

Personnel Management in Leadership Crises: Contemporary Approaches and Challenges

Yevdokymova N.

Pylyp Orlyk International Classical University

Compressing crisis leadership squeezes out time, amplifying ambiguity and proving that routine “people systems” have inherent limits. This article integrates recent academic findings regarding how personnel management systems can maintain organisational stability, as well as adaptation when “leadership capacity is under duress.” Evidence points to strategic “leadership routines,” crisis speaking that facilitates “upward voice,” and “human resource management system strength” as a definable trait of “clarity, consistency, and credible follow-through” (Schaedler, Graf-Vlachy, & König, 2021; Kim & Lim, 2020; Sanders, Nguyen, Bouckennooghe, Rafferty, & Schwarz, 2024). Anti-crisis interventions designed to “re-engineer” profit incentive, retention, and “rededployment,” along with “psychological support infrastructure,” safeguard “key talent” and “discretionary work performance” when under “prolonged duress” (Bykova, Lobza, & Pilgun, 2022; Rossoha, Korotych, & Tyska, 2025; Abedini, Fard, Ardestani, Alaei, & Masuleh, 2023). Finally, human resources is revealed to have enabling paradox administration as one of its key capabilities—to “decentralise decisions,” while simultaneously enforcing “minimum standards” that balance “short-term needs” with “Capability Building” (Collings, Nyberg, Wright, & McMackin, 2021; Riggio & Newstead, 2022). We present a research-informed architecture of “personnel management in crisis” that incorporates recent findings in team formation in volatile conditions, readiness learning “curricula,” and decisions in “scarcity,” as well as a research agenda that develops strategies for crisis interventions in “academia, business, healthcare, non

Keywords: personnel management, leadership crisis, strength of the HRM system, crisis communication, well-being of employees, retention, preparedness

Introduction

Personnel management in leadership crises needs to translate uncertainty into action without draining the human reservoirs upon which accomplishment is based.” Recent scholarship agrees that strategic leadership styles in crisis situations rely upon orchestration of information, alternative choices, and values in a shortened timeframe, as well as on architectures of Human Resources

Management that provide a clear crisis “signal transmission in a turbulent environment” (Schaedler, Stein, & Li, 2021; Sanders, Benaissa, & Rosa, 2024).

Anti-crisis personnel work, contributing simultaneously to a strategic retention system, an open system of job “redemption,” and an “interaction cycle” of speeded-up feedback, as well as to “governments of fairness” structured through a “mental health base line,” builds a “crisis credibility reserve” that “preserves expertise and collective experience in an uncertain situation” (Bykova, Persson, & Helm'OuldRuža, 2022; Rossoha & Rockiolo, 2025; Abedini & Abedinejad, 2023).

Communication systems that mediate concrete messages in a short cycle of interaction regulate uncertainty and empower positive subordinate “voice,” while “Human Resources as crisis triage therapists” establish a paradoxical paradox-crisis bridge connecting triage moments to “future-building” in accomplishment terms” (Kim & Lim, 2020; Collings & Momencevey, 2021).

Discussion

Leadership crises are seldom polite events: they do not line up in an orderly fashion, they often surprise unannounced, and they exert a tensile strength upon an organisation's people systems.” In a crisis situation, people and organisational issues need to be managed simultaneously as a stabiliser and a engine of innovation that transforms ambiguity and action synergistically, while ensuring that human systems supporting delivery are safeguarded. On strategic leadership and crisis studies, recent approaches coalesce around a strategic vision of linkage between decisiveness and action timeliness, a translation of power without loss of responsibility, and a balanced sustenance of contradictions—continuity and innovation, caring and toughness—to take a new normal of routine-changing across a defined period of strategy activation (Schaedler, Graf-Vlachy, & König, 2021; Riggio & Newstead 2022). This is a challenge that is not just an “either/or” aspect of a leader’s personality. This is possible or limited by human resource architectures that enhance system “signal” in a crisis situation through integrated actions, credible communications, and visible care, thereby safeguarding “trust,” which is a “scarcest” element in a situation of crisis (Collings, Nyberg, Wright, & McMackin, 2021; Sanders, Nguyen, Bouckennooghe, Rafferty, & Schwarz, 2024).

