iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN THE ERA OF COVID-19

Mohamed KARIM [1]
Professor, Faculté des sciences Juridiques, Economiques et Sociales, Ain Sebaa, Université HASSAN II
Fatima-Ezzahra ELHASSADE[2]
Phd Student, Faculté des sciences Juridiques, Economiques et Sociales, Ain Sebaa Université HASSAN II

ABSTRACT :
Our study delved into the conceptual literature, guided by the fundamental objective of deeply exploring how businesses navigated their performance during the health crisis triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic. Our analysis focused on the responses and measures adopted by companies to maintain their level of performance in these exceptional circumstances. The findings of this comprehensive investigation strikingly underscore the vital importance of proactive and informed management during periods of major disruption.
We particularly examined the specific challenges induced by the COVID-19 crisis. By closely scrutinizing the management practices implemented, we identified recurring trends and relevant strategies that enabled companies to effectively address this unprecedented situation. We closely examined the relationship between crisis management and performance management. Despite multiple uncertainties and challenges encountered, maintaining continuous performance evaluation has become imperative for making informed decisions and bringing about prudent adjustments.
In this perspective, we also explored the various performance measurement tools used by companies and their essential role in their adaptability to a constantly changing environment, thus ensuring their viability.

Keywords :
Crisis, crisis management, individual performance, organizational performance, Covid 19

1- Introduction

Towards the end of 2019, the world was struck by the rapid emergence of COVID-19, initially reported in China and swiftly spreading across global borders. On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization officially classified this illness as a pandemic, marking the onset of an unprecedented period of turbulence. As of August 25, 2020, alarming statistics reported over 23.3 million confirmed cases and over 800,000 deaths worldwide. This situation prompted urgent collaboration between the World Health Organization and the International Chamber of Commerce, underscoring the need for governments to act swiftly and effectively to contain the disease's spread, with short-term benefits for employee health and long-term benefits for the global economy.
The challenge posed by COVID-19 extends far beyond the realm of public health, encompassing significant economic, social, and organizational consequences. Businesses are grappling with a complex dynamic characterized by heightened volatility, widespread uncertainty, increasing complexity, and persistent ambiguity. In this context, maintaining business continuity, motivating employees, managing the transition to remote work, and coping with rising unemployment pose major challenges to overcome.
Personnel remains a crucial pillar of any organization, playing a central role in implementing operations and maintaining performance. By ensuring effective interaction and optimal performance, employees directly contribute to organizational efficiency, boosting productivity, sales, and profitability while reducing staff turnover rates. In this crisis context, the safety, health, and well-being of employees become crucial priorities for businesses.
Human resources professionals, responsible for managing recruitment, performance, compensation, and benefits, are faced with the need to develop innovative strategies to support employees, preserve their health, and maintain optimal performance. Faced with the historic uncertainty generated by COVID-19, businesses must adopt a thoughtful and flexible approach to human resource management, focusing on addressing current challenges and anticipating future ones.
The COVID-19 pandemic has also provided an opportunity for businesses to reassess their organizational culture and management strategies. While transitioning to remote work has been an immediate priority, it is essential not

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

to overlook the importance of performance evaluations. On the contrary, in times of crisis, it is crucial to recognize and celebrate successes, refocus organizational goals, and set new objectives for employees to foster rapid and effective economic recovery.

This research aims to explore the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on organizational performance management, specifically focusing on the challenges and opportunities encountered during this unprecedented period. To achieve this, we will address several key research questions, including types and models of crisis management, performance measurement tools, dimensions of organizational performance, as well as constraints and challenges related to employee performance evaluation. By delving into these concepts, we seek to clarify the complex link between crisis and organizational performance, thereby offering valuable insights for strategic management practices in a crisis context.

2- Exploration of Concepts : Crisis Management in a Managerial Context

This section aims to highlight, firstly, the various theoretical approaches previously taken by previous studies regarding a crisis situation, its dynamic management at the managerial level, as well as the general framework within which it operates, and secondly, the types and models of crisis management.

To ensure a rigorous use of the term "crisis," we will examine the crisis situation, the dynamics of its surrounding context, and the strategies deployed to manage it. Subsequently, we will address the different types of crises in general and the models or stages for crisis management according to several researchers.

2.1. Understanding the Crisis : Framework and Strategies

This section is dedicated to the study of the crisis[1] situation, with a literature review organized according to the research perspectives adopted to frame the crisis in a way that maintains coherence with the study's objectives. The following section discusses management during periods of crisis and leads us further towards a management approach.

2.1.1. Assessment of the Crisis

In general, a crisis is an unexpected and negative event that can have significant consequences (Shrivastava, 1993; Pearson and Clair, 1998). In the context of organizations, a crisis is an unlikely event with significant repercussions that jeopardize the viability of an organization and is characterized by causes, effects, and means of immediate resolution (Lemonakis and Zairis, 2020). It is an incident that risks compromising the safety of individuals, the environment, the reputation of an organization, and its stakeholders.

It is therefore an unforeseen event that is likely to have undesirable effects and consists of four distinct stages, namely: a pre-crisis phase, an acute phase, a course, and a resolution phase (Lemonakis and Zairis, 2020).

We can define crisis management as the careful study and anticipation of risks that an organization or company can implement to reduce uncertainty and take all necessary measures to protect people, the environment, employees, and the financial position of the company (Lemonakis and Zairis, 2019). It is a systematic process, supported by internal and external stakeholders, and can be relied upon to detect the crisis, prevent and prepare for potential damage, as well as to recover from and learn from the negative and positive impacts (Shrivastava, 1993 ; Pearson and Clair, 1998 ; Hong, Huang, and Li, 2012).

Crisis management within a company is therefore a "proactive" behavior that involves a systematic approach allowing organizations to deal with real crisis situations in a way that enables the company to continue its activities as normally as possible (Zamoum and Gorpe, 2018 ; Mikušová and Horváthová, 2019). It is a system of early warning or detection of potential problematic situations that involves forecasting, identification, analysis, and action, with appropriate procedures for both preventing and coping with a crisis.

The term "crisis" can be defined as a serious emergency situation where the operation of the business will be disrupted, and normal management and control processes will no longer be effective. The disruption of normal operational processes and fundamental structures of an organization can become so great that business continuity is threatened.

A crisis is "a series of conditions that requires an organization to perform tasks that exceed or are close to exceeding its capacity to cope without recourse to significant (often external) resources" (Adapted from Smith (2005), p. 318).

"A crisis is a situation that threatens the essential goals of decision-making units, reduces the time available for decision-making, and whose occurrence surprises decision-makers" (Hermann, 1972, p. 13). Risk and crisis management involve not only relational dimensions but also strategic and proactive management, a culture of prevention, preparedness, and proven mechanisms to monitor and instantly detect weak signals.

[1] The terms "crisis situation," "crisis environment," "crisis period," and "crisis context" have the same meaning, are interchangeable, and are used in the same way throughout this article.

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

Therefore, it is recommended to adopt this definition: A crisis physically disrupts the entirety of a system and challenges the fundamental principles of the organization members. It can threaten the legitimacy of an entire industry, cause a radical shift in the strategic mission of the company, or disrupt individuals' subjective world, altering their perception of reality and life, as well as their deep sense of identity and internal cohesion (Pauchant and Mitroff, 1988).

The term "crisis" originates from the Greek "krisis," meaning "to separate, choose, judge, decide." From the 18th century, this notion, originally with a medical connotation specifically to denote the worsening of symptoms heralding an outcome (Bolzinger, 1982, p. 475-480), was extended to societal analyses (Béjin and Morin, 1976, p. 1-2). In the 19th century, various theoretical perspectives (legal, sociological, economic) began to use this term, shaping the concept of crisis as it is used today (Béjin and Morin, 1976, p. 1-2).

