

Original Research

Received 27 May 2026

Revised 25 July 2026

Accepted 02 August 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6 (14s): 143–151

KEYWORDS:

Buddhist Eightfold Path, crisis management, mindful leadership, organizational resilience, ethical governance, holistic framework

The Buddhist Eightfold Path as a Holistic Model for Crisis Management in the New Era

Nguyen Thi Le

PhD Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam – 530003, Andhra Pradesh, India

Email: tnnadd92@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Contemporary organizations face increasingly complex and multifaceted crises, ranging from global pandemics and geopolitical instabilities to environmental catastrophes and digital disruptions. These escalating challenges demand ethical, adaptive, and holistic managerial frameworks. This paper proposes the Noble Eightfold Path of Buddhism comprising Right Understanding, Right Intention, Right Speech, Right Action, Right Livelihood, Right Effort, Right Mindfulness, and Right Concentration as a comprehensive and integrative model for crisis management in the new era. Drawing on contemporary management scholarship and Buddhist philosophy, the paper maps each of the eight elements onto core dimensions of crisis management, including situational assessment, ethical leadership, crisis communication, operational response, organizational resilience, and sustained recovery. The paper argues that the Eightfold Path transcends its spiritual origins to offer a value-driven, systems-oriented framework that directly addresses the limitations of conventional mechanistic crisis management models. Illustrative case discussions and integration with existing management theory are provided to demonstrate practical applicability. The findings contribute to the growing discourse on Buddhist-inspired management, mindful organizing, and responsible leadership in times of profound uncertainty.

1. INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has ushered in an era of pervasive and interconnected crises. The COVID-19 pandemic, climate-induced disasters, geopolitical conflicts, cyber-attacks, and widening socioeconomic inequalities have collectively exposed the inadequacy of many prevailing crisis management frameworks, which often emphasize reactive, technically driven, and profit-centric approaches. Amid this landscape, there is a renewed scholarly and practitioner interest in drawing on ancient wisdom traditions to fill philosophical and methodological gaps in modern management theory (Vu, 2024; Singh, 2025).

Buddhism, one of the world's oldest and most systematic philosophical traditions, has long been recognized for its psychological and ethical sophistication. The Noble Eightfold Path (Pali: Ariyo Atthaṅgiko Maggo) constitutes the core prescriptive teaching of early Buddhism and outlines a structured approach to the cessation of suffering through the cultivation of wisdom (paññā), ethical conduct (sīla), and mental discipline (samādhi) (Bodhi, 2000; Harvey, 2013). While traditionally understood as a guide to individual spiritual liberation, contemporary scholars have increasingly examined the path's relevance to organizational behaviour, corporate governance, and leadership (Mishra & Gupta, 2024; Sobhana & Srivastava, 2022).

This paper extends this emerging body of literature by positioning the Noble Eightfold Path as a holistic model specifically suited to crisis management challenges of the new era. The central thesis is that the Eightfold Path's integrated structure spanning cognition, intention, communication, behaviour, livelihood, effort, awareness, and concentration mirrors the multidimensional nature of organizational crises and offers actionable principles for each stage of crisis response. The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews the existing literature on crisis management models and Buddhist management

scholarship; Section 3 provides an overview of the Noble Eightfold Path; Section 4 develops the proposed holistic framework by mapping each path element to crisis management; Section 5 discusses practical applications and case illustrations; Section 6 addresses limitations and future directions; and Section 7 concludes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Crisis Management in the New Era

Crisis management scholarship has evolved significantly over the past four decades. Early frameworks, such as those proposed by Mitroff (2005), conceptualized organizational crises as largely technical and managerial failures requiring staged responses detection, prevention, containment, recovery, and learning. Subsequent scholarship introduced communication-centred models, most notably Seeger, Sellnow, and Ulmer's (2003) work on organizational crisis communication, which emphasized transparency, empathy, and stakeholder engagement as central to effective crisis response.

