

CERTAIN METHODOLOGICAL MILESTONES IN RESEARCH ON POLITICAL-MILITARY CRISIS MANAGEMENT

Ruslana GROSU

“Alexandru cel Bun” Military Academy of Armed Forces, Chişinău,
Republic of Moldova
ruslana.grosu@gmail.com

Abstract: *The scientific research on contemporary political-military crises requires the application of a diversified and relevant methodology, which combines interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary perspectives and highlights the importance of that framework to understand their dynamics and impact on international security. The objectives of the research include analyzing certain methodological approaches, highlighting their importance in formulating of recommendations for improving intervention strategies. The importance of this analysis is amplified by the need for a better understanding of the dynamics of crises, which threaten the regional stability and influence the global order. Thus, methodological diversity in analyzing contemporary political-military crises is imperative to address and nuance the complexity and uncertainty that characterize the international community. Each method brings a valuable perspective, and combining them in an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach maximizes the potential to develop some effective and sustainable responses to global crises. Such syntheses could serve as a methodological foundation in conducting new studies and formulating recommendations for more cohesive and widely accepted policies, while the use of a diversified methodology enhances the credibility and relevance of the research in the eyes of political decision-makers and other stakeholders.*

Keywords: crisis management, political-military crisis, methodology, research methods

1. Introduction

The analysis of contemporary crises requires the application of a diversified and relevant methodology that combines interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary perspectives due to the complexity and interconnectedness of global challenges. These pertinent methodological features are essential to understanding and managing crises effectively. The purpose of this research is to analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of the various methodologies applied in the study of political-military crises and their management, highlighting the importance of an interdisciplinary and

multidisciplinary framework in understanding the complexity and interconnectivity between contexts.

The specific objectives include identifying and analyzing the methodological approaches used in crisis management and its study, and arguing their necessity in formulating of recommendations for improving certain intervention strategies.

The importance of the research is underlined by the need for a better understanding of contemporary crises, which are marked by their dynamics and impact on international security. The political-military crises, such as armed conflicts, including pandemics and climate

change, not only threaten the regional stability, but also influence the world order, requiring quick and effective responses.

Therefore, this research not only responds to an immediate need to understand crises, but aspires to provide a solid foundation for formulating more effective policies and strategies that anticipate and adequately respond to the dynamics and challenges of political-military crises in the current global context.

1.1. Research Question

The paper clearly articulates the necessity of a distinctive research methodology for studying political-military crises, emphasizing the need for an approach that is as multifaceted as the crises themselves. Political-military crises, by their nature, are complex phenomena that span multiple domains (political, military, social, economic, and environmental), making traditional, monodisciplinary methods insufficient for their analysis and resolution.

The research question is focused on assessing and enhancing the effectiveness of various methodological approaches, used by various researchers, in understanding and managing these crises. The inherent complexity and the rapidly evolving nature of such crises demand a research methodology that is not only interdisciplinary, but also adaptable to the dynamic interplay of factors that characterize these events. The paper highlights that the traditional approaches often fall short in capturing the nuanced realities of political-military crises, which are marked by a high degree of uncertainty and continuous change. The study argues for a methodology that integrates multiple disciplines, combining theoretical perspectives and practical applications to better grasp the intricacies of these crises. This approach is necessary to achieve a holistic understanding and to formulate effective intervention strategies. The research aims to bridge the gaps identified in the existing literature, which often

overlooks the roles of non-state actors and environmental factors, or is limited by a regional focus that may not capture global dynamics.

The paper underscores the importance of methodological diversity to enhance the robustness and relevance of research findings. By employing a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, the research seeks to offer a comprehensive analysis that can inform policymakers. This includes the use of case studies to provide in-depth insights into individual crises, as well as statistical analysis to identify broader trends and patterns.

The necessity for a distinctive research methodology in this field stems from the requirement to address the multi-layered and interconnected challenges posed by political-military crises. Each dimension of analysis (political, military, economic, or environmental) brings, being integrated, a valuable perspective that provides a more accurate and effective understanding of the crises. Thus, the research question about the necessity of such a methodology is positioned as a critical inquiry that not only addresses a gap in the existing academic landscape, but also responds to practical, real-world needs for managing complex crises in a globalized world.

