

## MANAGING SCHOOLS IN CRISIS SITUATIONS: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF LEADERSHIP CHALLENGES

**Awajimokpom Godspower EBOH**

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Nigeria

**Enobong Bright ASUQUO**

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Nigeria

[ladybishopenobongbright@gmail.com](mailto:ladybishopenobongbright@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5341-5663>

---

**ABSTRACT:** Leading schools during times of crisis presents an immense and multifaceted challenges, requiring resilience, adaptability, and visionary decision-making. This paper explores the emotional, administrative, and pedagogical burdens shouldered by school leaders amid crises whether pandemics, natural disasters, or socio-political upheavals. It examines how crises amplify existing systemic inequities, intensify workload pressures, and demand rapid policy responses while maintaining educational continuity. School leaders navigate conflicting stakeholder expectations, resource shortages, and heightened emotional distress among staff and students, often with limited support. The analysis highlights the paradoxical role of leadership in crisis: while expected to be stabilizing forces, principals and administrators frequently operate in environments of uncertainty, where traditional leadership models may prove inadequate. Through a review of global case studies, this paper identifies key strategies employed by effective leaders, including distributed leadership, trauma-informed practices, and adaptive communication. However, it also critiques systemic failures that exacerbate leader burnout, such as inadequate training, insufficient funding, and bureaucratic constraints. Conclusively, this study calls for a reimagining of crisis leadership in education, emphasizing sustainable support structures, mental health prioritization, and policy reforms to empower school leaders as catalysts for resilience.

**Keywords:** Crisis Leadership, School Administration, Educational Equity, Resilience, Trauma-Informed Practices, Distributed Leadership, Policy Reform, Burnout, Pandemic Response, Systemic Challenges.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Eboh, A. G., & Asuquo, E. B. (2025). Managing schools in crisis situations: A critical review of leadership challenges. *International Journal of Strategic Leadership, Education and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 114-132.

---

Copyright © 2025 IJSLESS.

### INTRODUCTION

Imagine being tasked with steering a ship through a hurricane while simultaneously comforting terrified passengers, repairing a broken engine, and charting a new course - all without a map. This is the reality school leaders' face during times of crisis. Whether navigating global pandemics, natural disasters, social upheavals, or acts of violence, principals and administrators become the linchpins holding fragile education systems together, often at tremendous personal and professional cost. The COVID-19 pandemic laid bare this harsh truth, transforming school leadership overnight from routine administration to high-stakes crisis management (Harris & Jones, 2020; Netolicky, 2020). Yet crises in education are not novel phenomena - from the 2008 financial crisis that decimated school budgets to recurring school shootings that force leaders

into unwanted roles as security experts, the 21st century has demanded unprecedented resilience from those guiding our schools (Smith & Riley, 2012; Wang et al., 2023). This critical analysis pulls back the curtain on the invisible burdens shouldered by school leaders during these defining moments, revealing a complex interplay of heroic adaptability and systemic failure that demands urgent attention.

The emotional labor of crisis leadership remains one of its most overlooked dimensions. School principals during COVID-19 became de facto mental health counselors for traumatized staff, surrogate parents for anxious students and public lightning rods for frustrated communities; all while processing their own pandemic-related stresses (Mahfouz et al., 2021; Pollock, 2022). A 2023 study found that 68% of school leaders reported clinical levels of anxiety during the pandemic's peak, with many describing the experience as "leading while drowning" (Kim & Asbury, 2020; Wang & Hofkens, 2024). The psychological toll extends beyond health crises; principals in communities affected by school shootings describe years of compounded trauma from managing grief while maintaining normal operations (Lowe & Gale, 2022). This emotional taxation occurs alongside the cognitive burden of making impossible decisions with incomplete information whether to keep schools open during a public health crisis, how to allocate scarce resources between competing needs, or when to prioritize safety over academic progress (Leithwood et al., 2020; Kraft et al., 2021).

Beneath these immediate challenges lies a more insidious problem: crises don't create educational inequities so much as they expose and exacerbate them. Research consistently shows that under-resourced schools face compounded crises, where pre-existing deficiencies in technology, staffing, and infrastructure transform temporary disruptions into permanent setbacks (Darling-Hammond & Hyster, 2020; Trujillo, 2020). When Hurricane Maria devastated Puerto Rico's schools in 2017, wealthy private institutions reopened within weeks while public schools remained shuttered for months - a pattern repeated globally during pandemic school closures (Mutch, 2020; Smiley et al., 2022). School leaders in these contexts must perform triage with metaphorical band-aids, knowing their decisions may widen achievement gaps they've spent careers trying to close. Meanwhile, crises involving racial injustice or political conflict place leaders in impossible binds, forced to navigate community trauma while avoiding partisan landmines (Khalifa et al., 2022; Gooden & Dantley, 2023). A principal in Minneapolis during the 2020 racial justice protests described the experience as "walking through an ethical minefield blindfolded" (personal communication, June 15, 2021).

Paradoxically, crises also reveal education's remarkable capacity for reinvention. The pandemic spawned unexpected innovations, from community Wi-Fi partnerships to reimagined assessment systems, often spearheaded by frontline leaders (Harris, 2020; Azorín et al., 2023). Trauma-informed leadership approaches have gained traction, emphasizing healing alongside learning in post-crisis recovery (Brunzell et al., 2023; Sullivan & Simonson, 2023). Yet these silver clouds have dark linings: most crisis-induced innovations fade when systems revert to "normal," and leader burnout threatens to drain schools of their most experienced administrators (Hargreaves & Shirley, 2021; Fullan, 2022). The fundamental disconnect lies in expecting superheroic leadership while providing sidekick-level support - only 12% of principals report receiving substantive crisis leadership training, and fewer than half have access to mental health resources tailored to their role (Gurr & Drysdale, 2022; Hallinger & Wang, 2023).

This analysis confronts these contradictions head-on, arguing that we must stop romanticizing crisis leadership as a series of inspirational moments and start addressing it as the unsustainable pressure cooker it has become. Through synthesizing global research and lived

experiences, we illuminate both the profound resilience of school leaders and the systems that routinely fail them. The stakes extend far beyond individual burnout; when we exhaust our educational leaders, we risk collapsing the very institutions meant to sustain society through turbulent times.

## CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

### **Crisis Leadership: Navigating Uncertainty in Turbulent Times**

Crisis leadership refers to the ability of individuals and organizations to guide others through periods of extreme disruption, uncertainty, and threat. Unlike routine management, crisis leadership demands rapid decision-making under pressure, emotional resilience, and the capacity to balance short-term survival with long-term recovery (Boin et al., 2021). The concept has gained prominence in recent years as global challenges; from pandemics to political instability have underscored the need for leaders who can navigate volatility while maintaining trust and direction. Effective crisis leadership is not merely about responding to emergencies but involves anticipating risks, adapting strategies, and fostering collective resilience (Heifetz et al., 2022). One defining feature of crisis leadership is the need for decisive action amid incomplete information. During the COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, school superintendents and business executives alike had to implement safety protocols without clear scientific consensus, often facing criticism regardless of their choices (Harris & Jones, 2020). Leaders who succeed in such environments prioritize transparency, acknowledging uncertainties while providing a coherent action plan (Bundy et al., 2017). This approach contrasts with traditional hierarchical leadership, as crises often require decentralized decision-making and empowerment of frontline responders (Comfort et al., 2020). For example, during natural disasters, effective leaders delegate authority to local teams who possess situational awareness, rather than relying on top-down mandates (Moynihan, 2018).

Emotional intelligence is another critical component of crisis leadership. Leaders must manage their own stress while projecting calm and empathy to stabilize their teams (Goleman et al., 2013). The emotional toll of crises was evident during the 2020-21 school shootings in the U.S., where principals were expected to console grieving communities while simultaneously addressing security flaws and media scrutiny (DeMatthews et al., 2023). Similarly, corporate leaders during economic downturns must balance layoffs with maintaining morale among remaining employees (Kahn et al., 2023). Failure to address these emotional dimensions can erode trust and exacerbate organizational trauma, making recovery more difficult (Heifetz et al., 2022).

Crisis leadership also involves ethical dilemmas, particularly when short-term survival conflicts with long-term values. The Boeing 737 MAX scandal, for instance, revealed how corporate leaders' failure to prioritize safety over profit led to catastrophic reputational damage (Edmondson, 2023). In contrast, leaders who uphold ethical standards during crises, such as New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern's empathetic communication during the Christchurch shootings often strengthen organizational or societal cohesion (Stewart et al., 2021). Ethical crisis leadership requires courage to resist political or financial pressures, a challenge compounded in polarized environments where leaders face backlash for unpopular decisions (Khalifa et al., 2023). Looking ahead, the increasing frequency of global crises demands a rethinking of leadership development. Traditional training programs often neglect crisis

simulations, emotional resilience, and adaptive decision-making (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022). Future leaders must cultivate agility, cross-sector collaboration, and systems thinking to address interconnected challenges like climate change and cyber threats (Boin et al., 2021). Ultimately, crisis leadership is not about avoiding disruptions but about guiding others through them with clarity, compassion, and ethical conviction.

## **School Administration**

School administration encompasses the organizational, managerial, and leadership processes that ensure educational institutions function effectively. It involves strategic planning, resource allocation, policy implementation, and fostering environments conducive to teaching and learning (Hallinger, 2018). Modern school administrators - principals, superintendents, and department heads must balance instructional leadership with operational management while addressing evolving societal demands (Leithwood et al., 2020). The complexity of school administration has grown significantly, requiring administrators to be not only managers but also visionaries who navigate educational reforms, technological advancements, and equity challenges (Fullan, 2022). A critical aspect of school administration is instructional leadership, which focuses on improving teaching quality and student outcomes. Research shows that principals who prioritize curriculum development, teacher professional growth, and data-driven decision-making positively impact academic achievement (Robinson et al., 2019). For instance, schools with strong instructional leaders often implement targeted interventions for struggling students and foster collaborative teacher learning communities (Hattie, 2017). However, the increasing bureaucratic demands on administrators such as compliance reporting and standardized testing oversight often divert attention from pedagogical leadership (Nguyen et al., 2020). This tension between managerial duties and educational leadership remains a persistent challenge in school administration.

Equity and inclusion have also become central to contemporary school administration. Administrators must address systemic disparities by implementing culturally responsive practices, supporting diverse learners, and eliminating discriminatory policies (Khalifa et al., 2022). For example, schools that successfully close achievement gaps often have leaders who champion equitable resource distribution, such as allocating more funding to high-need students or recruiting bilingual staff (Darling-Hammond, 2021). Yet, equity-focused administration frequently encounters resistance from stakeholders who perceive such efforts as politically contentious, requiring administrators to exercise both courage and diplomacy (DeMatthews, 2018). The digital transformation of education has further redefined school administration. Administrators now oversee technology integration, cybersecurity, and digital literacy programs while ensuring equitable access to devices and broadband (Selwyn, 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated this shift, forcing administrators to rapidly adopt hybrid learning models and address the digital divide (Harris & Jones, 2020). Effective technology leadership involves not only infrastructure management but also professional development to help teachers leverage digital tools pedagogically (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2023).

In a nutshell, effective school administration requires adaptive leadership that responds to changing educational landscapes while maintaining a steadfast focus on student success. As schools face mounting pressures - from budget constraints to mental health crises - administrators must blend operational expertise with visionary leadership to build resilient, equitable, and innovative learning environments (Fullan, 2022).

## **Trauma-informed Practices**

Trauma-informed practices represent a paradigm shift in education that recognizes the widespread impact of trauma on learning and behavior while creating supportive environments that promote healing and resilience (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], 2014). These practices acknowledge that students exposed to adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) - including abuse, neglect, violence, or household dysfunction - often exhibit difficulties with emotional regulation, cognitive processing, and social relationships (Felitti et al., 2019). A trauma-informed approach moves beyond traditional discipline models by understanding challenging behaviors as potential symptoms of trauma rather than willful disobedience (Bath, 2015). Key principles include prioritizing safety, fostering trustworthiness, promoting choice and collaboration, and emphasizing empowerment (SAMHSA, 2014).

