

DISASTER RECOVERY EXPERIENCES OF SMALL RETAIL BUSINESSES

Dr. Riya Menon

Assistant Professor

Department of Business Management and Entrepreneurship

School of Management Studies

University of Commerce and Business Development, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

Small retail businesses often recover from disruptive events under conditions of limited liquidity, place-dependent customer demand, informal supplier arrangements, and close owner involvement in day-to-day operations. Their recovery is therefore more than the repair of a shop or the reopening of a counter. It is a sequence of decisions about safety, inventory, employees, customer communication, payments, credit, logistics, and the practical meaning of remaining visible within a local market. This paper examines the recovery experiences of small retail enterprises affected by natural hazards, public-health emergencies, infrastructure outages, fire, civil disturbance, and other operational disruptions. The study uses a comparative, evidence-informed review of recovery situations rather than a fabricated survey or unsupported statistical claim. It considers how retail firms stabilise immediate losses, restore core transactions, reconnect with customers and suppliers, adapt delivery and payment channels, and decide whether to return to a pre-disruption model or reorganise around new conditions. The analysis identifies five connected recovery domains: physical premises and utilities, working capital and cash flow, inventory and supplier continuity, customer access and trust, and owner-manager capacity for decision-making. It finds that reopening alone should not be treated as proof of recovery. A retailer may resume trading while facing reduced stock, accumulated debt, fragile demand, disrupted records, staff strain, or an unsafe business location. Recovery is more durable when small retailers have accessible continuity procedures, redundant payment and communication options, simple inventory records, supplier relationships, credible local support, and opportunities to learn from the event. The paper concludes that small retail recovery should be understood as a community-linked process that combines business continuity, financial repair, customer reconnection, and risk-informed adaptation.

Keywords: Small Retail Businesses, Disaster Recovery, Business Continuity, Retail Resilience, Owner-Managers, Supply Disruption, Customer Access, Cash Flow, Community Recovery, Risk Preparedness

1. INTRODUCTION

Small retail businesses occupy a distinctive position in local economies. Grocery outlets, garment shops, pharmacies, repair counters, stationery stores, mobile-accessory sellers, household-goods shops, and neighbourhood speciality retailers provide everyday access to goods while also creating work, local relationships, and commercial activity. Their operating model, however, may be highly exposed to disruption. A single shop can depend on one premise, one owner-manager, a small number of employees, short-cycle inventory, nearby customer footfall, daily digital payments, and a narrow set of suppliers. When a flood, fire, prolonged power outage, public-health restriction, cyber incident, transportation disruption, or civil

disturbance occurs, these dependencies can fail at the same time.

A disaster is commonly understood as a serious disruption created when a hazardous event interacts with exposure, vulnerability, and limited capacity. For a small retailer, this disruption may be visible as damaged stock or a closed storefront, but it can also appear through interrupted deliveries, unavailable payment systems, depleted cash reserves, loss of customer mobility, staff responsibilities at home, or uncertainty about reopening conditions. The immediate shock is only one part of the problem. The following days and months often require business owners to make difficult choices with incomplete information and limited time.

Research on business recovery has shown that firms do not recover in a uniform sequence. Some reopen quickly but trade at reduced capacity; some remain open while absorbing losses; some shift temporarily to delivery, phone orders, digital payment, or shared storage; and some never regain their former customer base. These outcomes are shaped by firm resources, the condition of the local market, the availability of utilities and transport, supplier relationships, insurance and credit access, and the health and decision-making capacity of owner-managers. Studies of disaster-affected businesses therefore caution against equating physical reopening with financial or organisational recovery (Dahlhamer & Tierney, 1998; Asgary, Anjum, & Azimi, 2012).

Retail recovery is also a social process. A small shop may be a source of essential goods, informal information, local trust, and visible economic normality. Customers decide whether they can safely travel, whether they have money to spend, and whether the business can meet their needs. Suppliers decide which accounts to prioritise. Landlords, lenders, local authorities, neighbouring businesses, and family members may become part of the recovery environment. This makes retail resilience dependent not only on internal planning but also on relationships and the condition of the surrounding community.