This necessity is further justified by the potential application of research outcomes in shaping policies and strategies that are not merely reactive, but also anticipatory, aiming to mitigate the impact of such crises before they fully manifest. The methodological approach applied by various researchers is therefore not just about understanding the current dynamics of political-military crises, but also about influencing the development of more proactive and resilient systems for crisis management and response.

1.2. Methodology

The paper contains a variety of research methods to analyze and elucidate the methodologies used by other researchers in the field of political-military crisis management. The author conducts a

systematic review, though not in the traditional sense. This method involves a comprehensive and critical evaluation of each included study, assessing the robustness of the research methods employed, the validity of the findings, and the implications for crisis management. By systematically analyzing the methodologies employed across studies, the author offers a *meta-analytical perspective* that enriches the discussion of methodological milestones and informs the development of more refined and effective research strategies. *Document analysis* is used to evaluate and synthesize information from various sources, including policy documents and previous research studies.

Comparative analysis is used to highlight differences and similarities between the methodologies employed in different studies, which is crucial for understanding the diversity of approaches in the field.

1.3. Sources

This research is based on 30 relevant and accessible sources, which has been strategically chosen to provide a comprehensive understanding of the topic, ensuring that the study reflects a diverse array of methodologies, theories, and empirical insights. The inclusion criteria for sources and studies in this research were stringently defined based on relevance to political-military crises, methodological rigor, and the scholarly impact of the publications. This ensures that the analysis encompasses a comprehensive and representative sample of the literature, reflecting diverse perspectives and methodologies within the field.

The sources were chosen based on their relevance to the research question, authority in the field, and their contribution to understanding both the breadth and depth of crisis management. Each source adds a layer of complexity and insight into the interplay of political, military, and societal factors in crisis scenarios.

These sources encompass a range of perspectives: from theoretical frameworks to case studies and empirical analyses, that are crucial for addressing the multifaceted nature of political-military crises. There are several key reasons for the choice of these sources and not others. The sources include works from various fields: International Relations, Military Studies, Crisis Management, and Security Studies. For example, papers written by G. Vasilevski, Y. Choi, and T. Koivula provide insights from different geopolitical and organizational perspectives, crucial for a multidisciplinary approach to crisis management. Certain selected references balance both theoretical discussions and practical applications. This is important in political-military crisis management research, where both theoretical understanding and practical implications play critical roles: studies like those by T. Koivula and B. Giegerich offer theoretical perspectives, while others like C.T. Wang et al. focus more on practical strategies in crisis management.

Including both historical analyses (like the works by Th. Tardy and Kh. Zamoum with T.S. Gorpe) and recent studies (such as S. Kushi and M.D. Toft's dataset on military interventions) ensures that the research considers how understandings and strategies in crisis management have evolved over time.

Some sources reflect a variety of geopolitical contexts, which is vital in understanding the global nature of political-military crises. The diversity in sources allows for comparative analysis across different regions and types of crises. References such as the military intervention project dataset provide empirical data essential for grounding theoretical models and hypotheses in real-world observations, enhancing the study's validity and applicability.

1.4. Some Criteria for Discussing Methodological Milestones

To discuss methodological milestones, it's essential to clearly explain the reasoning

behind the selection of specific criteria and variables. This interdisciplinary approach ensures that the study captures the complexity of political-military crises and the various methodologies used to study them. The paper is not a classic systematic review; however, it is very close to it. The systematic review methodology entails a thorough and critical evaluation of each included study. This process includes assessing the robustness of the research methods employed, the validity of the findings, and the implications for crisis management. This rigorous analysis is crucial for synthesizing the existing research and for highlighting methodological gaps and opportunities for future research.

This methodology inherently justifies the selection of sources and methods, as it requires a comprehensive search and evaluation strategy that is documented in the research protocol. This is a well-founded methodological framework by detailing the search terms, databases used, and the criteria for inclusion.

The *variables* were identified through a systematic examination of the literature to capture key methodological approaches used across studies. These include qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches, as well as specific analytical frameworks such as case studies, statistical analysis, and theoretical modeling. The selection of these variables was guided by their prevalence in the literature and their significance in contributing to an understanding of political-military crisis management.

The findings from the research provide insights into the most effective and commonly used research methods in the field of political-military crisis management. This meta-analytical perspective not only enriches the discussion of methodological milestones, but also informs the development of more refined and effective research strategies.

By systematically analyzing the methodologies employed across studies,

the research identifies gaps in the current literature, such as under-explored areas or methodologies that may benefit from further development.