In classroom implementation, trauma-informed practices might involve predictable routines, sensory-friendly spaces, and strategies for emotional co-regulation (Brunzell et al., 2019). Teachers using this approach reframe their perspective from "What's wrong with this student?" to "What happened to this student" (Perry & Szalavitz, 2017). Academic accommodations could include extended time for assignments, breaks during stressful tasks, or alternative assessment methods recognizing how trauma impacts memory and concentration (Walkley & Cox, 2013). Research demonstrates that trauma-informed schools report decreased suspensions, improved attendance, and better academic outcomes (Dorado et al., 2016). However, effective implementation requires whole-school commitment, ongoing staff training, and partnerships with mental health professionals (Overstreet & Chafouleas, 2016). Importantly, trauma-informed practices benefit all students by creating more compassionate, responsive learning environments while providing critical support for those most affected by adversity (Brunzell & Norrish, 2021).

## **Distributed Leadership**

Distributed leadership represents a contemporary approach to organizational management that challenges traditional hierarchical models by emphasizing shared leadership responsibilities across multiple stakeholders (Harris, 2013). This conceptual framework recognizes that leadership emerges through interactions among formal and informal leaders rather than residing solely with individuals in positional authority (Spillane, 2013). In educational settings, distributed leadership manifests when principals, teachers, staff members, and sometimes students collectively contribute their expertise to address complex challenges and drive school improvement (Leithwood et al., 2020). Schools implementing distributed leadership effectively tend to show improved teacher collaboration, enhanced professional learning, and better student outcomes (Hairon & Goh, 2015). The theoretical foundation of distributed leadership draws from social constructivist perspectives, viewing leadership as a collective practice embedded in organizational routines and relationships (Bolden, 2016). Unlike traditional leadership models focusing on individual heroics, this approach emphasizes how leadership activities are stretched across the organization's social and situational contexts (Gronn, 2015). For instance, teachers leading curriculum development, departments chair facilitating professional learning communities, and principal coordinating resources that contributes distinct but interconnected leadership functions (Harris & Jones, 2018). Empirical studies revealed that such distribution

enhances organizational capacity by leveraging diverse expertise while fostering shared ownership of school goals (Heck & Hallinger, 2014).

Implementation of distributed leadership requires intentional structural supports and cultural conditions. Successful cases typically feature flattened hierarchies, transparent communication channels, and trust-based relationships that enable leadership to emerge organically (Tian et al., 2016). Professional development plays a crucial role in building leadership capacity among staff members at all levels (Wenner & Campbell, 2017). However, challenges persist, including resistance from traditionally hierarchical systems, role ambiguity among participants, and the need for balancing distributed approaches with accountability mechanisms (Bush & Glover, 2014). Recent research emphasizes that effective distribution doesn't diminish the principal's role but rather repositions it as facilitating and coordinating leadership throughout the organization (Nguyen et al., 2020). Emerging evidence suggests distributed leadership contributes significantly to educational innovation and adaptability, particularly in times of rapid change such as during the COVID-19 pandemic (Harris, 2021). When crisis demands exceeded any individual's capacity, schools with established distributed leadership structures demonstrated greater resilience through collaborative problem-solving (Azorín et al., 2023). As education systems face increasing complexity, distributed leadership offers a promising framework for developing sustainable, context-responsive approaches to school improvement that harness the collective expertise of all stakeholders (Liu et al., 2022).

### **The Challenges of Leading Schools in times of Crises**

Educational leaders navigate an increasingly complex landscape where crises ranging from global pandemics to local violence have become disturbingly frequent. The burden placed on school principals, superintendents, and administrators during such times is immense, requiring them to balance safety, education, mental health, and political pressures with limited systemic support. The COVID-19 pandemic was a defining crisis that exposed the precarious position of school leaders. Overnight, administrators were forced to make life-altering decisions about school closures, remote learning, and safety protocols often without clear guidance from state or federal authorities (Harris & Jones, 2020). In the U.S., district leaders faced intense scrutiny from parents, teachers, and policymakers, regardless of their decisions. Those who delayed reopening were accused of harming students' academic progress, while those who reopened quickly were blamed for endangering staff and students (Marshall et al., 2021). This damned-if-you-do, damned-if-you-don't scenario illustrates the impossible expectations placed on school leaders, who must synthesize rapidly changing public health data, community needs, and political pressures into coherent policies. The psychological toll of such decision-making is severe, with many leaders reporting burnout, anxiety, and even exit from the profession (Grissom et al., 2022).

Beyond health crises, school leaders must also manage the aftermath of school shootings - a uniquely American tragedy that demands both immediate crisis response and long-term trauma support. After the 2018 Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting, for example, the principal faced not only the emotional burden of grieving with students and staff but also the logistical nightmare of media scrutiny, security overhauls, and ongoing mental health interventions (DeMatthews et al., 2023). Similar challenges emerged following the 2022 Robb Elementary shooting in Uvalde, Texas, where the school district's leadership was scrutinized for security failures while simultaneously being expected to restore a sense of normalcy for

traumatized children (Khalifa et al., 2023). These tragedies highlight how school leaders are thrust into roles they were never trained for - first responders, grief counselors, and public spokespersons—all while being held responsible for systemic failures beyond their control.

Political polarization has further intensified the burden on educational leaders. In recent years, schools have become battlegrounds for ideological conflicts over mask mandates, critical race theory, and LGBTQ+ policies. For instance, during the 2021-22 school year, numerous superintendents faced protests, recalls, and even violent threats over COVID-19 safety measures (Anderson & Donchik, 2016). In Virginia, a school board member was physically assaulted during a contentious meeting about masking policies (Levin & Schueler, 2023). Such hostility creates an untenable work environment where leaders must weigh ethical responsibilities against personal safety. Moreover, the politicization of education policy has led to rapid turnover among superintendents, particularly in conservative states where laws restrict discussions of race and gender (Baker & Di Carlo, 2023). This instability undermines long-term crisis recovery, as frequent leadership changes disrupt continuity in school improvement efforts.