Crisis management is much broader, a continuous flow, inherently integrated into an organization's management and culture. Multiple managerial and organizational skills are required to address crises. Among these skills, the ability to think beyond usual thinking patterns, which are limited to what is imaginable, and the ability to gain the buy-in of all parts of the organization, are of paramount importance (Mitroff, 2001, p. 121 and 151).

The crisis situation triggers a phase of instability in all or part of the components of the affected system, generating many unknowns for the actors involved, whether it is the nature or extent of the damage, the course of events, the succession of disruptions, or the reaction of stakeholders.

To organize the concept of crisis situations and better understand them, we describe below different models developed by researchers regarding the nature and type of situations that lead to crises.

Gundel (2005), aligned with Mitroff's opinion (2004), argues that to analyze and manage crisis situations scientifically and practically, it is essential, in a first phase, to distinguish them.

Mitroff, Pauchant, and Shrivastava (1988) analyzed various crisis situations and classified them into four distinct domains: an economic dimension covering crises affecting industrial, structural, financial, and social sectors; a technical dimension related to crises internal to the company as well as crises related to products; a political dimension encompassing regulatory and legal crises; finally, a "corporate" dimension directly related to the company's image and reputation. Similarly, Denervaud, Johnson, Soumoy, and Tcheng (2009) identified the crisis situation.

Denervaud, Johnson, Soumoy, and Tcheng (2009) identified the crisis situation as a geological part consisting of a stack of different layers driven by various flows: monetary, human, product, and ideas. According to these two authors, the crisis situation can be subdivided into several levels, with the financial aspect often seen as the first symptom of a crisis. This is followed by the economic aspect, which contributes to exacerbating the crisis. The third distinctive sign lies at the societal level, impacting the company's values. Finally, the environmental dimension emerges, corresponding to resource depletion.

The crisis situation can be compared to a state of persistent environmental turbulence, creating continuous challenges, and whose consequences impact the company's performance, even jeopardizing its survival.

Therefore, the organizational environmental context, as defined by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), is a concept that evolves through perceptions constructed by organization members. Thus, what prevails in strategic action is the environment as perceived and shaped by the organization's actors.

2.1.2. Managerial Management in a Specific Framework

According to Lagadec (1991), the effectiveness of crisis management within organizations could be enhanced by focusing more on the complexity of the dynamic interaction of the crisis, rather than confining it to its static aspect. Muller (1985) also emphasizes that crisis management highlights underlying conflicts that should not be addressed solely from a technical standpoint. Indeed, during a crisis, production turnover and the rate of employee layoffs due to low productivity tend to decrease (Murray et al., 1992; Nakamura, 2008). In such a conjuncture, management methods should evolve to address these new challenges. During a crisis, management primarily involves giving meaning, establishing values and references, and formulating standards and evaluation frameworks (Lagadec, 1991).

The ability to manage a crisis situation largely depends on what has been prepared upstream of the ordeal. The lack of preparation and the absence of prior reflection amplify the impact of the crisis. As Volpi (2003) points out, preparation aims to equip managers with a response that allows them to steer without being overwhelmed by problems. Therefore, to effectively manage and overcome a crisis, a manager must first remain resolute and spot the early signs of the crisis to address it. This concerns what Dugré (2011) calls the "informed" manager, capable of anticipating crisis scenarios and intervening with effective strategies.

A company that does not master the changes in its environment will experience accelerated deterioration in the event of a downturn (Daigne, 1991). For this reason, companies must develop new management strategies to

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

maintain their stability in an ever-changing world. It is essential to note that the management process during a crisis can only be implemented in a company that accepts the idea that a crisis can occur at any time, as it may be inevitable (Brouard and Larivet, 2008). It is in this context that Francart and Dufour (2002) proposed a strategic approach to guide thinking during a crisis. On the one hand, not forgetting the important elements that must be taken into account, namely technical, organizational, and cultural competencies, and on the other hand, developing a reactive strategy that will address all aspects of the crisis. However, the slow and delayed responsiveness of companies to such situations often elicits a slow and delayed response. The cause of this specific reaction in humans remains complex for many of them. Similarly, Liabert (2005) argues that many organizations strive to better prepare for crisis eventualities by seeking to identify risks and develop scenarios and anticipatory strategies to deal with them. In this perspective, Crémadez (2004) explored the idea of risk sharing among various sectors of activity. This approach, influenced by an uncertain external environment, aims to increase the likelihood of the company's sustainability. Additionally, Lagadec (1991) emphasized that managing systems in an inherently unstable environment must be geared towards adaptation consistent with the specific context in which they operate. It requires:

• Determining a vision and strategic directions instead of setting specific objectives;
• Creating several variants rather than defining tactics;
• Considering new issues rather than applying formal regulations previously introduced in a different context.

This author, advocating for a more proactive approach, urges us not to minimize leadership and accountability issues during a crisis but rather to prioritize consultation, exchanges, and negotiation in the decision-making process. Moreover, according to this author, how the crisis will be addressed and felt internally will largely depend on the quality of the social relationships prior to the event. Furthermore, Lagadec (1995) and Forgues (1996) categorize companies into three groups based on their level of preparedness: those unprepared, those poorly prepared, and those well advanced in their preparations. This assessment allows for an awareness of the threats facing the company, identification of the most critical crises it must face, and definition of measures to be implemented to control and even avoid potential crises. In the same vein, Lagadec (2001) emphasizes the importance of promoting constant anticipation. While most actors tend to focus on the most recent problems, it is crucial to constantly broaden the field of reflection and consider, through scenarios, the possible evolution of the system over time. In this perspective, Bryan and Farrel (2009) argue that companies must develop strategic action plans tailored to all situations. According to them, in times of crisis, it is the agile planning approach that prevails.

2.2. Typology and Approaches in Crisis Management

In this section, we will focus on the types of crises, including pandemics and their history, as well as crisis management models.

2.2.1. Categories and Evolution of Crisis Situations

Crises are sudden and unforeseen events that can severely disrupt the stability or normal functioning of a system. There are several types of crises, namely:

Economic Crisis: This is a period of declining economic activity and employment, characterized by a decrease in production, consumption, and investment. Economic crises can have various causes, such as recession, financial crisis, debt crisis. It occurs when a country's economy experiences a significant decline in economic growth and can lead to massive job losses, defaults, and bankruptcies, for example, the 2008 financial crisis.

Political Crisis: A political crisis occurs when the normal functioning of a country's government is severely disrupted. It can be caused by political conflicts, social movements, protests, contested elections, strikes, civil unrest, or armed conflicts. These crises can destabilize the government in place and have consequences on security and human rights. A recent example of a political crisis is the crisis between Russia and Ukraine, marked by political tensions and recurring crises.

Environmental Crisis: This involves crises related to the environment, which can take various forms, including air, water, or soil pollution, natural disasters (hurricanes, floods, droughts, etc.), industrial accidents, or pollution. These crises can have devastating effects on populations, the economy, and the environment.

Social Crisis: Social crises can be caused by issues such as social injustice, inequality, poverty, discrimination, etc. These crises can lead to social and political tensions and have repercussions on the mental and physical health of affected individuals.

Humanitarian Crisis: A humanitarian crisis occurs when a large number of people face a dangerous situation, such as war, famine, natural disasters, or forced displacement. An example is the crisis related to the conflict between Russia and Ukraine, particularly in the Donetsk region, especially in the city of Donetsk itself. This has

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

led to massive population displacements, with hundreds of thousands of people forced to flee their homes due to fighting and bombings.