This study examines recurring recovery experiences among small retail businesses and compares the practical choices that shape short-term continuity and longer-term renewal. It focuses on small enterprises rather than large chains because owner-managed retailers often have fewer formal safeguards and less room to absorb interruption. The aim is to identify recovery practices that are realistic for small firms, attentive to local conditions, and capable of supporting preparedness before the next disruption.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on business disaster recovery has moved beyond the simple question of whether a firm reopens. Early work emphasised the effects of physical damage, business interruption, location, and operational dependence. Later scholarship gave greater attention to organisational learning, owner-

manager judgement, social networks, and the difference between short-term survival and sustained recovery. Webb, Tierney, and Dahlhamer (2000) observed that the study of businesses and disasters requires attention to both direct impacts and the broader social and economic setting in which firms attempt to recover.

Small-business scholarship identifies particular challenges in crisis planning. Owner-managers may recognise risks but postpone formal preparation because immediate trading demands, costs, uncertainty, and limited specialist support make planning difficult. Herbane (2010) described the need for a crisis-based view of small business research, noting that a disruption can threaten the firm, the owner, and the surrounding support system at the same time. This is especially relevant to independent retail, where business and household finances may be closely connected.

Evidence from post-disaster settings shows that business continuity is influenced by financial resources, access to suppliers, property conditions, market demand, institutional support, and the ability to make rapid operational adjustments. Asgary et al. (2012) demonstrated that reopening can coexist with ongoing financial stress, which reinforces the need to assess recovery as an extended process. More recent studies of crisis response also foreground everyday practices such as monitoring operations, protecting available cash, communicating with stakeholders, and adapting work arrangements rather than relying solely on a fixed plan.

Business continuity standards and disaster-risk frameworks provide useful structure, but their application must be scaled to the capacity of micro and small enterprises. A practical continuity plan for a local retailer need not be complex. It should clarify who will make decisions, how customers and suppliers will be contacted, where essential records are kept, what stock or services are most critical, how payments can continue, and what conditions must be met before reopening. The literature therefore supports a proportionate approach in which preparedness, response, recovery, and learning are connected.

LITERATURE REVIEW SUMMARY TABLE

S. No.	Author / Year	Study Focus	Key Contribution	Limitations Identified
1	Dahlhamer & Tierney (1998)	Business recovery after the Northridge earthquake	Explained that recovery varies across firms and is shaped by organisational and environmental conditions.	Context-specific evidence requires careful adaptation to different locations and retail segments.
2	Webb, Tierney, & Dahlhamer (2000)	Businesses and disasters	Mapped major questions about vulnerability, interruption, response, and recovery in business settings.	Broad review does not offer a small-retail recovery checklist for daily decision-making.
3	Runyan (2006)	Barriers to small-business recovery	Highlighted resource limits, planning gaps, and practical barriers encountered after disaster.	Natural-disaster focus may not capture all types of contemporary operational disruption.
4	Herbane (2010)	Crisis-based small-business research	Showed how risk understanding, crisis response, learning, and support systems interact in small firms.	Case-based insights require contextual validation across different retail environments.
5	Doern (2016)	Owner-manager experiences during crisis	Illustrated how personal, business, and community factors can influence losses and response choices.	Focused on a specific urban crisis and cannot be treated as a universal model.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary focus of this research is to examine how small retail businesses experience, interpret, and manage recovery after disruptive events. The study compares recovery situations in which retailers must restore basic trading activity while managing uncertainty about premises, utilities, stock, customer demand, payments, staff availability, supplier delivery, and future risk. The objects of study are presented below.