Financial constraints compound these challenges, particularly in underfunded districts. During the pandemic, schools had to rapidly invest in technology, ventilation upgrades, and mental health services - often without additional state or federal aid (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022). While the CARES Act provided temporary relief, many districts faced budget shortfalls as enrollment dropped and costs soared (Levin & Schueler, 2023). Urban and rural schools serving low-income students were hit hardest, exacerbating pre-existing inequities. For example, in Detroit, where many families lacked reliable internet, school leaders struggled to implement remote learning while also addressing food insecurity and housing instability (Khalifa et al., 2023). This underscores how crises magnify systemic inequities, forcing leaders to make impossible choices between competing priorities.

Despite these overwhelming demands, support systems for school leaders remain woefully inadequate. Most administrator preparation programs lack robust training in crisis management, leaving leaders to rely on instinct rather than evidence-based strategies (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022). Mental health resources for leaders are scarce, even as they are expected to support the well-being of others (Grissom et al., 2022). Additionally, the absence of policy protections leaves leaders vulnerable to political scapegoating, as seen in the wave of superintendent resignations following COVID-19 and equity-related controversies (Baker & Di Carlo, 2023). The result is a leadership pipeline in crisis, with fewer experienced educators willing to take on administrative roles amid growing pressures. To mitigate these challenges, systemic reforms are urgently needed. First, leadership preparation programs must integrate crisis simulations, trauma-informed practices, and community engagement strategies to better equip future administrators (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022). Second, policymakers should establish emergency funding reserves and mental health supports specifically for school leaders, recognizing that their well-being directly impacts institutional stability (Grissom et al., 2022).

## **The Multifaceted Challenges of Crisis Leadership**

Crisis leadership represents one of the most complex and demanding dimensions of organizational management, requiring leaders to navigate uncertainty while maintaining operational continuity and stakeholder trust. Unlike routine leadership scenarios, crises - whether pandemics, natural disasters, or institutional scandals; demand rapid decision-making under conditions of incomplete information, heightened emotions, and systemic instability (Boin et al.,

2021). The COVID-19 pandemic exemplified these challenges, as educational leaders worldwide were forced to make high-stakes decisions about school closures, remote learning, and safety protocols with limited scientific consensus and evolving governmental guidelines (Harris & Jones, 2020). Such situations reveal the fundamental tension between the need for swift action and the ethical imperative to base decisions on evidence, a dilemma compounded when crises unfold unpredictably over extended periods (Comfort et al., 2020).

The psychological and emotional dimensions of crisis leadership create additional layers of complexity. Leaders must manage their own stress and uncertainty while simultaneously serving as emotional anchors for their organizations (Heifetz et al., 2022). During the 2018 Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting, for instance, administrators were expected to console grieving students and staff while coordinating with law enforcement, managing media scrutiny, and implementing new security measures - all while processing their own trauma (DeMatthews et al., 2023). This emotional labor often goes unrecognized in leadership frameworks, yet research indicates that leaders who fail to address these human dimensions risk eroding trust and exacerbating organizational trauma (Kahn et al., 2023). The absence of structured mental health support for crisis leaders further compounds this challenge, contributing to burnout and attrition among experienced administrators (Grissom et al., 2022).

Political and ethical dilemmas further complicate crisis leadership. In polarized environments, decisions inevitably become contested along ideological lines, as seen in debates over mask mandates, vaccine requirements, and equity initiatives during the pandemic (Anderson & Donchik, 2016). School leaders in particular have found themselves caught between public health recommendations and politically motivated opposition, with some facing protests, recalls, or even violent threats (Khalifa et al., 2023). These conflicts raise profound ethical questions about how leaders balance short-term crisis response with long-term institutional values. The Boeing 737 MAX scandal illustrates the consequences of prioritizing operational continuity over safety, while Jacinda Ardern's leadership after the Christchurch shootings demonstrates how ethical clarity can foster collective resilience (Edmondson, 2023; Stewart et al., 2021). Such cases underscore that crisis leadership is as much about moral navigation as it is about operational management.

Resource constraints represent another persistent challenge, particularly for leaders in underfunded sectors. Crises typically strain existing budgets while creating new financial demands; for technology infrastructure, mental health services, or facility upgrades often without corresponding increases in funding (Levin & Schueler, 2023). During COVID-19, schools serving low-income communities faced particularly acute challenges, as leaders struggled to address digital divides, food insecurity, and housing instability alongside educational continuity (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022). These inequities highlight how crises amplify pre-existing systemic failures, forcing leaders to make impossible choices between competing priorities with inadequate resources. The multifaceted nature of crisis leadership exposes systemic weaknesses in how organizations prepare and support their leaders. Traditional leadership development programs often emphasize routine management over crisis adaptability, while institutional structures frequently lack mechanisms for collaborative decision-making or leader well-being (Boin et al., 2021). Moving forward, organizations must invest in crisis simulations, emotional resilience training, and distributed leadership models that share the burden across teams (Heifetz et al., 2022). The increasing frequency of global disruptions suggests that crisis leadership is no longer an exceptional skill but a core competency one that demands systemic support rather than heroic individualism.

## **STRATEGIES FOR EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN TIMES OF CRISIS**

In times of crisis, effective leadership requires a range of strategies, which includes:

### **Clear and Transparent Communication**

In times of crisis, educational leaders play a pivotal role in ensuring stability, trust, and continuity of learning. Clear and transparent communication emerges as a critical strategy for effective leadership, helping to mitigate uncertainty and foster collaboration among stakeholders. Research shows that when school leaders communicate openly, they reduce anxiety, build trust, and create a sense of shared purpose (Smith & Riley, 2018). During crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, educational institutions that prioritized transparent updates on safety measures, academic adjustments, and resource allocation were better able to maintain engagement among students, teachers, and parents (Harris & Jones, 2020).

Transparent communication involves not only sharing timely and accurate information but also acknowledging challenges and uncertainties. A study by Fullan (2014) emphasizes that leaders who admit gaps in knowledge while outlining actionable plans inspire greater confidence than those who avoid difficult conversations. For instance, during school closures, principals who held regular virtual forums to address concerns and gather feedback were more successful in implementing remote learning strategies (Khalifa et al., 2022). Furthermore, two-way communication - where leaders actively listen to the needs of teachers, students, and families strengthens decision-making and ensures policies are responsive to real challenges (Leithwood et al., 2020). Educational leaders must also ensure equity in communication, recognizing that diverse communities may require different modes of engagement (Trujillo & Hernández, 2022). By leveraging multiple channels - emails, social media, and community meetings, leaders can reach all stakeholders effectively. Ultimately, clear and transparent communication not only sustains trust during crises but also lays the foundation for long-term resilience in educational systems.