More recent contributions have highlighted the inadequacy of linear, stage-based models for managing the 'wicked' crises characteristic of the new era crises marked by systemic interdependency, non-linearity, ambiguity, and rapid information diffusion (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001). The VUCA framework (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, Ambiguous) has been widely adopted to describe this operating environment, and scholars increasingly argue that crisis management frameworks must incorporate ethical, psychological, and sociocultural dimensions to be adequate (Mishra & Gupta, 2024; Sukhampha, 2023).

Organizational mindfulness, as theorized by Weick and Sutcliffe (2001), emphasizes collective attentiveness, situational awareness, and adaptive capacity as foundations of organizational reliability. This concept has been applied to crisis and safety management contexts (Pérez-Aróstegui et al., 2022), yet its Buddhist origins remain underexplored in the crisis management literature. The present paper seeks to address this gap.

2.2 Buddhist Philosophy in Management Scholarship

The intersection of Buddhist philosophy and management science has attracted growing academic attention. Scholars such as Vu (2024, 2025) have demonstrated that Buddhist religious logics particularly practices of emptiness, interconnectedness, and non-attachment profoundly shape organizational decision-making, corporate social responsibility adoption, and the construction of meaningful work. These studies suggest that Buddhist teachings are not merely compatible with but may actually enrich modern management theory by introducing non-Western epistemological frameworks that foreground relational and systemic thinking.

Research by Sobhana and Srivastava (2022) specifically explored the applicability of the Eightfold Noble Path to business management, demonstrating that its ethical principles support responsible leadership, employee engagement, and sustainable organizational growth. Similarly, Singh (2025) examined Buddhist principles including Right Livelihood and the Noble Eightfold Path in the context of corporate governance, finding that companies integrating these principles report enhanced stakeholder relationships and improved crisis resilience. Mishra and Gupta (2024) directly investigated crisis leadership behaviours through the prism of Buddhism's Eightfold Path using an interview-based methodology, identifying Right Intention, Right Action, and Right Speech as particularly salient to effective crisis leadership.

Beyond organizational studies, Buddhist-enacted practices in the workplace have been examined by Monash University scholars who highlighted the importance of contextually sensitive interpretation of Right Mindfulness, the Middle Way, and non-self in organizational settings in the wake of crises and impermanence (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001; Kay & Skarlicki, 2020). The present paper builds upon this body of work to construct a systematic, holistic crisis management framework grounded in the Eightfold Path.

2.3 Mindfulness and Organizational Resilience

The concept of mindfulness has been increasingly operationalized within organizational theory as a property of collective attentiveness and adaptive sense-making (Langer, 1989; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001). Research by Kudesia (2018) has specifically examined the relationship between mindfulness and the risk-resilience tradeoff in organizations, establishing that expertise-driven front-line awareness, simplified top-management heuristics, and middle-management troubleshooting collectively constitute a mindfulness-based approach to organizational reliability. These insights resonate with the Buddhist concept of Right Mindfulness, but extend it into institutional and collective dimensions.

Kay and Skarlicki (2020) demonstrated empirically that individual mindfulness facilitates constructive conflict management within organizations by enhancing collaboration and reducing avoidance behaviours. During crises, when conflict is intensified by resource scarcity, role ambiguity, and high-stakes decisions, this finding has particular operational relevance. Research on corporate mindfulness programs also reveals the growing albeit contested institutionalization of Buddhist-derived practices in Western organizational contexts (Sugino, 2020), underscoring the need for a rigorous, theoretically grounded engagement with Buddhist principles in management scholarship.

2.4 Research Approach

This paper adopts a conceptual research methodology grounded in systematic literature review and philosophical analysis. Drawing on primary Buddhist texts, contemporary management scholarship, and interdisciplinary research on organizational resilience and mindful leadership, the study develops a novel theoretical framework by mapping each element of the Noble Eightfold Path onto corresponding dimensions of crisis management. This approach is consistent with conceptual paper designs that seek to integrate disparate theoretical traditions into coherent, testable frameworks, and is appropriate for exploratory scholarship at the intersection of philosophy and management theory (Mishra & Gupta, 2024; Vu, 2024).