3.1 SMALL RETAIL RECOVERY SITUATIONS UNDER INVESTIGATION

- Neighbourhood grocery, household-goods, and convenience retailers facing stock loss, damaged premises, or interrupted local access
- Apparel, footwear, stationery, and speciality shops affected by reduced footfall, altered demand, delayed deliveries, or cash-flow pressure
- Retail businesses handling perishable or time-sensitive stock, where power interruption, contamination, or delivery failure can produce rapid loss

- Home-based and micro-retail enterprises dependent on family labour, informal credit, mobile communication, and local delivery arrangements
- Storefront retailers using digital payments, social media, online catalogues, or messaging applications to maintain customer contact during disruption

3.2 RECOVERY CONDITIONS AND DECISION CONTEXTS

- Physical safety, shop accessibility, electricity, water, telecommunications, transport, and sanitation conditions
- Working-capital availability, cash management, rent obligations, loan repayments, insurance claims, and supplier credit
- Inventory visibility, stock damage assessment, supplier reliability, replenishment timing, storage, and product substitution
- Customer mobility, trust, changing demand, affordability, information needs, and preference for in-store, delivery, or digital service

- Owner-manager wellbeing, family responsibilities, employee availability, informal support networks, and decision fatigue

3.3 RECOVERY EVALUATION PARAMETERS

- Speed and safety of restoring a minimum viable trading operation
- Ability to protect essential records, cash, stock information, and payment access
- Capacity to communicate reliably with employees, customers, suppliers, lenders, landlords, and authorities
- Financial sustainability after reopening, including the ability to replace stock without unmanageable debt
- Learning, preparedness, and risk reduction measures adopted after the disruption

3.4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOCUS

- Immediate reopening versus staged restoration of critical products and services
- Physical repair and inventory replacement versus financial and customer-demand recovery
- Single-supplier dependence versus diversified sourcing and mutual support networks
- Cash-only or single-platform payments versus redundant transaction and record-keeping options
- Return to former routines versus adaptation through delivery, digital communication, revised stock practices, and risk-informed planning

3.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE SCOPE

- To identify common recovery pressures faced by independent and owner-managed retailers
- To compare practical response choices across different types of operational disruption
- To explain why reopening does not necessarily represent full business recovery
- To highlight financial, relational, digital, and operational conditions that enable more durable recovery
- To support proportionate preparedness and continuity planning for small retail enterprises

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study uses a comparative and evidence-informed qualitative methodology. It synthesises established scholarship on business disaster recovery, small-business crisis management, continuity planning, and resilience in order to examine recovery experiences relevant to small retail enterprises. The approach does not claim a new survey, interview sample, sales dataset, or experimental result. Instead, it compares recurring recovery issues reported in the literature and translates them into a retail-focused analytical framework.

The analysis is organised around a recovery pathway that begins with immediate stabilisation and proceeds through restoration of core operations, customer and supplier reconnection, financial repair, adaptation, and learning. Each recovery situation is considered in relation to the same practical questions: What has been disrupted? What must be restored first? Which decisions depend on cash, information, relationships, or public services? Which actions can be taken by the retailer, and which require external support? This structure avoids treating recovery as a single event.

The study gives particular attention to the constraints common to small retailers: limited slack resources, concentrated ownership, informal records, dependence on local demand, narrow supply channels, rented premises, and limited access to formal advisory support. It also considers the positive role of local knowledge, customer trust, family labour, community networks, and practical improvisation. The aim is not to romanticise improvised recovery but to identify how informal strength can be combined with simple, documented, and repeatable continuity practices.

METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK

1. The study uses a comparative design covering major recovery experiences in small retail settings.
2. Peer-reviewed disaster, continuity, entrepreneurship, and small-business literature supports the qualitative synthesis.
3. Analysis considers physical, financial, supply, customer, digital, and owner-manager dimensions of recovery.

4. The framework distinguishes immediate response, operational restoration, financial repair, adaptation, and learning.
5. Small retail businesses are assessed as local economic actors connected to households, suppliers, landlords, and customers.
6. The comparison evaluates practical feasibility rather than assuming that formal plans can be implemented without resources.
7. Recovery is assessed through continuity of essential transactions, stock availability, customer access, and financial stability.
8. The analysis includes both in-person and digitally supported retail pathways, including delivery, messaging, and electronic payments.
9. No fabricated survey data, sales figures, claims outcomes, or business survival statistics are presented.