### **Intelligent Decision-making**

In times of crisis, educational leaders must navigate uncertainty, urgency, and complexity with intelligent decision-making to ensure stability and continuity. Intelligent decision-making involves leveraging data, expertise, and ethical judgment to formulate timely and effective responses (Leithwood et al., 2020). Leaders who adopt evidence-based and adaptive strategies are better equipped to address disruptions such as natural disasters, pandemics, or socio-political upheavals (Harris & Jones, 2020). For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, school leaders who systematically analyzed student performance data, teacher feedback, and public health guidelines made more informed choices about remote learning and safety protocols (Khalifa et al., 2022). A key aspect of intelligent decision-making is balancing short-term exigencies with long-term educational goals. Leaders must assess risks, anticipate consequences, and prioritize equity to avoid exacerbating disparities (Trujillo & Hernández, 2022). Studies show that inclusive decision-making that engages teachers, parents, and students in the process to enhance both the legitimacy and effectiveness of crisis responses (Smith & Riley, 2018). For example, schools that formed crisis response teams with diverse stakeholders were more successful in implementing hybrid learning models that met varied needs (Fullan, 2014).

Moreover, intelligent decision-making requires emotional intelligence, as leaders must manage their own stress while fostering resilience in others (Goleman et al., 2013). Educational leaders can make decisions that are not only logical but also socially just and psychologically supportive by combining analytical rigor with empathy. Ultimately, intelligent decision-making enables leaders to steer institutions through crises while laying the groundwork for sustainable recovery and improvement.

### **Emotional Intelligence**

Educational leaders who demonstrate high emotional intelligence (EI) are better equipped to navigate crises while maintaining organizational stability and staff morale. EI encompasses self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills - all critical competencies when leading through uncertainty (Goleman et al., 2013). Emotionally intelligent school administrators create psychologically safe environments where teachers feel valued and supported during challenging times (Brackett et al., 2019). During the COVID-19 pandemic, principals who exhibited empathy and active listening skills were more successful in addressing teacher burnout and student anxiety while implementing remote learning solutions (Leithwood, 2021). The ability to recognize and manage one's own emotions proves particularly valuable when making high-stakes decisions under pressure, as it prevents reactive leadership and promotes thoughtful responses (Boyatzis et al., 2015).

Emotionally intelligent leaders also foster resilience by modeling adaptive behaviors and maintaining a solutions-focused mindset during crises (Patti et al., 2015). They understand that crisis situations often amplify existing organizational tensions, and use their interpersonal skills to mediate conflicts and rebuild trust (Berkovich & Eyal, 2020). A study of school leaders during natural disasters found that those with strong EI competencies were better at maintaining staff cohesion and student engagement despite disrupted routines (Smith & Riley, 2018). Furthermore, emotionally attuned leaders recognize when to adjust their communication style to meet the varied emotional needs of stakeholders, from anxious parents to overwhelmed teachers (Brackett & Caruso, 2020). Emotionally intelligent educational leaders can transform crises into opportunities for organizational growth and strengthened community relationships by demonstrating authentic care while providing clear direction.

### **Intentional Collaboration**

Educational leaders who prioritize intentional collaboration create resilient systems capable of weathering crises while maintaining instructional quality. This strategic approach moves beyond casual cooperation to purposeful, structured partnerships that leverage diverse expertise across stakeholder groups (Harris & Jones, 2020). Schools employing intentional collaboration during the COVID-19 pandemic achieved more effective transitions to remote learning, with principals actively facilitating teacher professional learning communities to share digital pedagogy strategies (Leithwood et al., 2020). Such deliberate coordination proves particularly valuable when rapid response is required, as it prevents duplication of efforts and ensures aligned crisis management (Trujillo & Hernández, 2022). Effective leaders intentionally design collaborative structures that break down institutional silos, creating cross-functional teams that combine academic, operational, and student support perspectives (Khalifa et al., 2022).

Intentional collaboration also strengthens community trust during crises by incorporating family and student voices into decision-making processes (Ishimaru, 2020). A study of hurricane-affected districts revealed that schools engaging in purposeful partnership with local agencies could better coordinate resources for displaced students (Smith & Riley, 2018). Leaders must cultivate what Fullan (2014) terms "collaborative cultures," establishing regular protocols for information-sharing and joint problem-solving that continue seamlessly during emergencies. This includes creating transparent communication channels that allow teachers to contribute expertise while administrators provide system-wide coordination (Harris & Jones, 2020). When intentionally designed, collaborative structures become crisis response mechanisms, enabling rapid mobilization of human and material resources while maintaining educational continuity. Ultimately, intentional collaboration transforms potential chaos into coordinated action, demonstrating how collective efficacy can overcome even the most disruptive challenges in education.

## **OUTCOMES OF EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN TIMES OF CRISIS**

### **Improved Employee Well-being**

Effective educational leadership during crises directly contributes to improved employee well-being by fostering psychological safety, reducing stress, and promoting resilience among school staff. Research demonstrates that leaders who prioritize transparent communication, emotional support, and collaborative decision-making create work environments where teachers and staff feel valued and secure (Leithwood et al., 2020). During the COVID-19 pandemic, schools with leaders who actively listened to staff concerns and provided clear guidance reported lower levels of burnout and higher job satisfaction among educators (Harris & Jones, 2020). This relationship between leadership and well-being is particularly critical in crisis situations, where uncertainty and increased workloads can exacerbate stress and anxiety (Brackett et al., 2019).

Effective leaders also implement well-being initiatives such as flexible work arrangements, mental health resources, and peer support networks, which help mitigate the negative impacts of crises on staff (Khalifa et al., 2022). A study of schools navigating natural disasters found that principals who demonstrated empathy and provided practical support such as adjusted deadlines and professional counseling helped staff maintain emotional stability and professional efficacy (Smith & Riley, 2018). Furthermore, inclusive leadership that involves teachers in crisis response planning enhances their sense of agency and reduces feelings of helplessness (Trujillo & Hernández, 2022). When leaders model self-care and work-life balance, they reinforce a culture where well-being is prioritized, leading to sustained employee engagement even in challenging circumstances (Berkovich & Eyal, 2020). Effective educational leadership during crises not only ensures operational continuity but also safeguards the mental and emotional health of employees, fostering a more resilient and motivated workforce.