1.5. Variables and Relations

The research has been structured to not only critique and assess various methodologies used in political-military crisis management, but also to synthesize these findings into a coherent model. This model elucidates the relationships and dependencies among different variables identified throughout the literature review. Through this review were identified the follow critical *variables* such as types of crises (armed conflicts, pandemics, climate changes), involved actors (state and non-state actors, international organizations), the impact level (local, regional, global) response strategies, and outcome measures. These *variables* are:

- essential in understanding the dynamics of political-military crises;
- crucial as they influence the choice of methodological approach, whether it be qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods.

For example, understanding the role of non-state actors like terrorist organizations or international NGOs might require qualitative case studies or interviews, while analyzing the impact of military interventions on regional stability might benefit from quantitative data analysis.

The relationships between these variables were mapped to illustrate how different crisis types affect regional stability and international security, how various actors interact within these crises, and what outcomes result from different management strategies.

These considerations ensure that the research methodology is robust and capable of addressing the nuanced complexities of political-military crises, making it possible to draw actionable insights that are relevant to policymakers and practitioners in the field.

1.6. Conceptual Model

The *conceptual model* integrates these variables into a structured diagram that visually represents the interactions and influences among them. This model helps in understanding the complexity and interconnectivity of the variables involved in political-military crisis management.

The model serves multiple purposes:

- it provides a framework for analyzing the effectiveness of different crisis management approaches and predicting potential outcomes;
- it aids in the dissemination of complex interrelations to stakeholders and policymakers;
- it offers a baseline for future research foundation, highlighting certain gaps and areas for further investigation.

The development of a conceptual model, which clearly highlights the variables and their relationships within the realm of political-military crisis management, not only strengthens the research's foundation, but also addresses the relevance and applicability of the used examples. This approach ensures that the research provides valuable insights that are both theoretically informed and practically relevant, facilitating a deeper understanding of complex crisis dynamics. The selected examples in the study are representative of the broader dynamics and challenges in political-military crisis management. Each example was chosen based on its ability to illustrate the practical application of theoretical models and to reflect the diverse geographic and political contexts in which these crises occur. The examples serve to validate and exemplify the relationships and processes described in the conceptual model, ensuring that the model is not only theoretically sound, but also practically applicable.

By systematically linking the examples to the conceptual model and explicitly detailing the variable interactions, the study enhances its methodological rigor, addressing potential critiques regarding the

selection and use of examples. The systematic approach to the selection of sources and defining of variables and criteria aims to increase the credibility and applicability of research results. This provides a solid basis for understanding and managing the complicated dynamics of political-military crises, but also for facilitating the didactic activity in the teaching of the academic discipline Crisis Management.

2. General Considerations on Theories and Theoretical Models

The study of political-military crises draws on a variety of theories and theoretical models from diverse disciplines, including international relations, political science, and security studies. Among the most pertinent theories are realism, liberalism, constructivism, conflict theory, and game theory.

Regarding realism, this paradigm posits that states are rational actors seeking to maximize their power and security within an anarchic international system, making it a fundamental theory for understanding how states respond to military threats and crises. Liberalism focuses on the role of international institutions and norms in mitigating conflicts and promoting cooperation, and within the context of political-military crises, liberalism explores how economic linkages and multilateral policies can prevent or resolve conflicts. The constructivist approach considers the role of ideas, identities, and cultures in shaping states' interests and actions, and in the study of crises, constructivism can elucidate how perceptions and discourses influence responses to crises. By examining the origins and dynamics of conflicts within and between societies, conflict theory is crucial for understanding the underlying causes of military conflicts and the ways to manage them. Employed to model strategic decisions among actors with opposing or competitive interests, game theory can provide valuable insights into

negotiations and the formulation of strategies for conflict or cooperation.

A critical analysis of the existing literature reveals several gaps and limitations in the research on political-military crises: the predominance of a single theoretical perspective, the paucity of empirical data, the underestimation of non-state actors, a limited focus on certain regions, the neglect of environmental and technological factors, and more. Many studies are focused on a theory, such as realism or liberalism, overlooking the value of interdisciplinary approaches that could provide a more comprehensive understanding of crisis dynamics. Some research relies on insufficient data, which can compromise the generalizability of conclusions and their applicability. While much research focuses on state actors, the role of non-state actors, such as terrorist organizations or transnational corporations, is often underestimated in the context of military crises. Additionally, there is a tendency to focus on crises in specific geopolitical areas, ignoring how similar crises in other regions might offer valuable lessons and comparable perspectives. Certain traditional studies frequently disregard the impact of climate change and emerging technologies on security and crisis dynamics. Thus, to address these gaps, it is essential to adopt a more holistic and interdisciplinary approach in the research of political-military crises, integrating diverse theories and robust empirical data to better understand and effectively manage contemporary crises.

