation Science*, 8, 1-10.
- [6] Arslan, A., Golgeci, I., Khan, Z., Al-Tabbaa, O., & Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, P. (2021). Adaptive learning in cross-sector collaboration during global emergency: conceptual insights in the context of COVID-19 pandemic. *Multinational Business Review*, 29(1), 21-42.
- [7] Batorski, J. (2021). Crisis Management: The Perspective of Organizational Learning. In *Eurasian Business Perspectives: Proceedings of the 29th Eurasia Business and Economics Society Conference* (pp. 75-86). Springer International Publishing.
- [8] Criado, J. I., & Guevara-Gómez, A. (2021). Public sector, open innovation, and collaborative governance in lockdown times. A research of Spanish cases during the COVID-19 crisis. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 15(4), 612-626.
- [9] De Bruin, Y. B., Lequarre, A. S., McCourt, J., Clevestig, P., Pigazzani, F., Jeddi, M. Z., ... & Goulart, M. (2020). Initial impacts of global risk mitigation measures taken during the combatting of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Safety science*, 128, 104773.
- [10] Diddi, P., & Wei, L. (2022). Crisis management on social media: Effect of pre-crisis inoculation strategy and midst-crisis organizational interactivity. *Public Relations Review*, 48(5), 102206.
- [11] Gal-Arieli, N., Beer, I., Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Reichman, A. (2020). Can leadership transform educational policy? Leadership style, new localism and local involvement in education. *Sustainability*, 12(22), 9564.
- [12] Hofmann, E., Templar, S., Rogers, D., Choi, T. Y., Leuschner, R., & Korde, R. Y. (2021). Supply chain financing and pandemic: Managing cash flows to keep firms and their value networks healthy. *Rutgers Business Review*, 6(1), 1-23.
- [13] Houlihan, F. (2020). *Autocratic, Democratic and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles: Is there a link between these Leadership Styles and Absenteeism/Withdrawal Amongst Millennials?* (Doctoral dissertation, Dublin, National College of Ireland).
- [14] Hu, X., Yan, H., Casey, T., & Wu, C. H. (2021). Creating a safe haven during the crisis: How organizations can achieve deep compliance with COVID-19 safety measures in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 92, 102662.
- [15] Hyland-Wood, B., Gardner, J., Leask, J., & Ecker, U. K. (2021). Toward effective government communication strategies in the era of COVID-19. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1).
- [16] Islam, M. S., Sarkar, T., Khan, S. H., Kamal, A. H. M., Hasan, S. M., Kabir, A., ... & Seale, H. (2020). COVID-19-related infodemic and its impact on public health: A global social media analysis. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*, 103(4), 1621.
- [17] Ivanov, D. (2020). Predicting the impacts of epidemic outbreaks on global supply chains: A simulation-based analysis on the coronavirus outbreak (COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2) case. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 136, 101922.

-
- [18] Jaafar, S. B., Zamb, N. M., & Fathil, N. F. (2021). Leadership style: Is it autocratic, democratic or laissez-faire?. *ASEAN Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 3(1), 1-7.
- [19] Janssen, M., & Van der Voort, H. (2020). Agile and adaptive governance in crisis response: Lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic. *International journal of information management*, 55, 102180.
- [20] Kessa, R., Sadiq, A. A., & Yeo, J. (2021). The importance of vertical and horizontal collaboration: United States' response to COVID-19 pandemic. *Chinese Public Administration Review*, 12(1), 61-71.
- [21] Kilag, O. K. T., Uy, F. T., Abendan, C. F. K., & Malbas, M. H. (2023). Teaching leadership: an examination of best practices for leadership educators. *Science and Education*, 4(7), 430-445.
- [22] Kirkpatrick, N. (2023). *Communicating policy: bridging the gap between policy and the general public in Malta* (Master's thesis, University of Malta).
- [23] Lassi, Z. S., Naseem, R., Salam, R. A., Siddiqui, F., & Das, J. K. (2021). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on immunization campaigns and programs: a systematic review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(3), 988.
- [24] Leary, T., & Miller, M. (2021). The Toxic Relationship Between Laissez-Faire Leadership and Employee Burnout: No Longer a Well-Kept Secret. *International Leadership Journal*, 13(2).
- [25] Lundmark, R., Richter, A., & Tafvelin, S. (2022). Consequences of managers' laissez-faire leadership during organizational restructuring. *Journal of Change Management*, 22(1), 40-58.