10. Recommendations focus on low-cost, proportionate, and risk-informed actions that can complement public and financial support.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis presents a qualitative comparison of recurring recovery experiences among small retail businesses. The objective is to identify how different disruption patterns shape immediate decisions, recovery barriers, and the conditions required for sustainable trading. Five recovery configurations are considered: physical-premise disruption, inventory and supply interruption, customer-access collapse, payment and communication failure, and post-reopening financial repair. The comparison is interpretive because recovery outcomes vary with local risk, retail segment, property arrangements, public services, supplier terms, and household circumstances.

5.1 COMPARATIVE RECOVERY EXPERIENCE ANALYSIS

S. No.	Recovery Experience	Immediate Challenge	Key Decisions	Recovery Enablers	Principal Barrier	Implication
1	Physical premise and utility disruption	Unsafe access, damaged fittings, spoiled goods, or loss of power and connectivity	Close temporarily, assess safety, protect remaining stock, and decide a minimum viable reopening point	Safe alternative storage, utility restoration, landlord cooperation, and clear condition checks	Repair cost, delayed services, or lack of temporary trading space	Physical reopening should be staged around safety, basic services, and the highest-priority products
2	Inventory and supplier interruption	Stock loss, incomplete records, delayed deliveries, and fluctuating wholesale availability	Prioritise essential lines, verify stock, negotiate credit, and identify substitute sources	Simple inventory records, multiple suppliers, mutual support, and local distribution information	Single-source dependence and insufficient working capital for replenishment	Supply recovery needs both product availability and terms that do not create unsustainable debt
3	Customer access and demand disruption	Reduced mobility, safety concerns, lower purchasing power, and	Adjust operating hours, communicate availability, add delivery or pickup, and revise	Trusted customer contact, visible safety practices, local	Demand may remain weak after the shop has reopened	Customer reconnection is a separate phase and must be planned rather than assumed

		altered product needs	merchandise mix	delivery, and flexible transaction channels		
4	Payment, records, and communication failure	Digital payment outage, lost contacts, interrupted billing, and lack of reliable information	Use backup payment options, protect records, confirm orders, and maintain contact lists	Cloud or off-site backups, paper fallback, multiple communication channels, and verified contact details	Dependence on one platform, device, connection, or unbacked local record	Transaction continuity depends on operational information as much as it depends on inventory
5	Post- reopening financial repair	Accumulated rent, wages, credit obligations, insurance delays, and low-margin sales	Sequence payments, preserve cash, seek relief, renegotiate terms, and monitor recovery indicators	Transparent records, trusted lenders and suppliers, targeted assistance, and realistic cash forecasts	Reopening may occur before revenue and margins are sufficient for stability	Recovery plans should include a financial runway, not only a reopening date

5.2 EXTENDED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Physical-premise disruption creates the most visible form of loss, but its business consequences are not limited to repairs. A retailer must decide whether the premises can be entered safely, whether stock has been damaged or contaminated, whether records and payment devices remain usable, and whether customers can reach the location. For retailers with perishable goods, short periods without electricity or refrigeration may convert a manageable interruption into a major inventory loss. A staged restart, beginning with safe access, a limited product range, and verified utilities, is often more credible than a premature full reopening.

Inventory and supply recovery is frequently constrained by information. Many small retailers know their stock through practical familiarity rather than a continuously updated digital system. This knowledge can be valuable, but a disruption may make it difficult to distinguish saleable stock, damaged goods, unpaid orders, and critical replacement items. Retailers that keep simple but current purchase

records, supplier contact details, and a list of high-priority products are better positioned to make replenishment decisions. Diversifying suppliers does not require abandoning trusted relationships; it means maintaining viable alternatives when a primary source is unavailable.

Customer-access disruption illustrates why business recovery must be considered at community scale. A shop can be intact while roads, public transport, local safety conditions, household incomes, or consumer confidence prevent normal demand. Small retailers often respond through flexible opening times, phone or messaging orders, neighborhood delivery, smaller packages, essential-product bundles, or more frequent customer updates. These actions are not merely marketing tactics. They help customers understand whether the business is operating and allow the retailer to learn how demand has changed.

Payment and communication failures can be especially disruptive in retail because transactions occur continually and in small amounts. A retailer that relies on one payment platform, one smartphone, or one broadband

connection may lose the ability to transact even when stock and staff are available. Redundant options such as cash procedures, alternate payment methods, printed order forms, backup contact lists, and off-site copies of essential records can reduce this vulnerability. The most suitable solution depends on cost, customer habits, and local connectivity, but the principle is to avoid a single point of operational failure.