3. THE NOBLE EIGHTFOLD PATH: AN OVERVIEW

The Noble Eightfold Path (Ariyo Atthaṅgiko Maggo) is the fourth of the Four Noble Truths taught by Siddhartha Gautama (the Buddha) and constitutes the central practical prescription of Buddhist philosophy for the cessation of suffering (dukkha). The path is organized into three interrelated groups: Wisdom (paññā), comprising Right Understanding and Right Intention; Ethical Conduct (sīla), comprising Right Speech, Right Action, and Right Livelihood; and Mental Discipline (samādhi), comprising Right Effort, Right Mindfulness, and Right Concentration (Bodhi, 2000; Harvey, 2013).

A critical feature of the Eightfold Path is its non-sequential, mutually reinforcing structure. The eight elements are not steps to be completed one after another; rather, they function as an integrated system in which progress in any one element simultaneously supports and is supported by the others. This systemic interdependence makes the Eightfold Path structurally distinct from linear problem-solving or stage-based crisis management models and positions it as a genuine holistic framework (Williams & Tribe, 2000; Bodhi, 2000).

The Eight Path elements are briefly described as follows. Right Understanding (sammā diṭṭhi) refers to a clear perception of reality, particularly the recognition of the three marks of existence: impermanence (anicca), unsatisfactoriness (dukkha), and non-self (anattā). Right Intention (sammā saṅkappa) involves the cultivation of intentions aligned with renunciation, non-ill-will, and non-cruelty. Right Speech (sammā vācā) prescribes truthful, harmonious, gentle, and purposeful communication. Right Action (sammā kammanta) encompasses ethical conduct in bodily behaviour, including abstaining from harm, theft, and misconduct. Right Livelihood (sammā ājīva) concerns sustaining life through ethical, non-harmful economic activity. Right Effort (sammā vāyāma) involves the sustained and balanced application of mental energy toward wholesome states. Right Mindfulness (sammā sati) refers to clear and sustained awareness of body, feelings, mind-states, and mental objects. Right Concentration (sammā samādhi) denotes the development of focused, unified, and tranquil mental states through meditative practice (Bodhi, 2000; Harvey, 2013; Nhat Hanh, 1998).

4. MAPPING THE EIGHTFOLD PATH TO CRISIS MANAGEMENT: A HOLISTIC FRAMEWORK



Figure 1: A Holistic Crisis Management Framework Based on the Buddhist Eightfold Path

Note. An integrated crisis management framework derived from the Buddhist Eightfold Path, organized into three interdependent domains (Wisdom, Ethical Conduct, Mental Discipline), each corresponding to critical dimensions of crisis management and collectively oriented toward organizational resilience and sustainable recovery.

This section develops the proposed holistic framework by mapping each element of the Eightfold Path to a corresponding dimension of crisis management. The framework is organized around the three groups of Wisdom, Ethical Conduct, and Mental Discipline, and demonstrates how these dimensions collectively address the cognitive, ethical, communicative, operational, and psychological demands of organizational crisis.

4.1 Wisdom (Paññā): Cognitive Foundations of Crisis Management

4.1.1 Right Understanding (Sammā Dīṭṭhi): Accurate Crisis Assessment

Effective crisis management begins with accurate perception of reality. Right Understanding, as the first element of the Eightfold Path, calls for a clear-sighted recognition of conditions as they actually are, free from cognitive distortions generated by attachment, aversion, or denial. In organizational crisis contexts, this translates directly to what crisis management scholars term 'signal detection' and 'sense-making' the capacity of leaders and organizations to recognize early warning indicators of emerging crises, accurately assess their nature and scope, and resist the cognitive biases (such as normalcy bias and optimistic overconfidence) that systematically impede timely response (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001; Mitroff, 2005).

