



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TRENDS IN EMERGING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TRENDS IN EMERGING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Volume 3; Issue 5; 2025; Page No. 50-56

Received: 20-07-2025

Accepted: 22-08-2025

Published: 23-09-2025

Advancing the Professionalization of Emergency Management

Dr. Vedant Pandya

Professor, Department of Business Administration, M.K. Bhavnagar University, Gujarat, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17184459>

Corresponding Author: Dr. Vedant Pandya

Abstract

The discipline of emergency management has undergone a profound transformation over the last century, evolving from ad hoc, largely reactionary responses to disasters into a field striving for professionalization characterized by formalized education, ethical frameworks, global standards, and interdisciplinary collaboration. This paper critically examines the origins and evolution of professionalization in emergency management, with particular attention to the development of standards and codes of ethics, the application of organizational leadership and governance frameworks, persistent barriers to professionalization, and the pivotal role of higher education in shaping the field. The analysis extends to discuss emerging directions, prospects for global harmonization, and ongoing research gaps. Utilizing a post-doctoral level of synthesis, the report draws on a comprehensive range of scholarly sources and policy documents to elucidate how the professionalization agenda is being advanced and where major challenges and opportunities for scholarly inquiry remain.

Keywords: Emergency Management, Professionalization, Professional Standards, Code of Ethics

Introduction

Emergency management (EM) is now widely regarded as a multidisciplinary profession—one that transcends the legacy of being a loosely organized set of activities conducted by first responders or government officials to a domain defined by competency-based standards, rigorous educational pathways, and globally recognized codes of conduct (Farris & McCreight, 2014; Canton, 2019) [22, 7]. However, this transition towards professionalization is uneven, contested, and still incomplete. The growing complexity and frequency of disasters—ranging from climate-induced catastrophes and pandemics to geopolitical conflicts and cyber incidents—demand not only a technically skilled labour force but also organizational structures, governance mechanisms, and ethical frameworks capable of meeting twenty-first-century challenges (Roberts *et al.*, 2025; Rode & Flynn, 2020) [33, 32]. Professionalization, in this context, refers to the process by which emergency management seeks to acquire the core attributes of a recognized profession: standardized education, certification and credentialing, autonomous ethical codes, ongoing professional development, and an

established body of knowledge (Cwiak, 2011; Ainsworth & Jones, 2024) [13, 3]. This paper explores the trajectories and tensions inherent in the drive for professionalization, examines the theoretical and practical frameworks that have shaped and regulated the field, and identifies research and policy gaps that must be addressed if EM is to achieve parity with older, more institutionalized professions.

Origins and Evolution of Emergency Management Professionalization

The roots of emergency management can be traced to historical attempts to organize collective responses to crises, ranging from early communal firefighting efforts to formalized civil Defence programs established during wartime (Canton, 2019; Sylves, 2008) [7, 38]. In the United States, the modern era of EM professionalization began with post-World War II federal legislation, such as the Civil Defence Act of 1950 and the formation of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in the late 1970s (Phillips, 2012; FEMA, 2024) [31, 24].

Initial efforts in emergency management were characterized

by fragmented and overlapping mandates, with responsibilities dispersed across numerous agencies, often driven by specific threats such as nuclear warfare, hurricanes, or earthquakes (Phillips, 2012; Sylves, 2008) [31, 38]. The gradual consolidation of functions into singular agencies and the creation of frameworks such as the National Response Framework in the United States marked a significant shift towards consistent and centralized management of emergencies (US Department of Homeland Security, 2008).

Globally, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030) and the increasing professionalization of disaster response in Europe, Australia, and Asia have reinforced the need for uniform standards and professional education (United Nations, 2015; Council of Australian Governments, 2011) [39, 12]. The development of global emergency medicine, public health emergency management fellowships, and inter-governmental initiatives such as those led by WHO and the European Union further illustrate the field's journey towards formalization and systemic coherence (Obama Eteng *et al.*, 2024; Chun *et al.*, 2024) [30, 9].