Health Crisis: This crisis occurs when a contagious disease spreads rapidly and threatens public health and safety. These crises can severely affect population health, the ability of health systems to respond to demand, and the economy. A recent example of a health crisis is the COVID-19 pandemic, which began in 2019 and has affected millions of people worldwide.

Here, we can talk about the notion of a pandemic as the spread of a new disease affecting a significant portion of the world population. According to the World Health Organization, "pandemics are rare but iterative events, invariably associated with high morbidity, significant mortality, and considerable disruption of social and economic life.

Most pandemics are flu-like. History reminds us that the frequency of a flu pandemic is about once every 30 years, or about 3.33%[2].

The greatest influenza pandemics in history:

There have been different types of influenza pandemics, bacterial and viral. Some have been endowed with significant severity leading mainly to the loss of several human lives. However, due to the difficulty of collecting data for certain periods, directories containing pandemics vary from one organization to another and are not exhaustive. Below, we will mention the most frequently mentioned pandemics:

- The Plague of Athens (-430 to -426 BC): It is the first pandemic in history. Wrongly considered as a plague disease, the Plague of Athens is however caused by typhoid fever. Its geographical origin is, according to history, Ethiopia before striking Athens via Libya and Egypt. Historically, the decline of Athens began with the arrival of typhoid fever on-site causing the death of more than 1/3 of the inhabitants of the current Greek capital.
- The Black Death (1346-1353): Like COVID-19, the Black Death first raged in China and then reached Central Asia around the year 1346. It was brought by the Mongols who besieged the port of Caffa, passing through the Black Sea. The disease then spread to Africa and reached Europe via the ships of Genoese merchants. The bacteria of the Black Death thus reached different countries with a port in the Mediterranean. It then spread to almost all European countries, causing a lot of human damage.
- The Spanish flu H1N1 (1918-1919): Its origin is not very clear. While some scientists lean towards an Asian origin, it was approved in 2019 that the disease would actually have appeared in the United States, in the city of Kansas. Due to a particularly virulent and dangerous variety, it would have been observed for the first time in the United States. Its name, carrying the Spanish mention, refers to the Spanish freedom of expression during the First World War. Indeed, not having participated in this war, Spain was the only country to have relayed information regarding the evolution of the flu. The Spanish flu experienced three successive waves between 1918 and 1919 in several major cities.
- The Asian flu H2N2 (1956-1958): After the pandemic of 1918, the Asian flu of 1957 was the second deadliest influenza pandemic. However, not reaching a record number of deaths, the Asian flu caused heavy human losses, with approximately 3 million victims worldwide. Its geographical origin is Chinese. It then reached countries neighboring China, passing through Hong Kong, Singapore, and the island of Borneo before spreading outside the Asian continent by reaching North America and then striking Europe and Africa.
- The Hong Kong flu H3N2 (1968-1969): A new influenza pandemic called the Hong Kong flu developed in the late 1960s. According to scientific research, the Hong Kong flu originated from a mutation of the Asian flu of 1957. Initially having the H2N2 strain, it mutated into H3N2. This period also marks the beginning of effective vaccines against influenza.
- The H1N1 flu (2009-2010): Present worldwide, the flu was initially called swine flu. Declared a pandemic by the World Health Organization on June 11, 2009, it is the first of the 20th century. However, the virulence is low, even lower than that of seasonal flu. The observed damage is therefore of lesser magnitude, and the mortality rate, although varying according to researchers, remains negligible at around 0.02%. The extinction of the pandemic was officially declared following the WHO declaration in August 2020.
- COVID-19 (2019-present): The 2020 coronavirus pandemic is a pandemic caused by an emerging infectious disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus. The underlying disease is called COVID-19. On

[2] Pandemic influenza: A 21st century model for mortality shocks

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

January 30, 2020[3], the World Health Organization declared a PHEIC state. It was identified on November 17, 2019, in the city of Wuhan in Hubei province, central China. Impacting, beginning July 2020 and according to the WHO[4], more than 95% of countries worldwide, including Morocco, the coronavirus pandemic has generated several types of crises ranging from a health crisis to an economic crisis to a financial crisis. These types of crises are not exhaustive, but they illustrate the different ways in which a crisis can manifest and its impact on individuals, communities, and societies.

2.2.2. Approaches and Crisis Management Frameworks

Crisis management models are valuable tools for understanding, analyzing, and resolving complex problems that arise during a crisis. These models provide structures and methodologies to guide decision-makers and crisis management professionals in their efforts to address emergency situations. Several models have been developed to determine the best strategy in response to a crisis. This strategy includes different stages, and for each stage, the implementation of a specific procedure or set of procedures, most often: crisis recognition, recovery, and reconstruction after the crisis (Peters and Pikkemaat, 2018; Laws and Prideaux, 2017).

According to Heath (1998), crisis management comprises three stages:

- Pre-crisis stage (planning/preparation),
- Crisis stage (reduction/mitigation of the crisis impact),
- Post-crisis stage (evaluation of the strategy's outcomes).

Given the complexity of crisis management in businesses, it requires a deeper examination of the theoretical mechanisms at work (Coombs, 2010; Bundy et al., 2017). Companies and organizations operate in increasingly complex and turbulent environments. This leads them to face more risks, often unprecedented and difficult to predict, which disrupt the continuity of their operations and test their strength, regardless of their size (Delbecque and Combalbert, 2018).

Faced with such a situation, the establishment of a comprehensive crisis management system has become essential. Several models have been developed to determine the best strategy in response to a crisis. This strategy includes different stages, and for each stage, the implementation of a specific procedure or set of procedures, most often: crisis recognition, recovery, and reconstruction after the crisis (Peters and Pikkemaat, 2018; Laws and Prideaux, 2017). According to Heath (1998), crisis management comprises three stages:

- Pre-crisis stage (planning/preparation),
- Crisis stage (reduction/mitigation of the crisis impact),
- Post-crisis stage (evaluation of the strategy's outcomes).

One widely studied and cited model in academic literature is the four-phase crisis management model proposed by Barton (1969):

Prevention and preparation: This phase aims to anticipate and mitigate potential crisis risks. Prevention strategies are implemented to reduce the probabilities of a crisis occurring, while preparation measures are taken to prepare for a potential crisis. This phase focuses on risk identification, emergency planning, personnel training, and awareness of emergency procedures.

Alert and assessment: When a crisis occurs, this phase focuses on early detection, situation assessment, and rapid decision-making. Alerting signals the emergence of a crisis, while assessment provides an in-depth analysis of the situation, including its causes, impact, and potential consequences. This phase requires effective monitoring systems, rapid communication, and critical analysis capability.

Response: The response phase involves implementing specific actions to address the crisis. It includes resource coordination, emergency management, stakeholder communication, and mitigation of negative effects. This phase requires effective coordination, pre-established action plans, and quick decision-making ability under conditions of uncertainty.

Recovery and learning: Once the crisis is under control, this phase focuses on restoring normal operations and learning lessons from the crisis. It involves repairing damage, managing long-term consequences, and improving systems and processes to avoid similar future crises. This phase emphasizes organizational learning, post-crisis evaluation, and adaptation of policies and procedures.

In addition to the four-phase crisis management model, several other models have been developed and studied in academic literature, providing complementary perspectives on crisis management. These include the linear model, the cyclical model, and the capabilities model.

---

[3] Public Health Emergency of International Concern

[4] World Health Organization

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

The linear crisis management model follows a sequential and chronological approach to management stages. It is based on a linear progression from prevention and preparation to intervention and recovery phases. This model is often used to plan and coordinate actions at each stage of the crisis (Barton, 1969). It emphasizes the importance of advance planning, risk assessment, effective coordination, and strategic communication throughout crisis management (Borodzicz, 2005).