The Buddhist concept of the three marks of existence is particularly instructive here. The recognition of impermanence (anicca) equips crisis managers to expect and anticipate instability rather than assuming organizational stability as a default condition. The recognition of interdependence a corollary of non-self (anattā) enables systems thinking and awareness of how disruptions in one domain cascade through interconnected systems, a dynamic powerfully illustrated by supply-chain crises and pandemic-era organizational disruptions (Sukhampha, 2023; Vu, 2024). Right Understanding thus provides the epistemological foundation for crisis preparedness, scenario planning, and adaptive sense-making.

4.1.2 Right Intention (Sammā Saṅkappa): Ethical Leadership in Crisis

Right Intention the cultivation of intentions oriented toward renunciation, goodwill, and compassion addresses the motivational and ethical foundations of crisis leadership. In organizational crises, leadership intention has a decisive influence on whether responses are oriented toward genuine stakeholder welfare or toward narrow self-interest, reputational management, or liability avoidance. Mishra and Gupta (2024) found through interview-based research that crisis leaders who

demonstrated Right Intention characterized by genuine concern for all affected parties, transparency, and ethical commitment were perceived as significantly more effective than those whose crisis responses were primarily defensive or reputation-driven.

The Buddhist concept of non-ill-will (*avyāpāda*) is particularly relevant in crisis contexts characterized by blame allocation, scapegoating, and stakeholder conflict. Right Intention prescribes that leaders maintain goodwill toward all parties including those perceived as adversaries, critics, or responsible parties thereby enabling more constructive, integrative approaches to crisis resolution. Singh (2025) observed that companies whose governance structures reflect Buddhist ethical principles, including intentional compassion, demonstrated superior stakeholder relationships and crisis resilience compared to those governed by narrowly profit-maximizing logics.

4.2 Ethical Conduct (*Sīla*): Communicative and Operational Integrity

4.2.1 Right Speech (*Sammā Vācā*): Crisis Communication

Crisis communication is widely recognized as one of the most critical and complex dimensions of crisis management (Seeger, Sellnow, & Ulmer, 2003). Right Speech, as prescribed in the Eightfold Path, encompasses four dimensions: truthfulness, absence of divisiveness, gentleness, and purposefulness. Each of these dimensions has direct correspondence in crisis communication best practice. Truthfulness aligns with principles of transparency and disclosure that are foundational to stakeholder trust during crises. Absence of divisiveness corresponds to the crisis communication imperative to avoid scapegoating and polarizing narratives that exacerbate conflict and impede collective response (Seeger et al., 2003).

Gentleness in speech delivering difficult or distressing information with care, empathy, and sensitivity to the emotional states of recipients maps onto the crisis communication literature on empathic messaging and the management of fear and uncertainty. Research on mindfulness and conflict management by Kay and Skarlicki (2020) demonstrated that mindful communicators those attentive to their own and others' emotional states facilitate more constructive and collaborative outcomes in high-tension situations. Purposefulness in speech reflects the principle of message relevance, concision, and action-orientation that characterizes effective emergency communications. Collectively, the four dimensions of Right Speech provide a rich normative framework for ethical and effective crisis communication across all stakeholder groups.

4.2.2 Right Action (*Sammā Kammanta*): Ethical Crisis Response

Right Action prescribes ethical conduct in the domain of physical behaviour specifically, refraining from harm, theft, and misconduct. In organizational crisis management, this element translates into the operationalization of ethical decision-making frameworks during acute crisis phases. Organizational crises frequently create conditions that incentivize or rationalize unethical conduct: the suppression of adverse information to protect share prices; the allocation of crisis costs to vulnerable stakeholders; the diversion of recovery resources toward leadership protection; or the violation of employee rights in the name of operational necessity (Mitroff, 2005).