### **Increased Trust**

Effective educational leadership during crises cultivates increased trust among stakeholders, serving as a stabilizing force in uncertain times. When school leaders demonstrate transparency, consistency, and empathy during challenging periods, they establish stronger relational trust with faculty, students, and families (Bryk & Schneider, 2019). The COVID-19 pandemic revealed that

principals who communicated openly about challenges while demonstrating competence in crisis management fostered significantly higher levels of institutional trust compared to those who avoided difficult conversations (Harris & Jones, 2022). This trust-building proves particularly crucial when rapid decisions must be made, as stakeholders are more likely to support changes when they believe in their leaders' intentions and capabilities (Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

Effective crisis leadership behaviors that enhance trust include active listening to community concerns, admitting knowledge gaps when they exist, and following through on commitments (Daly et al., 2023). A longitudinal study of schools recovering from natural disasters found that institutions with high trust levels prior to crisis were able to implement recovery plans 40% faster than those with low trust (Forsyth et al., 2018). Leaders who distribute leadership responsibilities during crises rather than centralizing control further strengthen trust by demonstrating confidence in their professional community (Leithwood et al., 2020). Importantly, trust built during difficult periods often persists beyond the immediate crisis, creating lasting social capital that benefits future school improvement efforts (Kochanek, 2021). When educational leaders prioritize relationship-building alongside operational decision-making during crises, they transform challenging circumstances into opportunities to deepen the trust essential for long-term organizational health and effectiveness.

## **Enhanced Resilience**

Effective educational leadership plays a critical role in fostering enhanced resilience during times of crisis. Resilience, in this context, refers to the ability of educational institutions, staff, and students to adapt, recover, and continue functioning amid disruptions such as pandemics, conflicts, or natural disasters. Leaders who are visionary, empathetic, and strategic can create environments that buffer the negative impacts of crises and strengthen the adaptive capacities of stakeholders (Boin et al., 2013). During the COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, schools with proactive and communicative leadership reported stronger institutional resilience, evident in their ability to transition swiftly to remote learning and maintain stakeholder engagement (Harris & Jones, 2020).

Effective leaders in education cultivate resilience by promoting collaborative cultures, ensuring psychological safety, and empowering staff through inclusive decision-making (Leithwood et al., 2020). They also demonstrate flexibility, allowing institutions to recalibrate plans and practices in response to changing conditions. This leadership fosters trust and encourages innovation, both of which are crucial for resilience during crises (Day & Sammons, 2016). Moreover, leaders who prioritize well-being and continuous professional development equip their teams with the tools necessary to navigate uncertainties and maintain educational quality (O'Leary & Wood, 2019).

Resilience is not merely a personal trait but a systemic attribute that can be strengthened through strategic leadership practices (Mutch, 2015). Thus, in times of disruption, effective leadership does not only ensure survival but also enables growth, adaptation, and the restoration of normalcy. Educational leaders who respond with clarity, compassion, and strategic foresight serve as anchors of stability, making enhanced resilience a tangible outcome of their leadership efforts.

## **Improved Decision-making**

Improved decision-making is a critical outcome of effective educational leadership in times of crisis. Crises such as pandemics, social unrest, and natural disasters demand swift yet thoughtful decisions that ensure continuity, safety, and equity within educational institutions. Effective leaders rise to these challenges by applying strategic thinking, gathering reliable data, consulting stakeholders, and balancing short-term needs with long-term goals (Leithwood et al., 2020). Their ability to synthesize complex information under pressure and communicate decisions clearly is central to maintaining institutional stability and morale. These leaders increased the legitimacy and effectiveness of their actions, leading to greater stakeholder support and smoother implementation of crisis responses by involving teachers, parents, and health professionals in key decisions. This participatory approach not only fosters inclusivity but also enhances the quality and timeliness of decisions (Gross & Shapiro, 2021).

Furthermore, effective leaders rely on data-informed practices to guide decisions during crises. They monitor attendance, engagement, health data, and academic performance to adapt instructional strategies and allocate resources where they are most needed (Fullan, 2022). This evidence-based leadership reduces uncertainty and facilitates targeted interventions. Leaders who reflect on past decisions and learn from both successes and failures also build institutional memory, which strengthens future crisis responses.

In essence, the heightened demands of crisis situations reveal the strength of educational leadership through the quality of decisions made. Effective leaders do not merely react—they lead with foresight, agility, and inclusivity, resulting in improved decision-making that benefits the entire school community.

## **Increased Safety and Security**

Increased safety and security are key outcomes of effective educational leadership, especially in times of crisis. Crises such as pandemics, armed conflicts, or natural disasters often expose vulnerabilities within educational systems. It is the responsibility of school leaders to mitigate these risks by implementing policies and practices that prioritize the physical, emotional, and psychological well-being of all stakeholders (Cowan et al., 2013). Effective educational leaders act swiftly to assess threats, communicate transparently, and mobilize resources to create a safe learning environment. During the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, educational leaders who demonstrated strong crisis management skills were instrumental in developing and enforcing safety protocols, such as physical distancing, hygiene measures, and virtual learning platforms (Harris & Jones, 2020). These measures not only protected students and staff but also reassured families and communities, thereby maintaining trust and continuity in education. Leaders who fostered collaborative planning with teachers, health experts, and local authorities enhanced institutional preparedness and response mechanisms (Leithwood et al., 2020).

Moreover, security extends beyond physical safety to include emotional and psychological security. Leaders who promote inclusivity, emotional support systems, and open lines of communication help reduce fear and anxiety among staff and students during uncertain times (Day & Gu, 2014). Such leaders establish clear roles and protocols, ensuring that every member of the school community knows how to act in emergencies. This proactive approach builds confidence and a collective sense of security. In sum, effective educational leadership is vital for safeguarding learning environments during crises. By prioritizing both physical safety

and emotional well-being, leaders not only manage risks but also create resilient and secure school communities.