The cyclical model acknowledges the iterative and adaptive nature of crisis management. It involves a cyclical process of evaluation, planning, action, and continuous revision (Borodzicz, 2005). Unlike the linear model, this model allows for adjustment and modification of strategies and actions based on new information and developments occurring during the crisis (Comfort et al., 2004). It highlights the importance of organizational learning, adaptation, and continuous improvement of crisis management practices (Weick and Sutcliffe, 2007).

The capabilities model emphasizes strengthening organizational skills and resources to deal with a crisis. It identifies key areas such as planning, coordination, communication, resource management, and decision-making as essential elements for effective crisis management (Hochrainer-Stigler et al., 2010). This model underscores the importance of developing and reinforcing individual and collective skills, as well as the material and financial resources necessary to respond to the challenges of a crisis (Alexander, 2014).

3. From Individual Performance to Company Performance

When discussing company performance, it is important to specify whether it refers to organizational performance or economic performance, as the indicators used are different. Organizational performance is measured by criteria such as productivity, quality, and innovation, considered as determining factors. On the other hand, to measure economic performance, Delaney and Huselid have identified criteria such as profitability, sales growth, market share, and customer loyalty.

As for Gibert, he defines HR[5] performance globally as the achievement of organizational objectives, regardless of their nature or variety. The work conducted aims to evaluate the impact of HR practices on company performance, measured using various approaches, ranging from its operational results to its stock value.

Performance can be defined as the results achieved by an individual, a group of individuals, or a product, and this notion can be evaluated using different criteria such as quality and price for a product.

But to respond to the influence of effective HR practices on company performance, it is necessary to define performance within two scopes, that of HR and that of the company.

The concept of overall performance aims to make the concept of performance multidimensional, in line with the increasing demand from populations to see organizations pursue not only economic objectives but also social and environmental motivations.

HR performance represents the achievement of HR objectives through effective and efficient HR practices. In other words, HR performance is measured against achievable and motivating objectives, established at a level higher than the average value; indeed, a worker who performs their job normally is not considered as performing.

Company performance results from a series of cascading performances: productive or organizational performances resulting from work and measured through productivity, quality, or innovation indicators; commercial performance resulting from sales and measured by turnover and gross margin; financial performance expressed in net margin, profitability, or financial autonomy, and finally stock market performance expressed by stock price and share value.

The term "performance" is so widely used that it seems to be a consensus, yet performance remains a complex concept due to its "ambiguity" (Bourguignon, 1997, p. 89-101). Drawing on previous work (Khenniche, Henriot, 2021), the following characteristics are identified in the literature that can help stabilize a definition of this concept. Therefore, Bessire (1999) emphasizes that the different meanings of performance have in common the problem of evaluating activities, which revolves around three elements:

The political project, i.e., the direction of activity; the strategic and operational execution of the political project, an evaluation aimed at accounting for activity by clarifying measurement indicators, both in terms of progress and effectiveness. When assessing the performance of an activity or a set of activities within a company, they must be considered as an inseparable whole.

Pesqueux (2004) proposes an approach that considers that there are two perspectives in performance evaluation in management: an objective perspective and a subjective perspective. According to this approach, it is possible to model "organizational performance" by taking into account three elements: "action" performance, which

[5] Human Resources

IJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

reflects a transformation of potential into achievements, including material and immaterial means; "result" performance, which corresponds to the consequences of achievements, whether positive or negative; and finally "success" performance, which represents judgments made by evaluators on actions taken, from their justification to their implementation and results.

Renaud and Berland (2007) are particularly interested in a measure of performance. To measure performance, three inseparable measures must be highlighted: economy, which aims to account for the means used; efficiency, which maximizes results obtained at minimal cost; and effectiveness, which achieves the objectives set in the enterprise activity.

Overall performance translates into corporate social responsibility, which is defined by the European Commission[6] as "the voluntary integration of social and environmental concerns into business activities and relationships with stakeholders." It implies that organizations adopt a synthetic approach that includes three types of performance : economic, social, and environmental. This approach also involves seeking coherence among these three dimensions, using models of causality that link different factors from these different dimensions. Overall performance is a desire of organization leaders to consider performance within an extended framework, which takes into account an extensive environment including internal and external stakeholders, a long-term temporality, and economic, social, and environmental dimensions. Models such as the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) enable steering overall performance by integrating economic, social, and environmental considerations of different stakeholders.

The definition of performance is complex as it encompasses several dimensions. Thus, the literature presents performance as a general notion. Etymologically, the term "performance" comes from combining the English "to perform," which translates to "accomplish, achieve," with the Old French "Performer," derived from "former" meaning "accomplishment, execution." According to Larousse dictionary, the term "performance" was initially used in the sports domain to describe a horse's performance during a race. Then, it was extended to include numerical data obtained by an athlete or sports team in terms of results. This expression was then extended to other contexts to describe outstanding achievement, notable success of an individual, team, or company. Thus, the notion of performance implies the competence to efficiently carry out a specific task.

According to Simons (2000), organizational performance management involves a delicate balance between internal and external efficiency. In other words, to measure and control an organization's performance, they must consider both improving internal processes (such as productivity, absenteeism, and staff turnover) and developing markets (such as market share and sales growth). However, prioritizing one or the other of these aspects can pose risks. On one hand, excessive pursuit of efficiency can lead to the production of products or services that do not meet customer needs. On the other hand, excessive focus on effectiveness can lead to a decrease in profitability, as production costs are not adequately considered when seeking market share.

In this section, our approach will be to elucidate the nature of performance based on various categories of performance and various intellectual perspectives. To begin, we will examine the concept of individual performance, then we will address that of organizational performance.

3.1. Conceptual Distinction between Individual Performance and Organizational Performance

Performance is a complex notion that can be manifested at different levels, notably at the individual and organizational levels. Individual performance is often assessed through criteria such as productivity, quality of work performed, or the skills and expertise of the individual. On the other hand, organizational performance is evaluated through criteria such as profitability, sales growth, market share, or customer satisfaction. These two levels of performance are closely linked and interact in a complex manner. Indeed, the individual performance of employees can have a significant impact on the overall performance of the organization, while the performance of the organization can influence the motivation and engagement of the individuals working within it.

3.1.1. The Concept of Individual Performance

Beyond its etymological origin, the notion of individual performance has been the subject of numerous definitions in the literature since the early 1990s. Several researchers have contributed to this field, notably Campbell (1990, 1999), who defined individual performance within the workplace as a series of behaviors or actions aligned with the organization's goals, measurable in terms of skills and contributions to objectives. This definition highlights the importance of relevance and measurement in evaluating individual performance, emphasizing that behaviors and actions must be aligned with the organization's goals to be considered as performing.

[6] https://commission.europa.eu/

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

There are eight behavioral facets of performance in the workplace, namely: (1) task-specific skills, (2) non-task-specific skills, (3) verbal and written communication, (4) effort investment, (5) maintaining personal discipline, (6) contribution to team and colleague performance, (7) supervision, and (8) management and administration. This model has been widely used to distinguish between two types of performance: task (or role) performance, which varies considerably from job to job and is often influenced by the diversity of employees' responsibilities, redefined according to the different tasks assigned to them. Contextual performance (or extra-role), on the other hand, encompasses behaviors that enhance organizational effectiveness by influencing the psychological, social, and organizational framework of work. In concrete terms, these behaviors translate into actions aimed at defusing internal conflicts, mitigating interpersonal tensions, and encouraging mutual trust, thereby fostering collaboration and interpersonal communication. In this line, Motowidlo and Borman (2000) present a three-dimensional model of contextual performance:
These include interpersonal citizenship performance, organizational citizenship performance, and conscientiousness toward tasks. Motowidlo (2003) defined job performance as "the overall value anticipated by the organization from episodes of distinct behaviors by an individual over a given period" (Motowidlo, 2003, p.39). Similarly, Pulakos et al. (2006) defined adaptive performance as individuals' ability to adjust their behavior to new work conditions and requirements, thus establishing a link between the notions of individual performance and competence.