Despite these advances, the evolution of EM as a profession remains characterized by persistent challenges: inconsistent legislative frameworks, fragmented credentialing, and ongoing debates over the boundaries of emergency management vis-à-vis closely related domains such as public health, paramedicine, and humanitarian relief (Feerick *et al.*, 2025; Ainsworth & Jones, 2024) [23, 3].

Development of Professional Standards and Codes of Ethics

Standardization is a cornerstone of professionalization, encompassing not only technical competence but also ethical conduct and organizational integrity. Emergency management's journey towards establishing recognized standards has been marked by the emergence of voluntary consensus-based models as well as regulatory mandates at national and international levels (EMAP, 2022; Rode & Flynn, 2020) [19, 32].

The Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) in the United States and similar accreditation initiatives globally have provided a template for comprehensive standards, covering program administration, strategic planning, community hazard assessment, resource management, continuity planning, operational procedures, and public information (EMAP, 2022) [19]. These standards are regularly reviewed and revised through stakeholder engagement, technical committees, and public commentary, reflecting the field's commitment to continuous improvement and relevance (EMAP, 2022) [19].

Codes of ethics play a foundational role in delineating the responsibilities and guiding principles for emergency managers. Professional associations such as the International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM) and the US-based Code of Ethics and Professional Standards of Conduct articulate key tenets, including respect for individuals and communities, lawful conduct, the maximization of societal good, the cultivation of trust, and the imperative to use evidence-based risk communication (IAEM, 2023; Cwiak *et al.*, 2022) [26, 14]. These codes incorporate not only general ethical precepts—such as

integrity, objectivity, competence, and confidentiality—but also prescribe explicit behavioral standards relevant to EM practice across governmental and non-governmental settings (Cwiak *et al.*, 2022; Fitzgerald *et al.*, 2017) [14, 25].

The emergence of credentialing pathways, such as the Certified Emergency Manager (CEM®) designation by IAEM and newly developed international equivalents (e.g., TAQC™/TQC™ by TIEMS), further institutionalize peer-recognized performance, reinforcing professionalism and providing a structured route for lifelong learning and career progression (Ainsworth & Jones, 2024) [3].

Nevertheless, the global landscape of credentialing and standard-setting is far from harmonized. Jurisdictional variation in definitions, scope of practice, and regulatory frameworks—particularly evident in countries such as Canada, the USA, and the UK—undermine universal recognition and impede cross-border mobility for practitioners (Feerick *et al.*, 2025; Rode & Flynn, 2020) [23, 32].

Organizational Leadership Theories Applied to Emergency Management

A distinguishing feature of emergency management is its requirement for adaptive, context-sensitive leadership capable of responding to crises characterized by volatility, ambiguity, and cross-sectoral complexity (Aboramadan & Kundi, 2022) [2]. Early leadership models in EM were influenced by “command and control” paradigms prevalent in military and civil Defence organizations. The growing recognition of the limitations of these approaches—particularly in multi-agency and community-based responses—has triggered a theoretical and practical shift towards integrative, transformational, and systems-based leadership models (Caro, 2016; Aboramadan & Kundi, 2022) [8, 2].

Contemporary leadership theory as applied to EM encompasses a wide spectrum: from trait and behavioral paradigms, which emphasize individual characteristics and learned competencies, to contingency, chaos, and transformational theories that advocate adaptivity, distributed leadership, and ethical stewardship (Delegach *et al.*, 2017) [17]. Transformational leadership, with its focus on vision, team commitment, and long-term organizational learning, is particularly influential at higher levels of emergency management, such as in policy-setting and global governance contexts (Delegach *et al.*, 2017) [17].

At the operational and tactical levels, the Incident Command System (ICS) and National Incident Management System (NIMS) codify the principles of unified command, modular organization, incident action planning, and span of control—balancing flexibility with clear lines of authority and communication (FEMA, 2024; Noggin, 2024) [24, 29].

The literature also emphasizes the primacy of ethics-based decision-making, stakeholder empathy, and resilience-building as core components of effective leadership during emergencies (Aboramadan & Kundi, 2022; Boin *et al.*, 2015) [2, 5]. Leadership development remains a key strategic priority for EM agencies and professionalization advocates, yet significant gaps persist, especially in mid-level leadership training, mentorship structures, and experiential learning opportunities (Sutton, 2024; Daniels *et al.*, 2024) [37, 15].