Addressing the need for methodological diversity, we posit that contemporary crises, such as military conflicts, pandemics, climate change, and economic crises, are complex phenomena affecting different layers of society and the interests of many global actors. Each type of crisis requires diverse approaches to capture all its dimensions. For instance, some scholars, like Yu. Choi, employ a combination of quantitative and qualitative

analyses to assess UN-EU cooperation, providing a comprehensive picture of operational dynamics [1]. This methodological diversity allows researchers to access and integrate multiple perspectives, thereby enhancing the accuracy and relevance of research outcomes. The chosen methodology must be pertinent to the specifics of the problem analyzed, and methodological approaches must be adjusted to reflect the specific context and relevant variables of each crisis. Such relevance ensures that the research is not only rigorous, but also yields results that are applicable and useful for policymakers.

In crisis research, it is crucial to maintain a balance between different methodological approaches to avoid bias and ensure a fair representation of all involved perspectives. For example, G.J. Vasilevski applies qualitative analysis to assess military interventions, balancing it with case studies to introduce specific details and contexts [2]. This methodological balance helps prevent oversimplification and allows for a deeper understanding of complex issues.

The contemporary crises often transcend the disciplinary boundaries, involving the elements of politics, military, economics, sociology, technology, ecology, and psychology. This interdisciplinary nature necessitates an approach that integrates knowledge from various fields to offer comprehensive and effective solutions. For example, T. Koivula addresses the military role of the EU from a perspective that combines political science with security studies, paving the way for a more nuanced understanding of EU military engagements. Beyond general scientific methods, T. Koivula applies a deterministic perspective to demystify the EU's military role, arguing that preconceived perceptions and existing structures predetermine the political and military approaches [3]. The researcher provides a more theoretical analysis compared to other authors, focusing on the

historical and cultural influences on current policies. Meanwhile, other researchers such as C.T. Wang, H.H. Chien, H. E. Tsuei and Y.C.K. Chen conduct studies balancing both the theoretical and applied dimensions [4].

Therefore, the application of a diversified, relevant methodology that integrates interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches is essential for effectively addressing the complexity and interconnectedness of contemporary crises. This methodological approach not only enhances the quality and applicability of research, but also increases the likelihood of formulating intervention strategies that are effective in an increasingly interdependent and dynamic global context. This complex framework is necessary to navigate the multifaceted landscape of global challenges, contributing to the development of policies and practices that are both proactive and reactive.

3. Methodological Diversity in Research on Political-Military Crisis Management

The analysis of contemporary crises, particularly political-military ones, demands a complex and nuanced methodological approach to effectively elucidate the dynamic and interconnected challenges of the modern world. Adopting a diversified, relevant, and interdisciplinary methodology is essential for understanding, anticipating, and managing crises. These methods, along with the specific contributions of the studied authors, provide a solid foundation for addressing these challenges.

We will begin with the historical approach, emphasizing the contributions of researchers in leveraging this perspective. Th. Tardy utilizes historical analysis to evaluate the cooperation between the UN and the EU, while G.R. Winham performs a systematic synthesis of the literature to examine new issues in crisis management. This approach aids in identifying trends and lessons from the past that can

influence current and future strategies. Concurrently, Th. Tardy focuses on the evolution of international cooperation [5], while G.R. Winham analyzes the evolution of concepts and methodologies in the specialized literature, thus providing a basis for reformulating current approaches [6]. Researchers S. Kushi and M.D. Toft [7], K. Zamoum and T.S. Gorpe [8] apply historical analysis to assess trends in military interventions and the evolution of crisis management concepts, respectively. An assessment in the historical approach of the discrepancies between the ambitions and realities of European security policy was conducted by B. Giegerich, who offers a perspective on the evolution of institutional effectiveness [9]. This method allows for the identification of long-term patterns and historical influences on current practices.