3.1.2. The Concept of Organizational Performance

Our study on organizational performance aims to explore this concept within the entrepreneurial context. The notion of performance remains consistently at the heart of business strategy, eliciting continued interest both academically and managerially from executives. Performance "remains a central issue for management research" (Gauzente, 2000).

- **The Evolution of the Concept of Organizational Performance:**

The evaluation of organizational performance is an attempt to grasp the organization's ability to create value for stakeholders, such as investors, employees, consumers, society, etc. For investors, organizational performance must translate into an increase in stock value; otherwise, they will invest elsewhere. For employees, the quality of the work environment is an important aspect of organizational performance. For consumers, it will be the quality of the products and services offered, while for citizens, the contributions of the organization to community development and the social and physical environment will be taken into account. Performance deemed inadequate in any of the dimensions deemed important by a stakeholder carries risks in obtaining resources (e.g., material, human, or financial), possibly crucial for success and, in the long run, the organization's survival.
Different schools of organizational thought have shown interest in the concept of organizational performance:
Traditional management theories, developed by Fayol, Weber, and Taylor between 1900 and 1930, established that the organization was a "formal structure based on the central notion of goals to be achieved in economic and financial terms." Under this approach, value creation is based on business growth or a dividend policy based on investment.
The human relations school, represented by Mayo, Maslow, McGregor, and Likert between 1920 and 1970, developed a "humanized" conception of the organization, emphasizing the human factor and attempting to meet personnel needs while achieving set objectives. This approach considers that achieving social objectives also leads to achieving economic and financial objectives.

The systemic thinking school of organization, which emerged between 1930 and 1970, influenced by Von Bertalanffy's research, considers the organization as a system whose ultimate goal is sustainability. This approach highlights the organization's capacity and evaluates its performance based on the organizational process rather than the objectives to be achieved.
Recent authors have attempted to define business performance based on different dimensions. According to Uzan and Heraut-Zérigui (2016), the notion of performance is fundamental to management activity. Beaudin and Savoie (1994) identified four dimensions of performance: economic, social, systemic, and political approaches. Each is defined by criteria and measured using performance indicators such as organizational sustainability, economic efficiency, human resource value, and organizational legitimacy with external groups.
Lebas (1995) defines performance based on common characteristics in the management field: carrying out an action for a specific objective, achieving a result, comparing a result with an internal or external standard, the ability to achieve a result, and adopting concepts of continuous improvement for competitiveness. He emphasizes the importance of a multi-criteria approach to performance because it does not exist intrinsically and

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

includes a subjective dimension specific to each user of information based on the decision-making framework defined by a specific domain and a given time period. In summary, performance is a complex concept that requires a multidimensional and contextual approach to be accurately measured.

Bourguignon (2000) defined performance at three levels: Result performance is evaluated by comparing the achieved result to the previously established objective. Action performance, on the other hand, involves the means, processes, skills, and qualities used to achieve these results, and success performance depends on representations of success and varies depending on the perspectives of various stakeholders, as well as at the overall level of the company, where conceptions vary. Bouquin (2004) advocates for performance to be monitored through a measure that can be described as a "post hoc evaluation of results." According to him, performance within companies traditionally results from the interaction between resource economics, resulting in the search for resources at lower costs, process efficiency, corresponding to optimizing the means used to achieve objectives, and finally, result efficiency leading to the achievement of initial objectives. While business performance has "long been a one-dimensional concept, measured only by profit, notably due to the weight of owners in the decision-making process aimed at creating value for shareholders" (Saulquin and Schier, 2007), the concept has expanded to encompass new facets that go beyond its simple economic and financial dimension. Indeed, for some time, business performance has been associated with sustainable development and its ability to achieve its objectives (Calori et al., 1989). In this traditional perspective, performance is manifested by the implementation of measures and means aimed at ensuring profitability (Cohanier et al., 2010), and it is reflected by indicators that assess its level of profitability. The economic aspect of performance, often measured through a company's productivity (Ambec et al., 2009), reflects its ability to generate profits.

In this exclusively financial perspective, performance is expressed in various terms such as socioeconomic and financial performance, which stems from production, value added, gross operating surplus, gross operating profit, and net profit. Meanwhile, organizational performance encompasses "how the company is organized to achieve its goals and how to achieve them"; human performance, linked to company employees or business execution, which is "the ability of the company to satisfy its customers by offering them good quality goods and services, and to meet the expectations of its clientele"; strategic performance that responds to long-term strategic intent and value creation for customers; and competitive performance stemming from competitive power plays (establishing a defensive position, changing the balance, anticipating sector evolution, acquiring market share, and measuring strategic gap (difference between targeted and achieved performance) (Marmuse, 1997).

3.2. Definition and Evaluation of Overall Business Performance

The overall performance of a company is a concept that refers to the evaluation of the company's ability to achieve its long-term strategic objectives while optimizing short-term profitability. It allows measuring the health and sustainability of the company as a whole, taking into account both its financial and non-financial aspects.

The overall performance of a company can be measured using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) specific to a particular company and sector. Commonly used financial KPIs include revenue, profit margin, net income, return on assets, and return on investments. Non-financial KPIs often include measures of customer satisfaction, product or service quality, employee productivity, innovation, social responsibility, sustainability, and brand image.

Measuring overall performance may also involve the use of evaluation tools such as performance dashboards, customer satisfaction surveys, and environmental and social audits. By integrating the financial and non-financial aspects of the company, these tools provide a comprehensive and balanced overview of the company's performance.

3.2.1. Definition of Overall Business Performance

In the ongoing evolution of the concept of business performance, Lepetit (1997) describes overall performance as a multidimensional objective that encompasses economic, social, societal, financial, and environmental aspects. This approach concerns both businesses and human societies, whether they are employees or citizens. According to Germain and Trébucq (2004), overall performance results from the integration of financial, social, and societal performances. Similarly, Baret (2006) refers to the aggregation of economic, social, and environmental performances.

Social performance, on the other hand, is defined as performance towards employees (Berland, 2014), reflecting the ability to promote "responsible social policies towards stakeholders, primarily towards employees" (Uzan and Heraut-Zérigui, 2016). This places people at the heart of the business and affects several areas that impact the company (Uzan and Heraut-Zérigui, 2016).

The nature of the social policies implemented focuses on the content of employment policies, including companies' commitment to improving the employability of their workers, as emphasized by Mullenbach-Servayre and Le Flanchec (2012), and the integration of territories into the development of their HR planning (Bories-Azeau et al., 2015); Its organizational dynamics, focusing on the role of the human resources function in supporting and securing employees facing organizational changes in the company, in line with its strategic choices (Peretti and Uzan, 2011).
Societal performance: This concerns performance vis-à-vis stakeholders, as indicated by Berland (2014), encompassing the company's contribution and competence in meeting the expectations of these parties, as noted by Clarkson (1995). This therefore implies considering both favorable and unfavorable consequences as well as the company's initiatives towards the community.
Environmental performance: It encompasses the planning, manufacturing, and distribution of products, as well as considerations, reflections, and procedures related to pollution prevention, reduction, water resource preservation, biodiversity conservation, waste management, local pollution control, and environmental impacts of transportation.
Uzan and Héraut-Zerigui (2016) propose extending the concept of business performance, which has so far been limited only to the economic dimension, to a more comprehensive dimension, not only from an economic perspective but also from a social, societal, and environmental perspective. This definition falls within the pillar of sustainable development and is commonly used in professional and academic circles. Intangible management control (Cappelletti, 2012) integrates non-material elements such as knowledge, skills, human resources management, and reputation into performance measurements to meet the new needs of organizational management and thus to be economically viable. It is also more sustainable and socially responsible. Therefore, we are currently focusing on the tools used to measure the overall performance of the company.