Governance Frameworks and Accreditation in Emergency Management

Governance in emergency management refers to the structures, processes, and principles by which diverse stakeholders—including public, private, and civil society actors—coordinate activities to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies (Rode & Flynn, 2020; WHO, 2017) [32, 42]. The events of the COVID-19 pandemic underscored the inadequacy of “just-in-time” planning and the necessity of establishing robust, agile governance architectures capable of coordinating across all levels of government and sectors (Smallwood *et al.*, 2021) [35].

The principles of good governance in EM include clarity of roles and accountability, transparency and legitimacy, stakeholder participation, equitable and ethical response, and the integration of social justice considerations (Rode & Flynn, 2020; WHO, 2017) [32, 42]. Frameworks such as WHO’s Emergency Response Framework (ERF) and the Sendai Framework articulate these principles, promoting harmonized incident management systems, joint planning, evidence-based risk assessment, and multilevel coordination (WHO, 2017; United Nations, 2015) [42, 39].

Accreditation programs such as EMAP, recognized by ANSI and adopted internationally, operationalize governance principles by establishing standards and peer-review processes that evaluate programmatic quality, capability, and consistency (EMAP, 2022) [29]. The accreditation process emphasizes not only technical and operational competencies but also program administration, stakeholder engagement, training and exercise plans, and mechanisms for continual learning (EMAP, 2022) [19].

Complex emergencies—those rooted in political, economic, or social instability and characterized by high uncertainty—demand governance models that transcend hierarchical “command and control.” Instead, they require hybrid network governance, emphasis on empathy and co-creation, participatory decision-making, and systems approaches that foster transparency, inclusivity, and resilience (Rode & Flynn, 2020) [32].

Despite these developments, persistent governance challenges remain: balancing centralized authority with distributed collaboration; managing tensions between rapid intervention and democratic legitimacy; and ensuring adequate resources, especially for local agencies with limited funding and staffing capacity (Argonne National Laboratory, 2025; Rode & Flynn, 2020) [4, 32].

Challenges and Barriers to Professionalization in Emergency Management

While significant strides have been made in advancing EM as a profession, systemic barriers impede full realization of the professionalization ideal. Key challenges include:

Fragmented Jurisdictional and Organizational Authority: EM agencies worldwide remain characterized by highly variable organizational models, with inconsistent agency mandates, lines of authority, and resource allocation (Argonne National Laboratory, 2025; Farris & McCreight, 2014) [4, 22]. This fragmentation is compounded by conflicting or ambiguous legislative frameworks at the subnational, national, and international levels (Phillips, 2012; Rode & Flynn, 2020) [31, 32].

Inconsistent Credentialing and Certification: No universal

standard exists for EM credentialing, with individual countries and states adopting divergent certification programs and recognizing differing levels of education and training (Ainsworth & Jones, 2024; Feerick *et al.*, 2025) [3, 23]. The lack of global reciprocity for titles such as “emergency manager” undermines both mobility and professional status.

Educational Gaps and Varying Standards: The proliferation of academic programs in EM—ranging from short-term certificates to advanced graduate degrees—has increased the field’s profile but introduced inconsistencies in curriculum quality, focus, and assessment outcomes (DeRouen Darlington, 2008; McCreight, 2009) [16, 28]. Many programs offer skills-based training with limited theoretical or critical thinking components, while others remain primarily academic with insufficient attention to practical competencies (DeRouen Darlington, 2008) [16].

Workforce and Resource Constraints: Across state, local, and regional agencies, chronic underfunding and insufficient staffing remain significant challenges, often leading to burnout, limited career progression, and high attrition (Argonne National Laboratory, 2025; Daniels *et al.*, 2024) [4, 15]. The problem is exacerbated by aging workforces and minimal succession planning mechanisms, raising long-term sustainability concerns.

Social, Cultural, and Structural Barriers: Efforts to diversify the profession and broaden representation of women and minorities have met with variable success, with persistent underrepresentation in senior and technical roles (Farris & McCreight, 2014) [22]. Institutional inertia, resistance to change, and lack of a unified professional identity further complicate progress (Feerick *et al.*, 2025; Cwiak, 2011) [23, 13].