A critical analysis in the field of crisis management has been utilized by several authors, including J.L. Richardson [12], but we will focus on the contributions of C. Fahron-Hussey and colleagues, who applied critical analysis in case studies about NATO and EU decisions [13], and the research of Y. Choi, who criticized the effectiveness of UN-EU collaboration, suggesting the need for certain improvements on the structural dimension [1]. Both authors employ a critical approach to highlight the deficiencies both structurally and politically, with C. Fahron-Hussey focusing more on the decision-making process [13], while Y. Choi concentrates on decision execution and collaboration [1].

A dialectical approach has been developed by B. Karabulut through the application of several theories of international relations, combining deductive and inductive approaches to analyze and predict the state behaviors in political-military crises [14]. The use of the dialectical method has been identified in the research of authors J. Kuvekalović Stamatović and H. Ivanovski. The dynamics between the EU and NATO were explored by J. Kuvekalović Stamatović, and H. Ivanovski

analyzed the viability of a common European defense, both utilizing dialectical reasoning to highlight tensions and possibilities. Thus, J. Kuvekalović Stamatović focused on the complex relationship between organizations [15], while H. Ivanovski focused on strategic and political feasibility [16]. Integrating the dialectical approach and structural analysis could offer new ways to understand and reconcile seemingly contradictory interests in security and defense policy.

The application of comparative analysis is quite common among researchers concerned with the management of political-military crises. To understand different national approaches to crisis management, K. Štrbac and B. Milosavljević resorted to collecting data from multiple secondary sources to measure the effectiveness of crisis responses [17]. Similarly, this approach applied by J. Schmidt is complemented by document analysis to investigate the role of the EU as an international military actor, with the author focusing on the EU's autonomy in international crises [18].

The analysis and synthesis are the most widely utilized methods, and with regard to political-military crises, these methods have been applied with an emphasis on various aspects. For instance, N. Hynek used the document analysis to assess the impact of the Treaty of Lisbon on civil-military coordination within the EU, synthesizing information to propose improvements to coordination processes [19]. In the same context, E. Waard, H.W. Volberda, and J.L. Soeters analyzed the adaptability of organizations during crises, synthesizing various cases to extract principles of organizational reactivity [20]. A focus on document analysis and policy analysis was employed by T. Koivula to demystify the military role of the EU, evaluating policy documents to clarify EU military capacity and policies [3]. B. Giegerich applied document analysis to assess the discrepancies between the EU's

ambitions and achievements in crisis management, providing a critical perspective on institutional effectiveness [9; 10]. N. Novaki analyzes the rapid response mechanisms in international crises, focusing on the role of international organizations, with an approach oriented towards policy analysis and international cooperation, and methods include reviewing policy documents, conducting interviews, and observations on simulation exercises, suggesting the need for standardized protocols and a more flexible framework for crisis management [21]. Through the use of document analysis and interviews, Th. Tardy has been noted for evaluating the cooperation between the UN and EU, offering a perspective on the evolution and effectiveness of this collaboration [7].

The authors who have applied functional and structural analysis in researching the discrepancy between the structure and functions of the EU include B. Giegerich [10; 11], while M. Laakkonen employs the Delphi method to anticipate the developments in crisis management, focusing on anticipatory strategic functionality [22]. Noteworthy is B. Giegerich's criticism of the inadequate implementation of existing structures [11], while M. Laakkonen focuses on improving future planning [22].

We note that the diversity of research methods is expressed through the combination of multiple relevant approaches to nuance scientific approach and transform them into a robust support for political and military decision-makers engaged in managing the political-military crises. In support of that idea, we have identified a series of combinations such as the use of logical reasoning and the behavioral approach in the research conducted by B.T. Bakken and G.J. Vasilevski, where B.T. Bakken analyzes behavior under pressure in crises [23], and G.J. Vasilevski uses case studies to logically assess the effects of military and political decisions [2]. Thus, B.T. Bakken

focuses on individual and group behavior under stress [23], while G.J. Vasilevski examines the logic and effects of collective actions [2].

The combination of systemic analysis and structural analysis was found in J. Bergmann and P. Müller, who applied a case study approach and documentary review to investigate reforms in the Common Security and Defense Policy of the EU, analyzing the structures and integration mechanisms [24]. G.J. Vasilevski utilized the comparative analysis and case studies to examine military crisis management operations, evaluating how institutional structures influence outcomes [2]. Yu. Choi elucidated some case studies in a comparative aspect to analyze UN-EU cooperation, focusing on operational structures and functional synergies [1]. Structural analysis was also used by N. Hynek to analyze the structures post-Treaty of Lisbon, evaluating how structural changes have improved or limited civil-military coordination [19].