The Buddhist principle of non-harm (*ahiṃsā*) implicit in Right Action provides an unambiguous ethical standard against which crisis response decisions can be evaluated. This standard is particularly relevant in the new era, where organizational crises are subject to unprecedented public scrutiny through social media, digital journalism, and civil society activism. Research on corporate social responsibility during the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that firms whose crisis responses were aligned with non-harmful, stakeholder-protective conduct experienced significantly less reputational damage and more durable recovery trajectories (Arian et al., 2025; Singh, 2025). Right Action thus provides both an ethical imperative and a strategic logic for stakeholder-centred crisis response.

4.2.3 Right Livelihood (*Sammā Ājīva*): Sustainable Organizational Purpose

Right Livelihood sustaining organizational activity through ethical, non-harmful means addresses the structural and systemic dimensions of crisis vulnerability. Many organizational crises are, at their root, products of the pursuit of profit through harmful means: environmental degradation, exploitative labour practices, fraudulent financial engineering, or reckless supply-chain management. Right Livelihood, as a crisis management principle, directs attention to pre-crisis organizational practices and structures as root causes of crisis vulnerability (Sobhana & Srivastava, 2022).

In the New Era, the concept of Right Livelihood finds powerful resonance in the sustainability and ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) governance movements. Vu (2024) demonstrated that Buddhist logics of right livelihood and

interconnectedness significantly shape the adoption and implementation of CSR initiatives in SMEs, supporting more genuine and embedded forms of social responsibility as compared to compliance-driven approaches. Singh (2025) further observed that Buddhist ethical frameworks, including Right Livelihood, encourage a transition from profit-maximizing to stakeholder-welfare-oriented governance models a transition that simultaneously reduces structural crisis risk and enhances organizational legitimacy and resilience.

4.3 Mental Discipline (Samādhi): Psychological and Strategic Foundations

4.3.1 Right Effort (Sammā Vāyāma): Sustained and Balanced Crisis Response

Right Effort encompasses four components: preventing the arising of unwholesome mental states, abandoning those already arisen, cultivating wholesome mental states, and maintaining those already cultivated. In organizational crisis management, this fourfold schema maps onto a dynamic and balanced approach to crisis response that avoids two common organizational failure modes: under-response (denial, inaction, minimization) and over-response (panic, reactive over-correction, resource exhaustion). The Buddhist concept of the Middle Way avoiding extremes underlies Right Effort and provides a calibration principle for crisis response intensity and resource deployment.

Research on mindfulness-based crisis leadership consistently finds that leaders who maintain balanced, sustained effort neither paralyzed by anxiety nor recklessly reactive demonstrate superior decision quality and team outcomes under crisis conditions (Kudesia, 2018; St. Cloud State University Repository, 2019). Right Effort also encompasses the cultivation of organizational learning during and after crises: systematically replacing maladaptive response patterns with more effective ones, and institutionalizing crisis-response capabilities that are retained across organizational cycles. This learning dimension is a recognized critical success factor in organizational resilience (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001).

4.3.2 Right Mindfulness (Sammā Sati): Situational Awareness and Adaptive Sense-Making

Right Mindfulness clear and sustained awareness of present-moment experience across body, feelings, mental states, and phenomena is arguably the most extensively studied element of the Eightfold Path in management literature. In crisis management, Right Mindfulness directly corresponds to the concept of 'mindful organizing' developed by Weick and Sutcliffe (2001): a collective organizational orientation characterized by sensitivity to weak signals, reluctance to simplify complexity, deference to expertise, commitment to resilience, and fluid decision structures. These five principles of mindful organizing have been empirically linked to superior performance in high-reliability organizations operating in inherently crisis-prone environments.

Pérez-Aróstegui et al. (2022) developed a conceptual model of mindful organizing specifically applied to safety crisis management in healthcare during COVID-19, demonstrating that organizational mindfulness encompassing attentiveness, active awareness, and openness to new information qualifies as a key determinant of effective crisis management and organizational reliability. The application of Right Mindfulness at the individual leadership level has been further examined by scholars who found that mindfulness practices enable leaders to detach from fear-based decision-making, maintain present-moment awareness in rapidly evolving situations, and approach adversity with equanimity and self-awareness all of which are critical competencies for crisis leadership in the new era (Joplin, 2019).