Financial repair is the longest and often least visible stage. Reopening may generate revenue without producing enough margin to replace inventory, meet rent, cover debt, pay employees, and absorb ongoing disruptions. Owner-managers may use household savings or informal borrowing to bridge the gap, which can protect the business in the short term but increase personal vulnerability. Recovery support is more useful when it is timely, understandable, and compatible with the actual cash cycle of the business. A realistic recovery plan therefore tracks cash inflow, stock needs, fixed obligations, deferred payments, and the point at which operations become stable.

5.3 OBSERVATIONS FROM DATA ANALYSIS

- Reopening is an important milestone, but it is not a complete measure of financial, operational, or customer recovery.
- The most urgent decision is often not whether to resume all activities, but which essential transactions can be restored safely first.
- Retailers benefit from simple, current records of stock, suppliers, customer contacts, fixed obligations, and payment arrangements.
- Local trust and repeat customers can support recovery, but customer loyalty cannot compensate indefinitely for reduced purchasing power or inaccessible locations.
- Supplier credit and landlord flexibility can be decisive, yet informal arrangements should be documented clearly to avoid later disputes.
- Digital tools can expand communication and sales options, but dependence on a single device, application, or payment channel creates new vulnerabilities.

- Owner-manager wellbeing matters because crisis decisions are often made while individuals are also managing household, health, and caregiving pressures.
- Long-term recovery improves when the business converts lessons from the disruption into proportionate continuity and risk-reduction practices.

6. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis indicates that small retail recovery is best understood as the restoration of a workable business system, not as the reopening of a physical shop. A retailer must reconnect premises, stock, information, transactions, labour, suppliers, and customers. Weakness in any one part can slow the entire process. For example, a repaired store cannot trade effectively without inventory, a payment method, customer access, or enough cash to maintain operations. This interdependence explains why recovery timelines vary even among retailers affected by the same event.

Owner-managers occupy a central role in this process. Their local knowledge, personal relationships, and ability to make rapid practical adjustments can be major strengths. At the same time, relying only on the owner can create fragility. When one person holds supplier contacts, passwords, payment access, key records, and customer knowledge, illness, displacement, fatigue, or family obligations may interrupt the business precisely when decisions are most important. A simple continuity file shared with a trusted person can reduce this concentration of risk.

The analysis also shows that preparedness should be proportionate. A micro-retailer does not require a complex corporate disaster-recovery programme to benefit from planning. A concise plan can identify emergency contacts, critical stock categories, backup payment options, essential documents, alternate suppliers, communication templates, safe shutdown steps, and conditions for reopening. International guidance for small and medium enterprises similarly emphasises scalable business-continuity planning rather than a one-size-fits-all model (UNDRR ARISE, 2026).

Financial recovery requires particular attention because small retailers may reopen under debt and continued market uncertainty. Assistance

programmes, insurance, credit, rent relief, and supplier terms can either support recovery or unintentionally deepen vulnerability when application processes are opaque, delayed, or disconnected from the timing of inventory purchases and daily cash flow. Policymakers and support organisations should therefore consider not only whether assistance exists, but whether it reaches small firms in a usable form.

Finally, the discussion reinforces the community dimension of retail resilience. Small shops serve residents, and residents sustain small shops. Recovery measures that restore transport, safe access, utilities, communication, and local purchasing capacity can produce benefits that extend beyond individual businesses. Retailers should therefore be included in local preparedness conversations, market-area planning, and recovery communication. Their experience can reveal practical needs that are invisible in broader economic indicators.

7. CONCLUSION

This study examined recovery experiences among small retail businesses affected by disruptive events. It compared physical-premise disruption, inventory and supplier interruption, customer-access collapse, payment and communication failure, and post-reopening financial repair. The analysis shows

that each experience contains operational, financial, relational, and personal dimensions that must be addressed together.