3.2.2. Instruments for Evaluating Overall Business Performance

Overall performance measures are the devices and methods that organizations use to measure and analyze their performances in order to achieve their strategic objectives. They provide valuable information on the financial, operational, environmental, and social performances of a company.
One of the most commonly used tools is the performance dashboard, also known as the Balanced Scorecard. This dashboard helps measure and track your company's performance based on a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) related to various aspects of the business. These KPIs may include financial measures such as sales, profitability, and return on investment, as well as non-financial measures such as customer satisfaction, product or service quality, and operational efficiency.
Another important tool is performance benchmarks, which compare a company's performance to that of its competitors or the industry as a whole. This allows you to identify strengths and weaknesses compared to competitors and initiate appropriate corrective actions.
Customer satisfaction surveys are also valuable tools for measuring overall performance. They are used to collect feedback and opinions from customers about products, services, purchasing experiences, etc. This information can be used to assess overall customer satisfaction, identify improvement opportunities, and take actions to address them.
In summary, tools for measuring overall performance provide key information that allows organizations to monitor performance, identify improvement opportunities, and make informed decisions to achieve strategic objectives. These tools are essential for evaluating the sustainability and competitiveness of a company in an ever-changing business environment.
Dohou and Berland (2007) report on several instruments in terms of overall performance in their article. See particularly Elkington (1997), who presented the Triple Bottom Line (TBL)[7], Kaplan and Norton (1992, 2001), who focus on the Balanced Scorecard (BSC), and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), which originated from an international initiative launched by an American NGO[8] in 1997.

Accounting tools:

The concept of the TBL dates back to Elkington's work in 1997. The bottom line is literally "the bottom line of the balance sheet", the results of the company. It has long dominated the way we understand how accounting and business performance are related, however, according to the authors, accounting is perceived as a subjective social construct that evolves over time (Elkington, 1997). Consequently, the author distinguishes three fundamental lines, the first being the final financial result. This requires reconciling economics and sustainability

[7] Triple Bottom Line

[8] Non-Governmental Organization

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

through the integration of human capital concepts. There is also a distinction between final social results, which must be understood in a broad sense, encompassing society and workers, and environmental results.

Dashboard steering tool:

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) or Kaplan and Norton's (1992) prospective dashboard is a performance management tool. In its original form, it aims to align company actions with its strategy and supervise the measurement of four key axes: financial results, customer satisfaction, internal processes, and organizational learning. To evaluate overall performance, primarily oriented towards financial aspects (Berland, 2007), various authors have made adaptations to the BSC. Thus, the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard (Hockerts, 2001) and the Total Balanced Scorecard (Supizet, 2002) were born. In his literature review, Trébucq (2009) lists various possible evolutions of the BSC:

Option 1: Incorporate one or more societal themes in a cross-cutting manner across the four traditional perspectives;

Option 2: Rename or differently qualify one or more of the existing perspectives;

Option 3: Incorporate one or more additional perspectives;

Option 4: Modify the conventional order of perspectives.

Furthermore, the Balanced Scorecard also promotes interactive control (Mooraj et al., 1999) based on "dialogue to convince, mobilize energies, and channel new ideas" (Berland et al., 2005). Regarding overall performance, the interactive approach proposed by Travaillé and Naro (2013) facilitates dialogue and conflicting discussion of contentious issues. Therefore, the authors propose an alternative version of the BSC, the "paradoxical dashboard," as multiple stakeholders with diverse and often contradictory expectations may challenge assessments of overall performance. Allowing for an interactive approach, the tool is intentionally "unbalanced" to highlight inherent conflicts in controversial themes of the three dimensions of sustainable development and diverging expectations among stakeholders (Travaille and Naro, 2013).

- Diagnostic and reporting tools:

The Global Reporting Initiative is an international reporting standard aimed at measuring a company's overall performance. The tool is "widely used by listed companies in France" and "helps organizations define objectives, measure performance, and drive change to make their operations more sustainable" (Trebucq, 2009).

3.2.3. Aspects of Organizational Performance

Morin et al. (1994, 1996) suggest that measures of organizational performance should ideally be balanced across four axes: Sustainability, Economic Efficiency, Human Resource Value, Legitimacy vis-à-vis external groups. This conceptualization of organizational performance means that its evaluation requires data on several aspects:

Financial Performance: This involves evaluating the financial results of an organization, such as revenue, profitability, revenue growth, cost management, and profits earned.

Operational Performance: This dimension focuses on the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization's daily operations. This includes measures such as productivity, product or service quality, inventory management, production lead times, and customer satisfaction.

Strategic Performance: This involves achieving the organization's long-term strategic objectives, such as expanding into new markets, diversifying activities, innovating, brand recognition, and competitive positioning.

Social and Environmental Performance: This dimension assesses the social and environmental impacts of an organization. This includes aspects such as corporate social responsibility, sustainability, compliance with environmental standards, ethical practices, and contribution to society.

Human Resource Performance: This dimension focuses on talent management, skill development, employee satisfaction and engagement, as well as the organization's ability to attract, retain, and motivate talent.

Customer Relationship Performance: This dimension evaluates customer satisfaction, loyalty, and perception of the organization. This includes customer service quality, complaint management, customer retention, and the organization's reputation.

An organization's performance can therefore be measured using indicators whose selection and interpretation depend on decision-makers, their objectives, the period under consideration, their risk sensitivity, and their responsibilities.

However, in practice, it should be noted that executives and organizational managers tend to focus solely on indicators related to the sustainability and economic efficiency aspects when evaluating organizational performance (e.g., performance investment, capital performance, equity value, profit, sales, cash flow, cost of goods sold, profit margin, asset turnover, value added per employee). Criteria associated with economic performance and productivity aspects have several advantages:

• They appear comparable and reliable as they are developed on a standardized monetary basis.

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

• Compliant with professional standards verifiable by third parties (external or internal auditors).
• Information such as net income can be broken down into sales, cost of goods sold, overhead, and social security contributions, thus measuring different aspects of performance.
• A company never loses sight of its ultimate survival criterion: short-term profitability.

However, there are certain risks and limitations when managers rely solely on performance indicators related to organizational sustainability and profitability. In fact, these measures encourage managers and employees to:
• Pay more attention to managing the company's activities.
• Lack interest in the long-term performance of the company in terms of continuous improvement, innovation, and development.
• Pay less attention to their actions and attitudes, and short-term consequences.

4- Performance Management in a Crisis Context

Performance management is a key element in ensuring the success and survival of organizations, but it becomes even more crucial in times of crisis, such as the global financial crisis of 2008 or the recent health crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which can have profound consequences on business activities, testing their resilience and ability to maintain performance.

4.1. Impact of Crisis Management on Organizational Performance

Crisis management refers to the actions and strategies implemented by organizations to deal with unforeseen and disruptive situations, such as the COVID-19 crisis. On the other hand, organizational performance is a measure of an organization's effectiveness and efficiency in achieving its objectives.
Several researchers have emphasized the importance of effective crisis management in maintaining and improving organizational performance during times of crisis. For example, according to Hitt et al. (2020), proactive crisis management enables organizations to minimize operational disruptions, maintain stakeholder confidence, and preserve their competitive position. Additionally, research by Tuncdogan and Acar (2020) highlights the importance of clear and transparent communication, quick and flexible decision-making, as well as agile adaptation to new realities to ensure the continuity of organizational performance during a crisis.