4.3.3 Right Concentration (Sammā Samādhi): Focused Strategic Decision-Making

Right Concentration the development of unified, tranquil, and deeply focused mental states through meditative practice addresses the cognitive and psychological conditions necessary for high-quality strategic decision-making under crisis conditions. Crises characteristically generate information overload, emotional reactivity, cognitive narrowing, and time pressure conditions that severely compromise decision quality. Right Concentration prescribes the cultivation of a mental capacity that remains clear, focused, and undistracted even amid turmoil a quality that Buddhist scholars describe as 'equanimity' (upekkhā) and that management scholars increasingly recognize as a critical leadership competency (Harvey, 2013; Nhat Hanh, 1998).

From an organizational perspective, Right Concentration translates into the design of crisis management processes and structures that prioritize focused attention and deliberate decision-making over reactive, fragmented responses. This includes the establishment of dedicated crisis management teams with clear roles and decision authorities, the use of structured

scenario analysis and decision protocols, and the creation of organizational spaces physical and temporal that support reflective thinking and strategic coherence during crisis periods. Research on leadership in crisis organizations confirms that concentrated, purposeful attention to defined priorities is a distinguishing characteristic of effective crisis command (Mitroff, 2005; Mishra & Gupta, 2024).

5. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS AND CASE ILLUSTRATIONS

5.1 The Eightfold Path Framework in COVID-19 Organizational Response

The COVID-19 pandemic constitutes perhaps the most significant organizational crisis of the early twenty-first century and provides a rich empirical context for illustrating the practical relevance of the Eightfold Path framework. Sukhampha's (2023) analysis of the Thai government's crisis management during COVID-19 revealed the extent to which responses grounded in Buddhist governance norms including compassion, mindful deliberation, and ethical communication shaped crisis outcomes differently from those governed purely by techno-managerial logics. Similarly, the European Union-funded CRISIS project's ongoing investigation of Buddhist governance in Bhutan provides early findings indicating that Buddhist governance models involving state monasteries produced distinctive patterns of crisis management that challenged hegemonic Western frameworks (CORDIS, 2025).

At the organizational level, research by Pérez-Aróstegui et al. (2022) on healthcare organizations managing ICU crises during COVID-19 found that those exhibiting characteristics of mindful organizing directly analogous to Right Mindfulness demonstrated superior adaptive capacity and crisis coordination. Firms with strong pre-existing CSR cultures, consistent with Right Livelihood, also demonstrated significantly greater resilience and stakeholder trust preservation during the pandemic (Arian et al., 2025). These findings provide empirical support for the practical relevance of multiple Eightfold Path elements across organizational crisis management.

5.2 An Integrated Crisis Management Cycle Based on the Eightfold Path

The Eightfold Path framework can be operationalized as an integrated organizational crisis management cycle across three phases: pre-crisis preparation, acute crisis response, and post-crisis recovery and learning. In the pre-crisis phase, Right Understanding and Right Livelihood provide the foundation for organizational vulnerability assessment and structural risk reduction; Right Intention and Right Action guide the development of ethical crisis management policies and stakeholder commitments; and Right Mindfulness supports ongoing environmental scanning and early-warning signal detection.

In the acute response phase, Right Speech guides crisis communication protocols; Right Action directs the ethical framework for operational decisions under pressure; Right Effort maintains balanced, sustained response energy; and Right Concentration enables focused, high-quality strategic decision-making amid information overload and emotional stress. In the post-crisis recovery phase, Right Understanding supports honest retrospective analysis of crisis causes and response quality; Right Intention reorients organizational purpose toward stakeholder welfare and systemic repair; Right Effort drives the systematic institutionalization of crisis learning; and Right Concentration enables the disciplined development and implementation of long-term resilience strategies.