The findings indicate that durable recovery depends on more than a repaired storefront or a resumed sale. Retailers need safe access, working utilities, visible stock information, viable supplier terms, customer communication, transaction continuity, and a realistic financial pathway. Owner-manager knowledge and local relationships can enable quick adaptation, but they should be supported by simple records, backup arrangements, and documented decisions so that recovery does not depend on one person alone.

The study concludes that small retail businesses can strengthen resilience through proportionate continuity planning, diversified supplier and payment options, off-site records, customer communication arrangements, cash-flow monitoring, and participation in local preparedness networks. Future research may build on this framework through retail-segment case studies, longitudinal recovery tracking, and comparative research across urban, rural, formal, and informal market settings. Such work can support recovery policies that recognise small retailers as both vulnerable enterprises and essential contributors to community recovery.

8. REFERENCES

1. Alesch, D. J., Holly, J. N., Mittler, E., & Nagy, R. (2001). *Organizations at Risk: What Happens When Small Businesses and Not-for-Profits Encounter Natural Hazards*. Public Entity Risk Institute.
2. Asgary, A., Anjum, M. I., & Azimi, N. (2012). *Disaster recovery and business continuity after the 2010 flood in Pakistan: Case of small businesses*. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 2, 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2012.08.001>
3. Dahlhamer, J. M., & Tierney, K. J. (1998). *Rebounding from disruptive events: Business recovery following the Northridge earthquake*. *Sociological Spectrum*, 18(2), 121-141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.1998.9982189>
4. Doern, R. (2016). *Entrepreneurship and crisis management: The experiences of small businesses during the London 2011 riots*. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(3), 276-302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242614553863>
5. Doern, R. (2021). *Knocked down but not out and fighting to go the distance: Small business responses to an unfolding crisis in the initial impact period*. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 15, e00221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2020.e00221>
6. Doern, R., Williams, N., & Vorley, T. (2019). *Special issue on entrepreneurship and crises: Business as usual? An introduction and review of the literature*. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 31(5-6), 400-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2018.1541590>
7. Fasth, J., Elliot, V., & Styhre, A. (2022). *Crisis management as practice in small- and medium-sized enterprises during the first period of COVID-19*. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 30(2), 161-170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12371>

8. Herbane, B. (2010). *Small business research: Time for a crisis-based view*. *International Small Business Journal*, 28(1), 43-64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242609350804>
9. International Organization for Standardization. (2019). *ISO 22301:2019 Security and resilience - Business continuity management systems - Requirements*. ISO.
10. McManus, S., Seville, E., Brunsdon, D., & Vargo, J. (2007). *Resilience Management: A Framework for Assessing and Improving the Resilience of Organisations*. Resilient Organisations Research Report.
11. Runyan, R. C. (2006). *Small business in the face of crisis: Identifying barriers to recovery from a natural disaster*. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 14(1), 12-26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2006.00477.x>
12. Tierney, K. J. (2007). *Businesses and disasters: Vulnerability, impacts, and recovery*. In H. Rodriguez, E. L. Quarantelli, & R. R. Dynes (Eds.), *Handbook of Disaster Research* (pp. 275-296). Springer.
13. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. (2015). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*. United Nations.
14. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. (2017). *Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. UNDRR.
15. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction - Private Sector Alliance for Disaster Resilient Societies. (2026). *Strengthening Disaster Resilience of SMEs Through Business Continuity Planning: Guidance and Templates*. UNDRR.
16. Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2011). *Crisis strategic planning for SMEs: Findings from New Zealand*. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5619-5633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.563901>
17. Webb, G. R., Tierney, K. J., & Dahlhamer, J. M. (2000). *Businesses and disasters: Empirical patterns and unanswered questions*. *Natural Hazards Review*, 1(2), 83-90. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1527-6988\(2000\)1:2\(83\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1527-6988(2000)1:2(83))
18. Webb, G. R., Tierney, K. J., & Dahlhamer, J. M. (2002). *Predicting long-term business recovery from disaster: A comparison of the Loma Prieta earthquake and Hurricane Andrew*. *Global Environmental Change Part B: Environmental Hazards*, 4(2-3), 45-58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-2867\(03\)00005-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-2867(03)00005-6)