In some studies, functional analysis is further utilized in conjunction with case studies, each method contributing uniquely in terms of comprehensiveness and the complexity of evaluating the effectiveness of policies of actors or applied mechanisms. Through the application of the Delphi method, M. Laakkonen focused on the functional evaluation of military crisis management by anticipating developments and integrating expert feedback [22]. J. Schmidt employed comparative and documentary analysis to investigate the role of the EU as an international military actor, focusing on the functionality and limitations of this role [18]. B. Giegerich, to examine the discrepancies between the EU's ambitions and achievements in crisis management, applied case studies, focusing on the functionality of the responses [9; 10].

Furthermore, we encounter studies where the functional method is utilized together with the systemic method. The exploration

of the functionality of coordination between the EU, UN, and NATO allowed researchers C. Major and C. Mölling to assess how different systems interact and contribute to crisis management [26]. Among the authors who have applied the systemic method in their research is G.J. Vasilevski to evaluate military interventions, balancing it with case studies to discuss specific details and contexts [2]. This approach allows for a deeper understanding of the complex issues associated with contemporary crises, ensuring a fair representation of all involved perspectives. Additionally, J. Bergmann and P. Müller are other authors who have applied the systemic method in their research to analyze the evolution of reforms in the Common Security and Defense Policy of the EU, providing a detailed perspective on the complex interactions between the various structural and functional elements of security policy [24].

The case studies in the field of crisis research, particularly focusing on political-military issues, have been identified in the article written by S. Yigit, who analysed the Russian invasion of Ukraine as a case study to examine the effects of certain major military events on political alliances [27]. Th. Tardy [28] and G.J. Vasilevski [2] have explored international cooperation and crisis management through many case studies, highlighting the learned lessons and encountered challenges.

The statistical analysis represents a necessary tool in the management of political-military crises, providing essential support for understanding the complexity of crisis contexts, for effective planning, evaluating interventions, and supporting a coordinated approach at a global level. This transforms raw data into valuable information, which can be used to save lives, protect resources, and maintain regional and global stability. In this context, B.T. Bakken employed statistical analysis to assess the impact of behavior under pressure during crises, integrating certain approaches from various fields to offer a comprehensive perspective on

crisis dynamics [23]. The use of statistical analysis was also found in the study conducted by K. Zajączkowski on EU security policy, using data to evaluate the effectiveness of military operations as tools of foreign policy [29]. The statistical analysis has further been applied in leveraging results obtained from interviews. For example, J. Bergmann and P. Müller [24], J. Coelmont [25], and K. Zajączkowski [29] combined the statistical analysis with interviews to assess the dynamics of reforms and EU security policy, providing detailed insights into the effectiveness and limitations of current strategies. A. Kammel și B. Zyla emphasizes the importance of collaboration between various organizations and the multidisciplinary dimension to address the crises holistically, which is vital for effectively responding to the complexity of crisis situations [30].

The use of the interview method in managing political-military crises is essential for capturing the complexity and subtleties of crisis situations, while simultaneously providing flexibility and depth to the analysis. This method allows not only for data collection, but also for building a detailed understanding of the causes, impacts, and potential solutions to crises. Thus, Th. Tardy conducted interviews to complement document analysis and to gain insider perspectives on UN-EU cooperation [7], and N. Hynek used interviews to deepen the understanding of post-Lisbon changes and their impact on civil-military coordination within the EU [19]. The combination of semi-structured interviews with minimalist process tracing was found in J. Bergmann and P. Müller, who chose this method to evaluate the dynamics of reforms in the EU's security and defense policy [24]. Yu. Choi applied the interview method to complement case studies, conducted in a comparative manner in assessing UN-EU cooperation [1].

The pertinence of these methodologies reflects the necessity to approach

contemporary crises with a complete set of analytical tools, ensuring that every dimension of the crisis is comprehensively explored. The balance in methodology prevents reliance on a single perspective and promotes a holistic understanding.

4. Conclusions

Consequently, a methodological diversity in the analysis of contemporary political-military crises is not only necessary, but imperative to address and nuance the complexity and uncertainty of the international community. Each method brings a valuable perspective, and their combination in an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach maximizes the potential to develop effective and sustainable responses to global crises.