- [26] Menoni, S., & Schwarze, R. (2020). Recovery during a crisis: Facing the challenges of risk assessment and resilience management of COVID-19. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, 40, 189-198.
- [27] Nangia, R., & Arora, R. (2021). Critical study of leadership styles in handling COVID-19 crisis. *Border Crossing*, 11(2), 117-133.
- [28] Norris, K. R., Ghahremani, H., & Lemoine, G. J. (2021). Is it laissez-faire leadership or delegation? A deeper examination of an over-simplified leadership phenomenon. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 28(3), 322-339.
- [29] Pizzolitto, E., Verna, I., & Venditti, M. (2023). Authoritarian leadership styles and performance: a systematic literature review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, 73(2), 841-871.
- [30] Rapaccini, M., Sacconi, N., Kowalkowski, C., Paiola, M., & Adrodegari, F. (2020). Navigating disruptive crises through service-led growth: The impact of COVID-19 on Italian manufacturing firms. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 88, 225-237.
- [31] Rocha, R., Atun, R., Massuda, A., Rache, B., Spinola, P., Nunes, L., ... & Castro, M. C. (2021). Effect of socioeconomic inequalities and vulnerabilities on health-system preparedness and response to COVID-19 in Brazil: a comprehensive analysis. *The Lancet Global Health*, 9(6), e782-e792.
- [32] Rubin, O., Errett, N. A., Upshur, R., & Baekkeskov, E. (2021). The challenges facing evidence-based decision making in the initial response to COVID-19. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 49(7), 790-796.
- [33] Sadiq A-A, Kapucu N, Hu Q. (2020) Crisis leadership during COVID-19: The role of governors in the United States. *International Journal of Public Leadership* 17(1): 65–80.
- [34] Santoso, N. R., Sulistyaningtyas, I. D., & Pratama, B. P. (2022). Transformational leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic: Strengthening employee engagement through internal communication. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 01968599221095182.
- [35] Sarfi, T., Nosrati, S., & Sabzali, M. (2023). Trust, information, and COVID-19 conspiracy theories: cross-cultural implications for crisis management and public health. *Migration Letters*, 20(S4), 522-536.
- [36] STeFAN, T. A. L. U., & Nazarov, A. D. (2020, November). Challenges and competencies of leadership in Covid-19 pandemic. In *Research technologies of pandemic coronavirus impact (RTCOV 2020)* (pp. 518-524). Atlantis Press.
- [37] Su, Z., McDonnell, D., Wen, J., Kozak, M., Abbas, J., Šegalo, S., ... & Xiang, Y. T. (2021). Mental health consequences of COVID-19 media coverage: the need for effective crisis communication practices. *Globalization and health*, 17(1), 1-8.
- [38] Wang, Y., Hao, H., & Platt, L. S. (2021). Examining risk and crisis communications of government agencies and stakeholders during early-stages of COVID-19 on Twitter. *Computers in human behavior*, 114, 106568.

-
- [39] Wasylyshyn KM, Masterpasqua F. (2018) Developing self-compassion in leadership development coaching: a practice model and case study analysis. *International Coaching Psychology Review* 13(1): 21–34.
- [40] Williams T, Gruber D, Sutcliffe K, et al. (2017) Organizational response to adversity: fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. *Academy of Management Annual* 11(2): 733–769.
- [41] Wilson, A. (2020). Emotionally agile leadership amid COVID-19. *School Leadership Review*, 15(2), 1.
- [42] Wilson, D. E. (2020). Moving toward democratic-transformational leadership in academic libraries. *Library Management*, 41(8/9), 731-744.
- [43] World Health Organization (2020. a) Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection (SARI) when COVID-19 disease is suspected', interim Guidance. Available at: <https://tinyurl.com/rh99jm7> (accessed 10 December 2022).
- [44] Wu, X., Shi, L., Lu, X., Li, X., & Ma, L. (2022). Government dissemination of epidemic information as a policy instrument during COVID-19 pandemic: Evidence from Chinese cities. *Cities*, 125, 103658.
- [45] Zheng, Q., Jones, F. K., Leavitt, S. V., Ung, L., Labrique, A. B., Peters, D. H., ... & Azman, A. S. (2020). HIT-COVID, a global database tracking public health interventions to COVID-19. *Scientific data*, 7(1), 286.