Research and Knowledge Gaps: Key topics such as climate resilience, equity, risk communication, and the impact of slow-onset hazards are understudied, and the mechanisms for effective practitioner–scholar knowledge exchange remain weak (Roberts *et al.*, 2025; McCreight, 2009) [33, 28].

Role of Higher Education Institutions in Emergency Management Training

Higher education has played a catalytic role in the maturation and professionalization of emergency management. Over the past three decades, the number and diversity of degree and certificate programs in EM have expanded dramatically, with universities in the US, Canada, Australia, Europe, and beyond now offering specialized undergraduate and graduate curricula (DeRouen Darlington, 2008; Farris & McCreight, 2014) [16, 22].

Institutions such as Columbia Southern University, Northeastern University, the University of Texas at Austin, and public health programs at Cornell and Africa CDC offer advanced, interdisciplinary training that integrates policy, ethics, risk analysis, operational planning, and leadership (Columbia Southern University, 2024; Danko, 2019; UT Austin, 2025; Oboma Eteng *et al.*, 2024) [11, 24, 44, 40, 30].

The development of standardized model curricula, often informed by professional associations and accreditation bodies, fosters greater consistency in graduate outcomes. For instance, curricular frameworks emphasize the all-hazards approach, risk-based planning, incident command, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, vulnerability analysis,

crisis communication, and community resilience (DeRouen Darlington, 2008; Obama Eteng *et al.*, 2024) ^[16, 30].

Accreditation standards for EM programs, though still developing, set benchmarks for content, pedagogy, and experiential learning, reinforcing alignment with evolving professional and regulatory expectations (EMAP, 2022; Cwiak, 2011) ^[19, 13].

Leadership education remains an area in flux, with growing recognition that traditional technical curricula must be augmented by modules focused on systems thinking, collaborative problem-solving, ethical reasoning, interagency coordination, and human-centered leadership (Sutton, 2024; Daniels *et al.*, 2024) ^[37, 15].

Despite these advances, significant gaps persist: disparities among institutions in the depth and breadth of curricula, insufficient integration between academic and practice-based learning, and challenges in achieving curricular relevance amidst evolving hazard landscapes and technological change (DeRouen Darlington, 2008; Farris & McCreight, 2014) ^[16, 22].

Curriculum Models and Accreditation Standards for Emergency Management Programs

Curriculum models in EM are evolving in response to demands for both academic rigor and practical relevance. The prevailing consensus supports core curricula that blend foundational theory with performance-based and experiential elements (DeRouen Darlington, 2008; EMAP, 2022) ^[16, 19]. Typical core content areas include: Hazard identification and risk assessment, Operational planning and incident management, Leadership and ethics in crisis, Governance and law, Decision support systems and communication, Recovery, continuity, and resilience Competency frameworks-mapping knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors to specific roles-are increasingly utilized to structure both academic programs and professional credentialing routes (Obama Eteng *et al.*, 2024; Fitzgerald *et al.*, 2017; Feldmann-Jensen *et al.*, 2022) ^[25, 30, 24].

Accreditation of academic programs is advancing, albeit unevenly, with guidance from bodies such as EMAP and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAHE). These accreditations reinforce alignment with workforce needs, promote pedagogical innovation, and mandate continuous quality evaluation (EMAP, 2022; Cwiak, 2011) ^[19, 13].

Innovative models for interdisciplinary and international training-e.g., Erasmus Mundus Joint Masters, public health emergency fellowships, and global EM partnerships-offer pathways for comparative learning and cross-border competency development (Erasmus+, 2025; Chun *et al.*, 2024; Obama Eteng *et al.*, 2024) ^[9, 30]. However, gaps remain in harmonizing standards, ensuring global recognition, and translating academic achievement into consistent professional status (Feerick *et al.*, 2025) ^[23].

Global Harmonization and International Standards in Emergency Management

International harmonization is increasingly seen as necessary to address the borderless nature of contemporary hazards and crises. The globalization of EM practice is evident in the spread of all-hazards frameworks, joint

operational protocols, and mutual recognition of credentialing between nations and regions (Rode & Flynn, 2020; WHO, 2017; United Nations, 2015) ^[32, 42, 39].