Analyzing trends and lessons from the past is crucial for understanding the current context and for guiding future strategies, identifying patterns of success/failure and formulating informed and effective approaches for similar situations in the future. Critical evaluation of existing approaches in crisis management provides valuable insights into the weaknesses of current strategies, underscoring the need to continually adjust and improve intervention methods to effectively face emerging challenges. Combining deductive and inductive approaches allows for a deeper analysis of the behavior of states and non-state actors in political-military crises, offering a framework for anticipating actions and reactions in various crisis scenarios. Comparing different national or organizational approaches to crisis management contributes to understanding the diversity of responses and identifying the most effective practices, which is important for tailoring and customizing responses to the specifics of each situation. The use of analysis and synthesis supports the development of a comprehensive understanding of crises, facilitating the formulation of well-founded and

complexly adapted solutions to current scenarios.

Thus, methodological diversification, from historical analyses to critical and comparative approaches, not only enriches theoretical knowledge, but also enhances the practical applicability of research. New directions for research can emerge from the interaction between different methods and disciplines, offering innovative solutions to both old and new problems. Such syntheses could serve as a methodological foundation in conducting new studies and formulating recommendations for more cohesive and broadly accepted policies, while the use of diversified methodologies increases the credibility and relevance of the research in the eyes of policy-makers and other stakeholders. By presenting well-founded and comprehensive analyses, researchers can more effectively influence public policies and contribute to the formulation of crisis management strategies that are robust, adaptive, and sustainable.

The influence of contemporary events on research methodology applied in analysis on political-military crisis management has been profound, driving significant shifts towards more integrative, dynamic, and technologically driven approaches. Some recent global events, such as pandemics, armed conflicts, and significant geopolitical shifts, have underscored the necessity for methodologies that are as dynamic and complex as the crises themselves. The rapid evolution of these crises demands methodologies that are not only robust, but also flexible enough to adapt to new information and changing circumstances. This has catalyzed a shift towards more agile research practices, including real-time data analysis and the use of adaptive theoretical models that can account for the fluid nature of political-military environments.

The growing availability of data from diverse sources (e.g., satellite imagery, social media) and the advancement in data processing technologies have prompted

methodological innovations. Researchers are increasingly employing big data analytics and machine learning to analyze trends and predict future crisis trajectories, which was inspired by the need to process vast amounts of information quickly and accurately in times of crisis.

Certain contemporary crises often involve a range of non-state actors and are exacerbated by environmental changes, leading to a methodological pivot where these elements are now considered essential to comprehensive crisis analysis. This shift has been propelled by events like climate-induced migrations and transnational terrorist activities, which traditional military-political frameworks had previously overlooked.

The need for methodologies that not only understand, but also anticipate and mitigate crises, has never been more critical. Some contemporary events have demonstrated the limitations of reactive approaches, leading to a greater emphasis on developing proactive strategies that are deeply informed by empirical research and grounded in practical realities.

The findings from these methodologically diverse studies are increasingly shaping policies and strategies at both national and international levels. The ability to quickly adapt research methodologies in response to evolving crises is directly influencing the effectiveness of policy responses, making research outputs timely and more relevant.

Given the unpredictability of political-military crises, future methodological developments are likely to emphasize anticipatory models and scenario planning. These approaches will help policymakers and researchers not only to respond to current crises, but also to prepare for potential future scenarios, thus improving resilience and response strategies.

As crises increasingly transcend national borders, there is a growing recognition of the value of collaborative research efforts that pool knowledge and resources across countries and disciplines. This trend is

likely to expand, fostering a more understanding of global political-military integrated and comprehensive challenges.