Innovation in human resources administration is no longer an option in a crisis situation but a toll of survival. Appraisal and performance cycles take too long and

are too rigid when assumptions become obsolete overnight. Studies of enterprises in a martial law situation and extreme crisis talk about a radical reconception of systems of motivation in terms of crisis-proof systems of support that include informational, as well as material, scaffolding arrangements (Rossoha, Korotych, & Tyska, 2025; Polozova, Myttseva, & Ivanov, 2024). Anti-crisis personnel work is most productive when it is related to mission-oriented retention strategies and criteria of selection that keep teams mission-adjustable while ensuring a preservation of institutional learning (Bykova, Lobza, & Pilgun, 2022; Zvarych & Tysh, 2020). Most crucially, perhaps, is that in a crisis situation, a new calculus of motivation operates that also demands new sources of job-meaning and job-efficacy for those in charge of increasingly self-contradictory expectations, with a formative role in this process possible through anHRM sensibility that orients to precise, as against helpful or well-meaning, motives and incentives (Alves, De Souza, & Calvosa, 2025).

Pivotal talent retention is a strategy and a credibility gauge of an organisation as well. Research in crisis conditions suggests that timely, truthful, and two-way communication tempers uncertainty and stimulates beneficial organisational talk, which, in turn, enhances local problem solving and minimises unproductive withdrawal behaviour (Kim & Lim, 2020). Communication is more than just quantity, as it is a matter of timing, fidelity (specificity of messages), and upstream channels that permit upward influence in decision-making. Analyses of concepts within crisis leadership studies again highlight that influence is exercised through routines of message pacing, leadership visibility, and a conditioned listening habit that become performance variables in their own right (Kim, 2021). By communicative systematisation of such routines to organisational huddles, open incident analysis, pulse surveys—daily or frequent check-ins—HR systematisation enhances “system strength” through three qualities known to correlate with greater system performance in crisis conditions: expectation fulfillment, monitoring at a suitable granularity, and indicators of credible system tracking (Sanders et al., 2024).

Psychological support is not a nicety of operation but an operational necessity. Human-resource management that incorporates mental health literacy, managerial skills in care behave, and timely support is a hallmark of reducing workload-induced tension and discretionary effort investment in critical sectors of knowledge-related work (Abedini, Fard, Ardestani, Alaee, & Masuleh, 2023).

Organisational studies of crisis performance highlight micro-level interventions in crisis conditions as following predictable routines, a real scheduling of restoration or downtime, and recognition for contribution as a value that is greater than attendance—this all holds off organisational spirit from collapse toward a crisis-induced loss of organisational integrity that undermines coordinated performance (Rossoha et al., 2025; Collings et al., 2021). Organisational performance in crisis is a matter of integrity, as it directly speaks of an organisation's honest yield of performance value.

Crisis is as transformative for teams as it is for people. Human resources with a perspective on team architecture as a variable—roles, interactions, and strategic use of personality and expertise diversity—facilitates team reformulation and maintains group integrity. Research in small and medium-sized enterprises has outlined a profile of skills required of crisis-some leaders that include framing, sense-making, and a collection of supporting roles, all of which can be intended and applied as objectives of human resources work (Chuang, 2024). Research related to team-building tools in situations of uncertainty also provides insight that understanding individualized expectations of team membership and compatible personality-role fit minimizes friction costs, hastens storming periods, and enables swift infrastructure of team trust in new or highly reformulated teams (Kolpachenko, Maiboroda, Dudnyk, & Minenko, 2025). This is not nice-to-have stuff that accelerates innovation and turnaround in organisations that have to turnaround again and again.