4.2. Evaluation of Organizational Performance in a Crisis Situation

Measurement and evaluation of performance play an essential role in organizational management, especially during a crisis. Under normal circumstances, organizations use various indicators to assess their performance, such as financial, operational, and customer satisfaction indicators. However, during a crisis, these traditional measures may be insufficient to reflect the challenges and rapid changes organizations face. Therefore, it becomes crucial to adapt performance measurement and evaluation methods to account for the crisis situation.
When a crisis strikes, organizations may face significant disruptions in their operations, changes in customer demand, supply problems, budget constraints, and other unforeseen challenges (Rigby et al., 2020). In this context, traditional performance measures may no longer be relevant or sufficient to assess an organization's ability to cope with the crisis and adapt to new realities. It becomes necessary to expand performance indicators by incorporating crisis-specific measures. These measures may include indicators of organizational resilience, such as the ability to quickly adapt to changes, maintain the continuity of critical operations, and effectively manage risks (Müller et al., 2020). Additionally, measures of flexibility, agility, and innovation can be integrated to assess an organization's ability to adapt and find new opportunities in a rapidly changing environment (Dörfler et al., 2021).
It is also worth noting that measuring and evaluating performance during a crisis is not limited to quantitative aspects only. Qualitative aspects, such as employee satisfaction, psychological resilience, and the ability to maintain high morale despite difficulties, are equally important for assessing the overall performance of the organization (Chen et al., 2020).

4.3. Performance Management Strategies in Times of Crisis

The implications for performance management in times of crisis are manifold and require a strategic and proactive approach.
Firstly, it is essential to adapt goals and performance measures to reflect the new realities of the crisis. Short-term goals may need to be revised to accommodate changing constraints and priorities, while maintaining a long-term vision for sustainability and recovery post-crisis (Bourbonnais et al., 2020). Performance measures must also be adjusted to assess organizations' resilience, flexibility, and adaptability in the face of external disruptions (Ullah et al., 2020).
Moreover, communication and transparency become key elements of performance management in times of crisis. Managers need to communicate clearly and frequently with employees to maintain engagement, provide

IJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

information on performance expectations and priority objectives, and reassure and support employees (Cameron et al., 2020). Transparency in communicating performance and results also helps build trust and mobilize collective efforts toward common goals (Franco-Santos et al., 2020).
Furthermore, performance management in times of crisis requires increased organizational agility. Organizations must be able to quickly adapt to changes, redeploy resources flexibly, and make rapid, informed decisions based on new realities (Sutherland et al., 2020). The use of agile tools and methodologies, such as real-time dashboards and rapid learning cycles, can enable more effective performance management in times of crisis (O'Reilly et al., 2020).

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought about significant disruptions in the global economic landscape, profoundly impacting the performance of businesses across the globe. Measures such as lockdowns, economic restrictions, and changes in consumer behavior have posed unprecedented challenges to organizations. This health crisis has highlighted the crucial imperative of performance management in times of crisis, where businesses have had to adapt quickly, make informed decisions, and maintain their performance despite turbulence.
In the face of this unprecedented situation, the issue of the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on business performance has sparked keen interest among researchers, prompting exploration of new research perspectives. At the heart of these investigations lies the identification of key factors that influenced business performance during the crisis. Among these factors are adaptability, organizational resilience, risk management, and innovation. It is also crucial to understand how businesses have used performance measurement tools and mechanisms to assess their situation, make strategic decisions, and adjust their activities to maintain competitiveness.
Future research is also directed towards exploring the lessons learned from this crisis, aiming to develop more robust performance management strategies to confront potential future crises. Understanding best practices, effective crisis management approaches, and key resilience factors can guide businesses towards more proactive preparedness and more effective responses to crisis situations.
It is crucial to emphasize that performance management in times of crisis is not limited to financial or operational measurement but also encompasses essential aspects such as talent management, employee health and well-being, and stakeholder satisfaction. These dimensions should be integrated into future research efforts to obtain a more holistic view of organizational performance in times of crisis.
In summary, the COVID-19 crisis has underscored the crucial importance of solid and adaptable performance management in times of crisis. Future research in this area can contribute to a better understanding of key factors, best practices, and effective strategies to support business performance in challenging circumstances. This will enable organizations to be better prepared, more resilient, and capable of facing future challenges while maintaining their performance and competitiveness.

References :

[1] Alexander, D. (2014). Principles of Emergency Planning and Management. *Oxford University Press.*
[2] Baldwin, C. Y., & Weder di Mauro, B. (Eds.). (2020). Economics in the time of COVID-19. *CEPR Press*.
[3] BESSIRE D.(1999), « Définir la performance », *Comptabilité-Contrôle-Audit , tome 5, Vol.2, p. 127-150.*
[4] Barton, L. (1969). Organizational Crisis in Schools: A Dynamic, Multidimensional Approach. *Harvard Educational Review, 39(3), 330-351.*
[5] Berland, N. (2010), Mesure de la performance globale des entreprises. *HAL Id : halshs-00544875*.
[6] Béjin, A. et E. Morin (1976). « Introduction », *Communications, n° 25, p. 1-3.*
[7] BIEKERTH., GMINDERC.U. (2001), "Towards a Sustainability Balanced Scorecard", Oikos PhD summer academy, Environmental Management and Policy and related Aspects of Sustainability.
[8] Bolzinger, A. (1982). « Le concept clinique de crise », *Bulletin de psychologie, Tome XXXV, no 355, p. 475-480.*
[9] Borodzicz, E. P. (2005). Risk, Crisis and Security Management. Wiley.
[10] Bourbonnais, R., Macpherson, R. A., & Hayes, K. (2020). Leading in crisis: A real-time look at the impact of COVID-19 on Canadian organizations. Canadian Public Administration, 63(2), 205-224.
[11] BOURGUIGNONA. (1997), « Sous les pavés la plage… ou Les multiples fonc - tions du vocabulaire comptable : l'exemple de la performance », *ComptabilitéContrôle-Audit, tome 3, Vol. 1, p. 89-101.*