References List

- [1] Choi Yunmi. UN-EU cooperation in international peace and security: the driving force behind peacekeeping cooperation. PhD thesis. The University of Edinburgh, 2013.
- [2] Vasilevski Gjorgi J. European Union's military crisis management: challenges and perspectives. PhD Thesis. Fort Leavenworth, KS: US Army Command and General Staff College. 2012.
- [3] Koivula Tommi. The European Union and the use of military force: uncovering the myths. Routledge, 2016.
- [4] Wang C. T., Chien H. H., Tsuei H. E., Chen Y.C.K. Crisis Handling Strategy: A Theoretical and Practical Study for Military Crisis Management. *International Journal of Crisis Management*, 2012, 2.2: 57-67.
- [5] Tardy Thierry. UN-EU Relations in Military Crisis Management: Institutionalisation and Key Constraints. *Studia Diplomatica*, 2009, 43-52.
- [6] Winham Gilbert R. (ed.). New issues in international crisis management. Routledge, 2020.
- [7] Kushi Sidita; Toft Monica Duffy. Introducing the military intervention project: A new dataset on US military interventions, 1776–2019. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2023, 67.4: 752-779.
- [8] Zamoum, Khaled; Gorpe, Tevhide Serra. Crisis management: A historical and conceptual approach for a better understanding of today's crises. In: *Crisis management-theory and practice*. IntechOpen, 2018.
- [9] Giegerich Bastian. Chapter One: EU Crisis Management: Ambitions and Achievements. *The Adelphi Papers*, 2008, 48.397: 15-34.
- [10] Giegerich Bastian. European military crisis management: connecting ambition and reality. Routledge, 2017.
- [11] Giegerich Bastian. European Military Crisis Management. *Studia Diplomatica*, 2009, 37-42.
- [12] Richardson James L. Crisis management: A critical appraisal. In: *New Issues in international Crisis management*. Routledge, 2020. p. 13-36.
- [13] Fahren-Hussey, Claudia. *Military Crisis Management Operations by NATO and the EU*. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019.
- [14] Karabulut Bilal. *International Relations: Theories, Concepts, and Organizations*. Lexington Books, 2024.
- [15] Stamatović Kuvekalović Jovanka. EU and NATO: whose is the victory over managing crises?. *The Review of International Affairs*, 2021, 72.1181: 86-90.
- [16] Ivanovski Hristijan. A common defence for Europe. MA thesis, The University of Manitoba, 2016.
- [17] Štrbac Katarina, Milosavljević Branislav. Crisis management system in European Union: How it works?. *Serbian Journal of Engineering Management*, 2021, 6.1: 45-54.
- [18] Schmidt Julia. The European Union as an Emerging International Military Actor. In: *The European Union and the Use of Force*. Brill Nijhoff, 2020, p. 1-30.
- [19] Hynek Nik. EU crisis management after the Lisbon Treaty: civil–military coordination and the future of the EU OHQ. *European security*, 2011, 20.1: 81-102.

- [20] de Waard Erik, Volberda Henk W., Soeters Joseph L. Drivers of Organizational Responsiveness: Experiences of a military crisis response organization. *Journal of Organizational Design*, 2013, 2.2: 1-14.
- [21] Nováky Niklas. Deploying EU military crisis management operations: a collective action perspective. *European security*, 2015, 24.4: 491-508.
- [22] Laakkonen Mikko. Military crisis management in the next decade (2020-2030): inducing consent or relying on compliance?. 2011.
- [23] Bakken Bjørn T., Gilljam Martin, Haerem Thorvald. Perception and handling of complex problems in dynamic settings: Three cases of relevance to military command and crisis management. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference of the System Dynamics Society*. 2004.
- [24] Bergmann Julian, Müller Patrick. Failing forward in the EU's common security and defense policy: the integration of EU crisis management. *Journal of European public policy*, 2021, 28.10: 1669-1687.
- [25] Coelmont Jo. EU Security Council and a European Commissioner for Security and Defence: The Final Pieces of the Union's Common Security and Defence Policy Puzzle? Egmont Institute, 2022.
- [26] Major Claudia, Mölling Christian. More than wishful thinking? The EU, UN, NATO and the comprehensive approach to military crisis management. *Studia Diplomatica*, 2009, 21-28.
- [27] Yigit Sureyya. Miscalculated Cause-and-Effect: The Russian Invasion of Ukraine and Finland's Accession to NATO. In: *Analyzing Global Responses to Contemporary Regional Conflicts*. IGI Global, 2024. p. 39-51.
- [28] Tardy Thierry. UN-EU Relations in Military Crisis Management: Institutionalisation and Key Constraints. *Studia Diplomatica*, 2009, 43-52.
- [29] Zajączkowski Kamil. EU Military Operations as a Tool in the EU's Foreign Policy Toolbox. *Studia Europejskie*, 2021, 25.4: 7-35.
- [30] Kammel Arnold H., Zyla Benjamin. The comprehensive approach to EU crisis management: Contexts, lessons identified, and policy implications. *Journal of Regional Security*, 2018, 13.1: 39-64.