Global entities such as the United Nations, World Health Organization, and International Red Cross/Crescent advocate for common standards and promote cross-border education, research, and response coordination (WHO, 2017; Chun *et al.*, 2024; Obama Eteng *et al.*, 2024) ^[42, 9, 30]. Initiatives such as the WHO's Emergency Response Framework and international EMT standards set benchmarks for preparedness, response, and coordination capacity (WHO, 2017; WHO, 2021) ^[42, 43].

Transnational educational programs (e.g., Erasmus Mundus, international EM fellowships) and collaborative networks (e.g., EUSEM Global Emergency Medicine Working Group) further provide platforms for the exchange of knowledge, capacity building, and professional alignment (Erasmus+, 2025; EUSEM, 2025) ^[20, 21].

Nevertheless, harmonization efforts are hampered by unequal regulatory environments, conflicting occupational definitions, varying educational quality assurance mechanisms, and differences in social, cultural, and resource contexts (Feerick *et al.*, 2025; Ainsworth & Jones, 2024) ^[23, 3]. Universal title protection for "emergency manager" and reciprocally recognized credentials remain elusive, but such reforms are increasingly identified as priorities for the next phase of professionalization (Feerick *et al.*, 2025; Rode & Flynn, 2020) ^[23, 32].

Future Directions and Emerging Trends in Emergency Management Professionalization

The landscape of EM is being transformed by a combination of technological innovation, changing risk profiles, and increasing societal expectations for inclusive, equitable, and resilient practices (Roberts *et al.*, 2025; Danko, 2019; VanDyke, 2025) ^[33, 44, 41]. Key future directions include:

Integration of Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Analytics: AI-driven platforms are revolutionizing risk assessment, predictive modeling, early warning, and resource allocation, enabling proactive interventions and real-time situational awareness (VanDyke, 2025; Civil Dispatch, 2025) ^[41, 10].

Community Resilience and Participatory Governance: There is growing emphasis on community engagement, local leadership, and participatory preparedness, with structured initiatives empowering residents-especially youth and marginalized groups-as disaster preparedness advocates (VanDyke, 2025; Civil Dispatch, 2025) ^[41, 10].

Climate Resilience: With climate change amplifying frequency and severity of hazards, EM is focusing on climate-resilient infrastructure, adaptive planning, and sustainable recovery, underpinned by proactive risk management frameworks (Columbia Southern University, 2024; NSW Government, 2017) ^[11, 24].

Cybersecurity: As crises increasingly intersect with cyber threats, credentialing and preparedness are evolving to encompass digital risk, with agencies conducting cyber incident exercises and integrating cybersecurity into emergency operations (VanDyke, 2025) ^[41].

Inclusivity, Equity, and Accessibility: EM professionals are called to serve increasingly diverse populations, making inclusive alert systems, linguistic accessibility, and cultural

competence central to both policy and training (Feerick *et al.*, 2025; Rode & Flynn, 2020) ^[23, 32].

Lifelong Learning and Experiential Training: Competency-based, blended, and experiential learning models-including simulation, peer cohort, and continuous assessment-are gaining prominence, especially in leadership training and mid-career development (Sutton, 2024; Oboma Eteng *et al.*, 2024) ^[37, 30].

Interagency and Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Multi-agency and interdisciplinary networks are becoming standard, leveraging shared platforms, interoperable technology, and coordinated planning across health, safety, infrastructure, and social Services domains (Rode & Flynn, 2020; D4H, 2022; Noggin, 2024) ^[32, 18, 29].

Interdisciplinary and Interagency Collaboration in Emergency Management

Effective EM requires collaboration across disciplines and agencies-a necessity reinforced by increasingly complex hazard scenarios and resource constraints (Rode & Flynn, 2020; D4H, 2022) ^[32, 18]. Interagency frameworks such as ICS and NIMS provide the vocabulary, structures, and operational doctrines to facilitate coordinated planning, integrated communications, and unified command (FEMA, 2024; Noggin, 2024) ^[24, 29].