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

[12] Brouard, F., & Larivet, S. (2008). Prévention et gestion des crises en PME: apports de la veille et de l'intelligence économique. 9e Congrès International Francophone en Entrepreneuriat et PME. Louvain-la-Neuve,
[13] Belgique : *Communication CIFEPME, 2008, 15.*
[14] Bryan, L., & Farrell, D. (2009). Repères pour diriger par temps d'incertitude. *L'expansion Management Review(1), 60-69.*
[15] Bundy J., Pfarrer M.D., Short C.E. & Coombs W.T. (2017), Crises and crisis management : Integration, interpretation, and research development, *Journal of Management, vol. 43, no 6, p. 1661-1692*
[16] Cameron, K. S., Kim, M. U., & Whetten, D. A. (2020). Organizational effects of COVID-19: A framework to understand and manage disruption
[17] CAPRON M., QUAIR E L F.(2006), « Évaluer les stratégies de développement durable des entreprises : l'utopie mobilisatrice de la performance globale », *Revue de l'Organisation Responsable , 1(1) : pp. 5-17.*
[18] Clarke C.J. & Varma S. (2004), Strategic risk management : the new competitive edge. *Long range planning, vol. 32, no 4, p. 414-424.*
[19] Coombs W.T. & Holladay S. J. (2002), Helping crisis managers protect reputational assets : Initial tests of the situational crisis communication theory. *Management Communication Quarterly, vol. 16, n° 2, p. 165-186.*
[20] Comfort, L. K., Ko, K., & Zagorecki, A. (2004). Coordination in Rapidly Evolving Disaster Response Systems: The Role of Information. *American Behavioral Scientist, 48(3), 295-313.*
[21] Cremadez, M. (2004). Organisations et stratégie. Paris, *Dunod.*
[2] Daigne, J.-F. (1991). Le management en période de crise : aspects stratégiques, financiers et sociaux.
[23] Delbecque É. & Combalbert L. (2018), La gestion de crise. Que sais-je.
[24] Denervaud, I., Johnson, M., & Soumoy, E. (2009). Les crises, un terreau d'innovation. L'expansion *Management Review, 134(3), 108-119*
[25] Chen, Y., Yan, J., & Zhou, X. (2020). How to keep your employees motivated during the COVID-19 pandemic: The roles of organizational procedural justice and psychological capital. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 105(12), 1354-1364.*
[26] Dugré, C. (2011). Les 13 Signes avant-coureurs de la crise: Québec, *Benjamin Livre.*
[27] Dörfler, V., Ackermann, L., & Eden, C. (2021). Strategic management in times of crisis: Lessons learned from.
[28] Evans N. & Elphick S. (2005), Models of crisis management : An evaluation of their value for strategic planning in the international travel industry. *International Journal of Tourism Research, vol. 7, n° 3, p. 135-150.*
[29] Forgues B., & Lagadec, P. (1996). Un Nouveau Champ De Responsabilite Pour Les Dirigeants. *Revue Française de Gestion (108), 100-109.*
[30] Florence Nande, Nathalie Commeiras « Comment peut-on améliorer la performance individuelle au travail ? », *Varia, 2021/1 (N° 38).*
[31] Francart, L., Dufour, I., & Galam, S. (2002). Stratégies et décisions :" la crise du 11 septembre : *Economica.*
[32] GIBERT P. (1980), Le contrôle de gestion dans les organisations publiques, *Les Editions d'organisation, Paris.*
[33] Gilbert C. (2003), Risques collectifs et situations de crise, Apports de la recherche en sciences humaines et sociales, Paris, *L'Harmattan, p.340.*
[34] Gundel, S. (2005). Towards a new typology of crises. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 13(3), 106-115.*
[35] Hermann, C. F. (1972). « Some Issues in the Study of International Crisis », dans C. F. Hermann (dir.), International Crises: Insights from Behavioral Research, New York, *Free Press, p. 3-17.*
[36] Hitt, M. A., Xu, K., & Carnes, C. M. (2020). Crisis leadership and the role of decision-making. *Journal of Management Studies, 57(8), 1762-1777.*
[37] Hochrainer-Stigler, S., Kunreuther, H., Linnerooth-Bayer, J., & Mechler, R. (2010). The Risk Management Challenges of Catastrophes. *Journal of Risk Research, 13(2), 191-204.*
[38] Jacquet, S. (2011), Management de la performance : des concepts aux outils. *Centre de Ressources en Economie Gestion (CREG).*
[39] Jean-Pierre Taïeb. (2016), « Valoriser la performance RH », *Dunod, P. 224.*
[40] Kahn W.A., Barton M.A. & Fellows S. (2013), Organizational crises and the disturbance of relational systems. *Academy of Management Review, vol. 38, n°3, p. 377-396.*
[41] KHENNICHE S., H ENRIOT J.(2021), « Action publique : quête de performance et perte de sens, un éclairage par les tensions de gouvernance », *Management international / International Management / Gestion Internacional, Vol. 25.*

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

[42] Lagadec, P. (1991). La gestion des crises, *www.patricklagadec.net/fr/pdf/integral_livre1.pdf (page consultée en mars 2023).*
[43] Lemonakis C. & Zairis A. (2020), Crisis Management and the Public Sector : Key Trends and Perspectives. In Public-sector Crisis Management. Access at : https://www.intechopen.com/online-first/crisismanagement-and-the-public-sector-key-trends-andperspectives
[44] Lemonakis C. & Zairis, A. (2019), Managing "crisis" and public sector organizations. Access at : https://www.europeanbusinessreview.eu/page.asp?pid=3368
[45] Leveson N., Dulac N., Marais K. & Carroll J. (2009), Moving beyond normal accidents and high reliability organizations : A systems approach to safety in com - plex systems. *Organization Studies , vol. 30, n°2-3, p. 227-249.*
[46] Liabert, T. (2005). La communication de crise-2ème édition: *Dunod-Paris.*
[47] Liu, W., Song, M., & Wen, L. (2020). How Does Crisis Management Capability Affect the Financial Performance of Firms During the COVID-19 Pandemic? A Dynamic Capabilities Perspective. Frontiers in Psychology.
[48] Mitroff, I. I. (2004). Crisis leadership: Planning for the unthinkable: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
[49] Mitroff, I. (2001). Managing Crises Before They Happen: What Every Executive and Manager Needs to Know About Crisis Management, New York, *Éditions Amacom.*
[50] Nakamura, E. (2008). Layoffs and lemons over the business cycle. *Economics letters, 99(1), 55- 58.*
[51] Naudé, W. (2020). Entrepreneurial opportunities in a crisis: The impact of COVID-19. *Small Business Economics, 55(4), 793-802.*
[52] Pauchant, T., & Mitroff, I. I., La gestion des crises et des paradoxes. Prévenir les effets destructeurs de nos organisations, Editions Québec Amérique, 1995.
[53] Pearson, C. M., & Clair, J. A. (1998). Reframing crisis management. The Academy of Management Review, 23(1), 59–76.
[54] PESQUEUX Y. (2004), « La notion de performance globale », *5 e Forum international ETHICS, Tunisie.*
[55] Pfeffer, J. S., & Salancik, G. (1978). The external control of organizations: a resource dependence perspective. Harper & Row.
[56] RENAUD A., B ERLAND N .(2007), « Mesure de la performance globale des entreprises », *28 e Congrès de l'Association Francophone de Comptabilité, Poitiers.*
[57] REYNAUD E. (2003), « Développement durable et entreprise : vers une relation symbiotique », journée AIMS, *Atelier Développement Durable, ESSCA Angers.*
[58] Shrivastava, P. Industrial & Environmental Crisis Quarterly *Vol. 7, No. 1 (1993), pp. 23-42 (20 pages).*
[59] Rigby, D. K., Sutherland, J., & Takeuchi, H. (2020). Embracing agile: How to master the process that's transforming management. *Harvard Business Press.*
[60] Shrivastava, P. (1993), Crisis theory/practice : Towards a sustainable future. Industrial & Environmental Crisis *Quarterly, vol. 7, n°1, p. 23-42.*
[61] SIMONS R.(1995), Levers of Control. How Managers Use Innovative Control System to Drive Strategic Reneval, *Harvard Business School Press.*
[62] Smith, D. (2005). Business (not) as usual: crisis management, service recovery and the vulnerability of organisations. *Journal of Services Marketing, 19(5), 309-320.*
[63] Sylvie Saint-Onge, Victor Haines. (2007) « Gestion des performances au travail », *De Boeck superieur, P.15-52.*
[64] Tuncdogan, A., & Acar, A. Z. (2020). The role of agile and resilient supply chains in managing the effects of pandemics such as COVID-19. *European Journal of Operations Research, 287(3).*
[65] Volpi, R. (2003). Laboratoire Redéploiement Industriel et Innovation, *Maison de la Recherche – 21, quai de la Citadelle – 59140 DUNKERQUE.*
[66] Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Managing the Unexpected, *Resilient Performance in an Age of Uncertainty. Wiley.*