5.3 Buddhist-Inspired Crisis Leadership Competencies

The Eightfold Path framework implies a specific profile of crisis leadership competencies. Mishra and Gupta (2024) identified through empirical research that crisis leaders embodying Buddhist principles demonstrated the following behaviours: honest and empathic communication aligned with Right Speech; genuine stakeholder-protective decision-making aligned with Right Action; maintenance of calm, focused attention under pressure aligned with Right Concentration; and sustained ethical commitment even when organizational survival pressures created incentives for compromise, consistent with Right Intention and Right Livelihood.

These competencies align with broader management research on authentic and ethical leadership in crisis contexts, while adding a distinctive philosophical depth rooted in millennia of empirical contemplative tradition. Research on mindful leadership in organizational contexts further supports the view that Right Mindfulness operationalized through structured meditation and reflective practices can be developed and cultivated as an organizational capability, rather than being an innate

personality characteristic (Kudesia, 2018; Brendel et al., 2023). This suggests that Buddhist-inspired crisis leadership competencies are learnable and institutionalizable through deliberate practice.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

While the Eightfold Path offers significant conceptual resources for crisis management scholarship, several limitations and cautions must be acknowledged. First, the translation of a spiritual-philosophical system into an organizational management framework inevitably involves conceptual simplification and decontextualization. Buddhist scholars have long cautioned against the appropriation of Buddhist practices in ways that strip them of their ethical and soteriological context, reducing rich philosophical teachings to performance-enhancing techniques a dynamic critiqued in the corporate mindfulness literature as 'palliative Buddhism' (Sugino, 2020). The Eightfold Path framework proposed here must be implemented with awareness of and sensitivity to its cultural and philosophical origins.

Second, the empirical evidence base for Buddhist-inspired crisis management remains limited. While studies such as those by Mishra and Gupta (2024), Vu (2024), and Sukhampha (2023) provide important qualitative and comparative evidence, large-scale quantitative studies of the relationship between Buddhist organizational practices and crisis outcomes are lacking. Future research should develop validated measurement instruments for Eightfold Path-aligned organizational practices and investigate their relationship to crisis management performance across diverse organizational contexts, sectors, and cultural settings.

Third, the universality of the framework requires further examination. While the Eightfold Path's principles of ethical conduct, mindfulness, and wisdom have broad cross-cultural resonance, their specific organizational manifestations may vary significantly across cultural, religious, and institutional contexts. Comparative research examining Buddhist-influenced organizations in Southeast Asia, the Himalayan region, and the Western world would enrich understanding of the framework's transcultural applicability. Future research might also explore the integration of the Eightfold Path framework with complementary Indigenous, African, and other non-Western wisdom traditions in crisis management. These limitations notwithstanding, the Eightfold Path framework offers a compelling and generative foundation for a more ethically grounded, holistic, and cross-culturally informed approach to crisis management scholarship and practice.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has proposed the Noble Eightfold Path of Buddhism as a holistic and integrative model for crisis management in the new era. By mapping each of the eight path elements Right Understanding, Right Intention, Right Speech, Right Action, Right Livelihood, Right Effort, Right Mindfulness, and Right Concentration onto corresponding dimensions of organizational crisis management, the paper demonstrates that the Eightfold Path's ancient wisdom offers a remarkably comprehensive and coherent framework for addressing the multidimensional challenges of contemporary crises.

The framework's distinctive contribution lies in its integration of cognitive, ethical, communicative, operational, and psychological dimensions of crisis management within a single, mutually reinforcing system. Unlike conventional crisis management models that address these dimensions in isolation or through technical checklists, the Eightfold Path conceives of them as aspects of an integrated organizational way of being a holistic orientation toward wisdom, ethical conduct, and mental discipline that shapes not only crisis response but the organizational culture, leadership quality, and structural integrity from which effective crisis management ultimately arises.