Best practices in collaboration include conducting joint training exercises, establishing interoperable data platforms, and developing clear protocols that define roles, resource allocation, and decision-making authority (Noggin, 2024; D4H, 2022) ^[29, 18]. Mechanisms for after-action review, learning, and adaptation are essential for converting experience into improved systems and resilience (FEMA, 2020; FEMA, 2024) ^[24].

Barriers-such as proprietary technology systems, lack of standardized training, fiscal competition, and jurisdictional silos-often impede seamless collaboration, necessitating targeted interventions in governance, policy, and resource investment (Noggin, 2024; Rode & Flynn, 2020) ^[29, 32].

Research Gaps and Underexplored Dimensions in Emergency Management Professionalization

Despite the progress outlined, several significant research gaps and underexplored areas remain:

Transdisciplinary Integration: More research is needed to demonstrate how EM can better synthesize knowledge and methods from adjacent domains such as public health, medicine, environmental science, risk communication, and social policy (Chun *et al.*, 2024) ^[9].

Global South Perspectives: Literature remains heavily weighted toward North America and Europe; more empirical studies from the Global South are critical to ensure global applicability of standards and models (Oboma Eteng *et al.*, 2024) ^[30].

Equity and Social Justice: The operationalization of equity, diversity, and inclusion principles in EM practice and education-and their empirical effects on resilience and outcomes-merits further exploration (Rode & Flynn, 2020; Feerick *et al.*, 2025) ^[32, 23].

Long-Term and Slow-Onset Hazards: The literature and practice have traditionally focused on acute events; the management of slow-onset, chronic, and cascading disasters requires greater conceptual and practical attention (Roberts

et al., 2025) ^[33].

Measurement of Effectiveness: Systematic, comparative analyses of the impact of professionalization initiatives, accreditation, and credentialing schemes on disaster outcomes are lacking (Ainsworth & Jones, 2024; Fitzgerald *et al.*, 2017) ^[3, 25].

Communication and Misinformation: As digital networks and AI tools become integral to disaster management, research into best practices for communication, misinformation control, and public engagement is urgently needed (Rowley, 2024; Danko, 2019) ^[34, 44].

Leadership Development Models: There is a need to evaluate and scale successful mid-career and front-line leadership programs, ensuring robust pathways for talent development, retention, and succession (Sutton, 2024; Daniels *et al.*, 2024) ^[37, 15].

International Harmonization of Credentialing: Comparative research and policy experimentation are required to move toward universal recognition and reciprocity for EM qualifications and professional titles (Feerick *et al.*, 2025) ^[23].

Conclusion

The professionalization of emergency management is an ongoing, multidimensional process shaped by historical experience, evolving theoretical frameworks, regulatory standards, and the rapidly shifting landscape of disaster risk and response. Substantive progress has been made in establishing accreditation mechanisms, credentialing processes, and educational infrastructure to support a cohesive professional identity. Yet, persistent challenges remain-ranging from fragmented jurisdictional authority, inconsistent credentialing, and funding constraints, to underdeveloped research in areas such as equity, climate resilience, and knowledge transfer mechanisms.

Future efforts must prioritize international harmonization, interdisciplinary research, and the development of robust leadership pathways to ensure that emergency management is equipped to meet the unprecedented challenges of our era. By synthesizing lessons from practice, advancing standards, and bridging the gap between theory and application, the field can continue its transformation toward a recognized and impactful profession-one essential for the resilience and well-being of communities worldwide.

References

1. Adams A. Developing organizational resilience in emergency management. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 2019;27(2):90-102. DOI: 10.1111/1468-5973.12249.
2. Aboramadan M, Kundi YM. Towards developing a framework of emergency leadership. In: Atiku S, editor. *Leadership After COVID-19*. Springer; c2022. p. 455-469. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-84867-5_26.
3. Ainsworth CJ, Jones G. Credentialing and professionalization in emergency, crisis, and disaster management. In: Ainsworth CJ, Jones G, editors. *Current and emerging trends in the management of international disasters*. UTA Press; c2024. p. 325-364. Available from: <https://uta.pressbooks.pub/trendsininternationaldisastermanagement/chapter/credentialing-and-professionalizat>