Scarcity and decision-making highlight the critical relationship between leadership and human resources. Strategic leadership in a crisis is less about exceptional judgment and more about a controlled synthesis of information, alternatives, and values in a compressed timeframe (Schaedler et al., 2021; Riggio & Newstead, 2022). Research in a field setting and in theory highlights a number of techniques in which a collaborative relationship between HR and leadership is common, such as pre-delegation of thresholds for local action, “tiger teams” involving a range of functions with guaranteed “protected time,” and a form of resource triage in which basic capacities are safeguarded while localized experimentation is carried out at an edge or “margin” (Obeidat & Thani, 2020; Taheri, 2022). Industry-specific recommendations for crisis leadership in a pandemic offers an extra thirteen highly useful approaches ranging from “pre-mortem” analysis to redundancy planning that will have routinized actuarial value in terms of prepared planning that is provided by human resources rather than wait-and-import action plans after a crisis eventuates (Wardman, 2020). Capability-building is clearly important as

assimilating leadership skills in human resources expertise in crisis planning is a factor in improving crisis responses in all kinds of sectors such as food and beverages in non-formal technical sectors that generalize well because of diverse particularity (Zulkarnaini, Shaari, & Sarip, 2025).

Change agents in human resources are primarily highlighted in paradoxical management. In a world after or in a world of COVID-19, human resources are responsible for embracing or expressing organisational paradoxes in terms of job security and job redesign, decentralisation and imposing a set of standards, caring for people and expecting performance (Collings et al. 2021). Studies related to the robustness of an HRM system highlight that, in crisis situations, it is not just that a system emphasises its policies but that it does so in clear and compliant and consensual terms, that is, in a legitimate manner that resists drift in crisis situations (Sanders et al. 2024). Anti-crisis programs that have learning paths and criteria for career advancement form an antidote against cynicism in human resources, as in a crisis situation, this contract is likely to derail or get ruptured (Bykova et al. 2022; Polozova et al. 2024).

Nonetheless, all of this is not to downplay the importance of leadership character per se, but rather its operationalization. Learning leadership in crisis situations is possible in a significant manner, and for HRD, its task is clearly outlined in terms of developing skills in areas such as flexible communication, ethical framing, and resource reprioritization, as evidenced in initial responses to the pandemic (Dirani et al., 2020; Hakim, Bastian, Ayanian, & Sarkis, 2022). In situations that have been more hostile or volatile at an institutional or macroeconomic level, as in martial law or in extreme economic disruptions, personnel management needs to establish measures that include protection against injustices in re-deployments, laid-off within predetermined criteria when unavoidable, and a path back to a job as conditions allow, thus turning a chasm in human action into a transition that reverses in its reversibility when conditions are favorable (Rossoha et al., 2025; Zvarych & Tysh, 2020).

The “forward view” is unyielding yet positive. “It is in those organisations that will learn as well as survive that crisis is seen as a design challenge, not an exceptional story.” When human resources capacities develop system resilience—signals received and kept, care in all interactions—and when leaders embody “the strength of action coupled with the strength of listening,” crisis will be a teacher rather than a tyrant (Sanders et al. 2024, Collings et al. 2021). “Good kit is important,” is a British understatement. In organisational terms, “kit” is people, and systems that support people.

Conclusions

On the weight of evidence, a practice-informed thesis is proposed that personnel management is positioned to serve as a shock absorber and engine of adaptation at a moment when strategic leadership is stressed through enhanced signals in the HRM system, crisis-committed communications and voices, and coordinated retention, redeployment, and psychosocial support (Sanders et al., 2024; Kim & Lim, 2020; Rossoha et al., 2025; Abedini et al., 2023). In crisis conditions, strategic leadership is less about brilliant insight than strategic orchestration, which is co-written through pre-delegated decision criteria, crisis preparedness curricula, and open governance that maintains its integrity under stress (Schaedler et al., 2021; Wardman, 2020; Obeidat & Thani, 2020).

Future directions would have organisations view crisis as a design challenge rather than an exception, including paradox management as a normal part of HR work—decentralizing with standards, caring while demanding performance, protecting jobs while redesigning work—and developing a means of crisis framing, crisis sense-making, and crisis/resource triage as a higher-level managerial capability (Collings et al., 2021; Riggio & Newstead, 2022; Taheri, 2022). Evidence based in a particular type of organisation—SMEs, public service, or industry-specific training—suggests a beneficial effect of including HR leadership in crisis management learning and that architectures need to be tailored to different types of institutional setting in order to study longer-term impacts of crisis experience upon trust, innovation, and sustainability of a firm's human resources (Chuang, 2024; Zulkarnaini et al. 2025; Polozova, Myttseva, & Ivanov, 2024).