As organizations navigate an era of unprecedented complexity, interconnectedness, and instability, the invitation to draw on the deepest insights of the world's contemplative traditions is both timely and necessary. The Noble Eightfold Path, grounded in 2,500 years of empirical inquiry into the nature of suffering and its cessation, offers crisis management scholarship and practice a rich source of wisdom that deserves systematic empirical investigation, thoughtful theoretical development, and ethically informed organizational application.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arian, A., et al. (2025). From crisis to stability: How CSR shielded firms during COVID-19. *Journal of Business Research*, 185, Article 115071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115071>
- [2] Bodhi, B. (2000). *The connected discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. Wisdom Publications.

- [3] Brendel, W., Hankerson, C., Byun, S., & Cunningham, B. (2023). Cultivating mindful leadership in organizations: A coaching-based approach. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 75(2), 143–160. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000233>
- [4] CORDIS (2025). Crisis, governance, and Buddhism in contemporary Bhutan (CRISIS Project). European Commission. <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101207553>
- [5] Harvey, P. (2013). *An introduction to Buddhist ethics: Foundations, values and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Joplin, T. (2019). Mindfulness practices in crisis leadership. In D. Holton (Ed.), *Contemplative practices in organizational contexts* (pp. 77–98). Information Age Publishing.
- [7] Kay, A. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2020). Cultivating a conflict-positive workplace: How mindfulness facilitates constructive conflict management. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 159, 8–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.02.009>
- [8] Kudesia, R. S., & Reb, J. (2018). Mindfulness and the risk-resilience trade-off in organizations. In B. D. Trump, M.-V. Florin, & I. Linkov (Eds.), *IRGC resource guide on resilience* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–8). International Risk Governance Center (IRGC). <https://irgc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Kudesia-et-al-for-IRGC-Resilience-Guide-Vol-2-2018.pdf>
- [9] Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Addison-Wesley.
- [10] Mishra, M., & Gupta, R. (2024). Examining crisis leadership behaviours through the principles of Buddhism: An interview-based study. *International Journal of Management Practice*, 17(4), 417–434. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMP.2024.138569>
- [11] Mitroff, I. I. (2005). Why some companies emerge stronger and better from a crisis: 7 essential lessons for surviving disaster. AMACOM.
- [12] Nhat Hanh, T. (1998). *The heart of the Buddha's teaching: Transforming suffering into peace, joy, and liberation*. Broadway Books.
- [13] Pérez-Aróstegui, M. N., García-Morales, V. J., & Martín-Rojas, R. (2022). A conceptual model of mindful organizing for effective safety crisis management. *Safety Science*, 153, Article 105811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2022.105811>
- [14] Seeger, M. W., Sellnow, T. L., & Ulmer, R. R. (2003). *Communication and organizational crisis*. Greenwood Press.
- [15] Singh, P. (2025). Buddhist principles in corporate governance. *The Academic*, 3(2), 1155–1165.
- [16] Sobhana, A., & Srivastava, S. (2022). A study on applicability of the Eightfold Noble Path of Buddha to business management. *Human Resource Journal*, 4(1), Part B.
- [17] St. Cloud State University Repository. (2019). Mindfulness-based leadership in organizational crisis [Graduate capstone project]. Retrieved from <https://repository.stcloudstate.edu>
- [18] Sugino, C. M. (2020). Palliative Buddhism: Corporate exoticization and appropriation of mindfulness under neoliberal crisis. *Aigne: Journal of the College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.33178/aigne.vol8.2>
- [19] Sukhampha, R. (2023). Management of crisis or crisis of management? The Thai government's response to COVID-19. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 5, Article 1251439. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2023.1251439>
- [20] Vu, M. C. (2024). The role of Buddhist religious logics in family SMEs. *International Small Business Journal*, 42(2), 145–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02662426231182425>
- [21] Vu, M. C. (2025). A non-Western tension-centred approach to meaningful work. *Organization Studies*, 46(1), 87–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406241290040>
- [22] Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2001). *Managing the unexpected: Assuring high performance in an age of complexity*. Jossey-Bass.
- [23] Williams, P., & Tribe, A. (2000). *Buddhist thought: A complete introduction to the Indian tradition*. Routledge.