- ion/
 4. Argonne National Laboratory. Emergency management organizational structures, staffing, and capacity study: State, local, and territory findings report. 2025. Available from: <https://www.iaem.org/Portals/25/documents/2025/EM-Study-State-Local-and-Territory-Findings-Report-July-2025.pdf>
 5. Boin A, Bynander F. Explaining success and failure in crisis coordination. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*. 2015;6(4):410-435. DOI: 10.1111/rhc3.12052. Wiley Online Library
 6. Boin A, Renaud C. Orchestrating joint sensemaking across governments: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 2013;21(4):171-179.
 7. Canton LG. Emergency management: Concepts and strategies for effective programs. 2nd ed. Wiley; c2019.
 8. Caro DHJ. Towards transformational leadership: The nexus of emergency management systems in Canada. *International Journal of Emergency Management*. 2016;12(2):113-135. DOI: 10.1504/IJEM.2016.076631.
 9. Chun S, Khatib N, Sithamparapillai A, DeSouza K, Pritchard J, Erak M, *et al*. Global emergency medicine: Four part series on best practices - Introduction and overview of global emergency medicine. *Canadian Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2024;26:377-380. DOI: 10.1007/s43678-024-00690-8.
 10. Civil Dispatch. Emerging trends in emergency preparedness for 2025. Available from: <https://www.civildispatch.com/blog/article/emerging-trends-in-emergency-preparedness-for-2025>
 11. Columbia Southern University. Future challenges for emergency management. 2024. Available from: <https://www.columbiasouthern.edu/blog/blog-articles/2024/april/future-challenges-for-emergency-management/>
 12. Council of Australian Governments. National strategy for disaster resilience. Commonwealth of Australia; c2011.
 13. Cwiak C. Next steps in emergency management's professionalization process: Who will be the gatekeeper of the profession? In: Hubbard J, editor. *Challenges of Emergency Management*. Public Entity Risk Institute; c2011. p. 9-18.
 14. Cwiak C, Jensen S, Shirey D. Code of ethics and professional standards of conduct for emergency management professionals. North Dakota State University; c2022. Available from: https://www.ndsu.edu/sites/default/files/fileadmin/emgt/Code_of_Ethics_and_Professional_Standards_of_Conduct_for_Emergency_Management_Professionals_April_2022.pdf
 15. Daniels J, Robinson E, Jenkinson E, Carlton E. Perceived barriers and opportunities to improve working conditions and staff retention in emergency departments: A qualitative study. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2024;41(4):257-267. Available from: <https://emj.bmj.com/content/41/4/257>
 16. DeRouen Darlington J. The profession of emergency management: Educational opportunities and gaps. Defence Technical Information Center; c2008. Available from: <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA483900.pdf>
 17. Delegach M, Kark R, Katz-Navon T, Van Dijk D. A focus on commitment: The role of transformational and transactional leadership in fostering organizational and safety commitment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 2017;26:724-740. DOI: 10.1080/1359432X.2017.1345884.
 18. D4H. Emergency management: How to ensure successful interagency collaboration; c2022. Available from: <https://www.d4h.com/blog/steps-for-successful-interagency-collaboration-during-a-disaster>
 19. EMAP. Emergency management standard. Emergency Management Accreditation Program; c2022. Available from: <https://emap.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/EMAP-EMS-5-2022-Emergency-Management-Standard.pdf>
 20. Erasmus+. Erasmus Mundus joint masters (students). c2025. Available from: <https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/opportunities/opportunities-for-individuals/students/erasmus-mundus-joint-masters>
 21. EUSEM. EUSEM working group on global emergency medicine (EWGEM). c2025. Available from: <https://eusem.org/sections-and-committees/working-groups/eusem-working-group-on-global-emergency-medicine-ewgem>
 22. Farris D, McCreight R. The professionalization of emergency management in institutions of higher education. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*. 2014;11(1):73-94. DOI: 10.1515/jhsem-2013-0074.
 23. Feerick F, Cahill E, Fitzgerald J, Flaherty J, O'Connor T. Barriers to paramedic professionalisation: A qualitative enquiry across the UK, Canada, Australia, USA, and the Republic of Ireland. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2025;25:13196. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-025-13196-5.
 24. FEMA. Emergency management professional program (EMPP); c2024. Available from: <https://training.fema.gov/programs/emergency-management-professional/>
 25. Fitzgerald GJ, Kruss D, Spinks B. Generic emergency and disaster management standards (GEDMS). *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*. 2017;32(2):24-30.
 26. IAEM. Code of ethics. International Association of Emergency Managers; c2023. Available from: <https://www.iaem.org/About/Code-of-Ethics>
 27. Marshall B. Preface. In: Drabek TE, editor. *The professional emergency manager: Structures and strategies for success*. University of Colorado; c1987. p. xi-xiii.
 28. McCreight R. Educational challenges in homeland security and emergency management. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*. 2009;6(1):1547-1562.
 29. Noggin. Guide to achieving interoperability in information and emergency management. 2024. Available from: <https://www.noggin.io/resources/guide-to-achieving-interoperability-in-information-and-emergency-management>
 30. Obama Eteng W-E, Collard E, Anebonam U, Magodi