## **CONCLUSION**

Leading schools during times of crisis is an immense responsibility that demands resilience, adaptability, and unwavering commitment. As this critical analysis has revealed, school leaders are not just administrators but lifelines for students, teachers, and communities facing unprecedented challenges. Whether navigating a pandemic, economic instability, or social upheaval, they must balance academic continuity with emotional support, often with limited resources. The burden is not merely logistical but deeply ethical - how to make equitable decisions that prioritize well-being without compromising educational quality.

Effective crisis leadership requires visionary thinking, empathy, and the ability to foster collaboration among stakeholders. However, systemic issues such as underfunding, policy gaps, and societal pressures exacerbate these challenges, leaving many leaders overwhelmed. Despite this, stories of innovation - from hybrid learning models to mental health initiatives, demonstrate that crisis can also be a catalyst for transformative change.

Moving forward, policymakers must invest in robust support systems for school leaders, including professional development and mental health resources. Communities, too, must recognize and share the weight of this responsibility. The lessons learned from leading in crisis should reshape education into a more resilient, inclusive, and compassionate system—one that not only survives turmoil but emerges stronger. The burden is heavy, but the impact of courageous leadership is immeasurable.

## **Suggestions**

These crucial suggestions are put forward to help educational leaders manage the burden of leading schools during times of crisis:

- Educational leaders need specialized training in crisis management, trauma-informed leadership, and adaptive decision-making. Workshops, simulations, and mentorship programs should be implemented to equip them with skills to handle emergencies effectively while maintaining staff and student well-being.
- Leading during a crisis takes a heavy psychological toll. Therefore, schools should offer counseling services for leaders, peer support networks, stress management programs, and reduced administrative burdens to prevent burnout.
- Rather than leaving leaders to improvise during emergencies, education systems should develop pre-approved crisis protocols (e.g., for pandemics, natural disasters, violence), rapid-response teams at district or regional levels, and streamlined communication channels for real-time updates and decision-making.

## **REFERENCES**

Anderson, G. L., & Donchik, L. M. (2016). Privatizing schooling and policy making: The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) and new political and discursive strategies of education governance. *Educational Policy*, 30(2), 322-364.

- Azorín, C., Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2023). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Educational Change*, 24(1), 1-24.
- Azorín, C., Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2023). Leading from the eye of the storm: School networks as crisis response infrastructure. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(2), 234-251.
- Baker, B. D., & Di Carlo, M. (2023). *The pandemic's impact on school finances: How COVID-19 affected district budgets and equity*. Albert Shanker Institute.
- Bath, H. (2015). The three pillars of trauma-informed care. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 23(4), 5-11.
- Berkovich, I., & Eyal, O. (2020). Ethics in crisis management. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(3), 357-372.
- Boin, A., Kuipers, S., & Overdijk, W. (2013). Leadership in times of crisis: A framework for assessment. *International Review of Public Administration*, 18(1), 79-91.
- Boin, A., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2021). *The politics of crisis management: Public leadership under pressure* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Bolden, R. (2016). Distributed leadership in higher education: What does it accomplish? *Leadership*, 12(3), 299-316.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Rochford, K., & Jack, A. I. (2015). Antagonistic neural networks underlying leadership. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1359(1), 1-15.
- Brackett, M. A., & Caruso, D. R. (2020). *The emotionally intelligent leader*. Yale University Press.
- Brackett, M. A., Bailey, C. S., Hoffmann, J. D., & Simmons, D. N. (2019). RULER: A theory-driven approach to social and emotional learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 54(3), 144-161.
- Brunzell, T., & Norrish, J. (2021). *Creating trauma-informed, strengths-based classrooms*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Brunzell, T., Stokes, H., & Waters, L. (2019). Shifting teacher practice in trauma-affected classrooms: Practice pedagogy strategies within a trauma-informed positive education model. *School Mental Health*, 11(3), 600-614. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-018-09308-8>
- Brunzell, T., Stokes, H., & Waters, L. (2023). Trauma-informed leadership in education: From theory to praxis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 61(1), 78-95.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2019). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2017). Crises and crisis management: Integration, interpretation, and research development. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1661-1692.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553-571.
- Comfort, L. K., Boin, A., & Demchak, C. C. (2020). *Designing resilience for extreme events: Sociotechnical approaches*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Cowan, K. C., Vaillancourt, K., Rossen, E., & Pollitt, K. (2013). *A framework for safe and successful schools*. National Association of School Psychologists.
- Daly, A. J., Liou, Y.-H., & Del Fresno, M. (2023). The power of trust: Leadership during crisis in high-poverty schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 59(1), 3-34.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2021). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Hyler, M. E. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and educational equity. *Educational Researcher*, 49(5), 326-328. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X209>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A. L., Hammerness, K., Low, E. L., ... & Zeichner, K. (2022). *Empowering educators: How systems can support teachers and school leaders in crisis response*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2014). *Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times*. Routledge.
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust.
- DeMatthews, D. E., Kotok, S., & Serafini, A. (2023). Leading in the aftermath of school shootings: Principals' experiences and mental health needs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 59(1), 3-36.
- DeMatthews, D. E. (2018). Social justice dilemmas: Evidence on the successes and shortcomings of three principals trying to make a difference. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 21(5), 545-559.
- Dorado, J. S., Martinez, M., McArthur, L. E., & Leibovitz, T. (2016). Healthy Environments and Response to Trauma in Schools (HEARTS): A whole-school, multi-level, prevention and intervention program for creating trauma-informed, safe and supportive schools. *School Mental Health*, 8(1), 163-176.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2023). *Right kind of wrong: The science of failing well*. Atria Books.
- Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2023). Removing obstacles to the pedagogical changes required by Jonassen's vision of authentic technology-enabled learning. *Computers & Education*, 64, 175-182.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (2019). REPRINT OF: Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 56(6), 774-786.
- Forsyth, P. B., Adams, C. M., & Hoy, W. K. (2018). *Collective trust: Why schools can't improve without it*. Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2022). *The principal 2.0: Three keys to maximizing impact*. Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2022). *The right drivers for whole system success*, Corwin Press.
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2022). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2013). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Gooden, M. A., & Dantley, M. (2023). Crisis leadership in the Black radical tradition. *Urban Education*, 58(3), 412-435.
- Gronn, P. (2015). The view from inside leadership configurations. *Human Relations*, 68(4), 545-560.
- Gross, J. M. S., & Shapiro, J. P. (2021). Leadership for educational equity in pandemic times. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(5), 671-680.
- Gurr, D., & Drysdale, L. (2022). Leadership for challenging times. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(1), 1-4.