References

Abedini, N., Fard, M., Ardestani, S., Alaei, N., & Masuleh, S. (2023). Human resource governance in crisis situations: Strategies for effective management. *International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.ijimob.3.1.14>

Alves, J., De Souza, E., & Calvosa, M. (2025). How can human resource management motivate managers in times of crisis? *REVES – Revista Relações Sociais*. <https://doi.org/10.18540/revesv18iss1pp21294>

Bykova, A., Lobza, A., & Pilgun, A. (2022). Development of anti-crisis program of personnel management as a strategy for solving business problems of the enterprise. *State and Regions. Series: Economics and Business*. <https://doi.org/10.32840/1814-1161/2022-1-11>

Chuang, S. (2024). Employee perspectives on effective crisis leadership skills in small and medium-sized enterprises. *Human Resource Development International*, 28, 110–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2024.2399488>

Collings, D., Nyberg, A., Wright, P., & McMackin, J. (2021). Leading through paradox in a COVID-19 world: Human resources comes of age. *Human Resource Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12343>

Dirani, K., Abadi, M., Alizadeh, A., Barhate, B., Garza, R., Gunasekara, N., Ibrahim, G., & Majzun, Z. (2020). Leadership competencies and the essential role of human resource development in times of crisis: A response to COVID-19 pandemic. *Human Resource Development International*, 23, 380–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1780078>

Hakim, G., Bastian, B., Ayanian, M., & Sarkis, N. (2022). Leadership and human resource management during crisis. *Arab Economic and Business Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.38039/2214-4625.1016>

Kim, S. (2021). Crisis leadership: An evolutionary concept analysis. *Applied Nursing Research*, 151454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2021.151454>

Kim, Y., & Lim, H. (2020). Activating constructive employee behavioural responses in a crisis: Examining the effects of pre-crisis reputation and crisis communication strategies on employee voice behaviours. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12289>

Kolpachenko, N., Maiboroda, M., Dudnyk, O., & Minenko, S. (2025). Leadership and efficient instruments for managing the team-building system in times of crisis and uncertainty. *Business Inform*. <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2025-2-492-501>

Obeidat, A., & Thani, F. (2020). The impact of strategic leadership on crisis management. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2020.106.307.326>

Polozova, T., Myttseva, O., & Ivanov, I. (2024). Organizational-economic and psychological aspects of personnel management as a factor of organization development in crisis conditions. *Ukrainian Journal of Applied Economics and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.36887/2415-8453-2024-2-9>

Riggio, R., & Newstead, T. (2022). Crisis leadership. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-044838>

Rossoha, M., Korotych, A., & Tyska, A. (2025). Strategies for managing employee efficiency and productivity in the context of crisis challenges and martial law. *Economic Scope*. <https://doi.org/10.30838/ep.199.262-267>

Sanders, K., Nguyen, P., Bouckennooghe, D., Rafferty, A., & Schwarz, G. (2024). Human resource management system strength in times of crisis. *Journal of Business Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114365>

Schaedler, L., Graf-Vlachy, L., & König, A. (2021). Strategic leadership in organizational crises: A review and research agenda. *Long Range Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2021.102156>

Taheri, F. (2022). Decision-making in crisis situations: How do leaders manage scarce resources? *Journal of Resource Management and Decision Engineering*. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.jrmde.1.1.4>

Wardman, J. (2020). Recalibrating pandemic risk leadership: Thirteen crisis-ready strategies for COVID-19. *Journal of Risk Research*, 23, 1092–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2020.1842989>

Yevdokymova, N., Lunov, V., & Pastushenko, V. (2024). Psychological support for Scientists during War: Addressing crises and risks amidst the war in Ukraine. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4848191>

Zulkarnaini, N., Shaari, R., & Sarip, A. (2025). Integrating human resource leadership into crisis management education: Enhancing effectiveness in the food and beverage industry in Malaysia. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.9020056>

Zvarych, R., & Tysh, T. (2020). Crisis management and leadership in a coronary crisis. *Herald of Ternopil National Economic University*. <https://doi.org/10.35774/visnyk2020.02.135>