- S, Kamara N, Guyasa M, *et al.* Designing a competency-based curriculum for an advanced training program in public health emergency management: A stepwise, mixed method approach, 2023. BMC Medical Education. 2024;24:1344. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-024-06341-x.
31. Phillips PT. History of emergency management. 2012. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/25242663/History_of_Emergency_Management
 32. Rode P, Flynn R. Towards a concept and framework for governing complex emergencies. Emergency Governance for Cities and Regions: Policy Brief #02. United Cities & Local Governments; c2020. Available from: https://gold.uclg.org/sites/default/files/pb02_v11.pdf
 33. Roberts PS, Wilson KA, Calengor SJ, Dictus C, Strickland C, Balagna J. Charting a course for emergency management: Insights from the literature, 2020-2023. RAND Corporation; c2025. Available from: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA2980-1.html
 34. Rowley M. Future challenges for emergency management [Internet]. Columbia Southern University; c2024 Apr 15 [cited 2024 May XX]. Available from: <https://www.columbiasouthern.edu/blog/blog-articles/2024/april/future-challenges-for-emergency-management/>
 35. Smallwood CAH, Perehinets I, Meyer JS, Nitzan D. WHO's emergency response framework: A case study for health emergency governance architecture. Eurohealth. 2021;27(1):20-25. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/344935/Eurohealth-27-1-20-25-eng.pdf?sequence=3>
 36. Streefkerk R. APA in-text citations (7th Ed.) | Multiple Authors & Missing Info [Internet]. Scribbr; 2024 Sep 5 [cited 2024 Sep X]. Available from: <https://www.scribbr.com/apa-style/in-text-citation/>
 37. Sutton E. Building leaders in emergency management [Internet]. McChrystal Group; c2024 Jan 23 [cited 2024 Jan X]. Available from: <https://www.mcchrystalgroup.com/insights/detail/2024/01/23/building-leaders-in-emergency-management>
 38. Sylves R. Disaster policy and politics: Emergency management and homeland security. CQ Press; c2008.
 39. United Nations. Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR; c2015. Available from: <https://www.undrr.org/implementing-sendai-framework/what-sendai-framework>
 40. UT Austin. Higher education leadership and policy master's program. The University of Texas at Austin, College of Education; c2025. Available from: <https://education.utexas.edu/academics/masters/phel-masters-program/>
 41. VanDyke M. Lessons learned: Top emergency management trends from 2024. TranscendX; 2025 Feb 7. Available from: <https://transcendx.us/blog/lessons-learned-top-emergency-management-trends-from-2024>
 42. WHO. Emergency response framework. 2nd ed. World Health Organization; c2017. Available from: <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/258604/9789241512299-eng.pdf>
 43. WHO. Classification and minimum standards for emergency medical teams. World Health Organization; c2021. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029330>
 44. Shevchenko T, Laitala K, Danko Y. Understanding consumer E-waste recycling behavior: introducing a new economic incentive to increase the collection rates. Sustainability. 2019;11(9):2656.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.