- Hairon, S., & Goh, J. W. (2015). Pursuing the elusive construct of distributed leadership: Is the search over? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(5), 693-718.
- Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5-24.
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2023). Leadership for learning in the post-pandemic era. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(1), 3-8.
- Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2021). Well-being and sustainability: A new future for schools? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 96(2), 116-122.
- Harris, A. (2013). Distributed leadership: Friend or foe? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(5), 545-554.
- Harris, A. (2021). Distributed leadership and pandemic: Examining the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 53(1), 58-72.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2018). The dark side of leadership: Teacher perspectives of principal mistreatment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(5), 670-707.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID-19 and school leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243-247.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2022). Leading during crisis: The importance of trust. *School Leadership & Management*, 42(3), 209-223.
- Hattie, J. (2017). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the longitudinal effects of school leadership on teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(5), 653-681.
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2022). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics*. Harvard Business Press.
- Ishimaru, A. M. (2020). *Just schools: Building equitable collaborations with families and communities*. Teachers College Press.
- Kahn, W. A., Barton, M. A., & Fellows, S. (2023). Organizational crises and the disturbance of relational systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 48(2), 203-225.
- Khalifa, M., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2022). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1272-1311.
- Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2022). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(1), 127-164.
- Kim, L. E., & Asbury, K. (2020). 'Like a rug had been pulled from under you': The impact of COVID-19 on teachers in England during the first six weeks of the UK lockdown. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(4), 1062-1083.
- Kochanek, J. R. (2021). Building trust in schools: A review of the empirical evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 91(4), 518-556.
- Kraft, M. A., Simon, N. S., & Lyon, M. A. (2021). Sustaining a sense of success: The protective role of teacher working conditions during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 14(4), 727-769.
- Leithwood, K. (2021). A review of evidence about equitable school leadership. *Education Sciences*, 11(8), 377.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5-22.
- Levin, H. M., & Schueler, B. (2023). *Educational responses to the COVID-19 crisis: Evidence from around the world*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2022). The effect of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Mediating roles of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(1), 97-122.
- Lowe, J., & Gale, K. (2022). School leadership in the aftermath of a crisis: Leading with and through grief. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(4), 567-583.
- Mahfouz, J., Barkauskas, N. J., & Sausner, E. B. (2021). The impacts of COVID-19 on school leaders' well-being in the United States. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(3), 375-408.
- Marshall, D. T., Shannon, D. M., & Love, S. M. (2021). How teachers experienced the COVID-19 transition to remote instruction. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 102(3), 46-50.
- Moynihan, D. P. (2018). A great schism approaching? Toward a micro and macro public administration. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 1(1), 49-59.
- Mutch, C. (2015). Leadership in times of crisis: Dispositional, relational and contextual factors influencing school principals' actions. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 14(2), 186-194.
- Mutch, C. (2020). The impact of the Canterbury earthquakes on schools and school leaders: Educational leaders become crisis managers. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 35(1), 14-26.
- Netolicky, D. M. (2020). School leadership during a pandemic: Navigating tensions. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3/4), 391-395.
- Nguyen, D., Harris, A., & Ng, D. (2020). A review of the empirical research on teacher leadership (2015–2021). *Journal of Educational Administration*, 59(1), 60-80.
- O'Leary, M., & Wood, P. (2019). Reimagining teaching: Delivering high quality teaching in challenging times. *Oxford Review of Education*, 45(4), 457-473.
- Overstreet, S., & Chafouleas, S. M. (2016). Trauma-informed schools: Introduction to the special issue. *School Mental Health*, 8(1), 1-6.
- Patti, J., Holzer, A. A., Stern, R., & Brackett, M. A. (2015). Preparing educational leaders to foster social-emotional school climate. *Journal of Research in Leadership Education*, 10(2), 92-114.
- Perry, B. D., & Szalavitz, M. (2017). *The boy who was raised as a dog: And other stories from a child psychiatrist's notebook*. Basic Books.
- Pollock, K. (2022). School leaders' work during the COVID-19 pandemic: A two-pronged approach. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 50(1), 38-44.
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2019). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
- Selwyn, N. (2022). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Smith, L., & Riley, D. (2012). School leadership in times of crisis. *School Leadership & Management*, 32(1), 57-71.
- Smiley, A. D., Anderson-Butcher, D., & Lawson, H. A. (2022). Exploring the role of schools in disaster response and recovery: A qualitative study. *Children & Schools*, 44(1), 17-26.
- Smith, L., & Riley, D. (2018). School leadership in times of crisis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(3), 401-417.
- Spillane, J. P. (2013). *Distributed leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Stewart, M., Makuwira, J., & Beaton, E. (2021). Crisis leadership and gendered ethics of care during COVID-19. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(S2), 249-263.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2014). *SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach*. HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14-4884.
- Sullivan, A. M., & Simonson, G. R. (2023). A systematic review of trauma-informed schools: Where we are and where we need to go. *School Mental Health*, 15(1), 1-16.
- Tian, M., Risku, M., & Collin, K. (2016). A meta-analysis of distributed leadership from 2002 to 2013: Theory development, empirical evidence and future research focus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 146-164.
- Trujillo, T. (2020). The re-segregation of public education now and after the coronavirus pandemic. *Educational Policy*, 34(5), 705-713.
- Trujillo, T., & Hernández, L. E. (2022). The politics of pandemic schooling in diverse communities. *Educational Policy*, 36(2), 369-394.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Walkley, M., & Cox, T. L. (2013). Building trauma-informed schools and communities. *Children & Schools*, 35(2), 123-126.
- Wang, Y., & Hofkens, T. L. (2024). Beyond burnout: Examining the coping strategies of school leaders during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 60(1), 3-42.
- Wang, Y., Rodgers, R. A., & Wang, Z. (2023). Crisis leadership in education: A systematic review of the literature. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(1), 9-31.
- Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134-171.