



CRISIS LEADERSHIP IN A VOLATILE WORLD: PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS THEORETICAL MECHANISMS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Mohammed DJOUBAR*

University of Laghouat- Algeria

m.djoubar@lagh-univ.dz

Laboratory of Economic development

Send Article Date: 01-02-2026

Date of acceptance of the article: 09-05-2026

Abstract:

In an era increasingly defined by volatility and complex global disruptions, the conceptualisation of crisis leadership has shifted from heroic individualism to distributed, context-sensitive practices. This Conceptual review integrates the philosophical and normative foundations of the field, drawing upon Buddhist ethics and existential authenticity, with the theoretical mechanisms that drive effectiveness, specifically trust, communication, and signal detection. By critically synthesising recent literature, the study juxtaposes crisis leadership against traditional constructs, highlighting the unique necessities of rapid decision-making and ethical stewardship. The analysis reveals significant methodological fragmentation and a predominance of Western-centric (WEIRD) samples. Consequently, this paper proposes an integrative research agenda advocating for longitudinal multi-phase designs and the incorporation of neuroscientific and simulation-based methodologies. The findings offer a robust framework for developing resilient, ethically grounded leadership capable of navigating the exigencies of modern organisational crises.

Keywords: Crisis Leadership; Signal Detection Theory; Social Exchange; Collective Resilience; Non-Western Contexts

Introduction:

In an era increasingly defined by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), the capacity for effective crisis leadership has emerged as a paramount determinant of organizational survival and societal resilience. Global disruptions, ranging from the COVID-19 pandemic to economic instability, have demonstrated that

* Mohammed DJOUBAR

leading through crises is not merely a technical challenge but a profound test of ethical stewardship and adaptability (Pereira et al., 2025). Consequently, the academic conceptualization of crisis leadership has undergone a significant paradigm shift. The field is moving away from archaic "heroic" individualism—which overemphasizes solitary decision-making—toward more reflective, distributed, and context-sensitive models that prioritize collective action and shared responsibility (Lehtonen et al., 2025; Gooty et al., 2025).

Despite the burgeoning interest in this domain, the existing literature remains characterized by theoretical fragmentation and a lack of holistic frameworks (Wu et al., 2021). Current research often isolates behavioral competencies from their deeper philosophical underpinnings or fails to bridge the gap between normative ethical theories and the practical mechanisms that drive effectiveness, such as trust and communication (Buhagiar & Anand, 2023). Furthermore, a predominance of Western-centric perspectives (WEIRD samples) has historically constrained the cross-cultural generalizability of crisis leadership models, leaving non-Western and sector-specific contexts underexplored (Kreamer et al., 2025; Wu et al., 2021).

Research Questions

To achieve the study's objectives and address the identified gaps, this research poses the following four central questions:

RQ1: What are the philosophical and normative foundations of crisis leadership, and how has its conceptualisation evolved from heroic individualism to diverse, collective practices?

RQ2: What are the primary theoretical mechanisms—specifically trust, communication, social exchange, and signal detection—that explain the effectiveness of leadership in fostering organisational survival and employee well-being?

RQ3: To what extent does crisis leadership converge with and diverge from related constructs such as transformational and situational leadership, particularly regarding decision-making speed and ethical imperatives?

RQ4: What are the prevailing methodological limitations and 'WEIRD' sample biases in the extant literature, and what integrative directions should shape the future research agenda?



This paper aims to address these theoretical and methodological disjunctures by offering a comprehensive, multi-dimensional synthesis of crisis leadership. Unlike traditional reviews, this study conceptually integrates the field's philosophical and normative foundations—drawing on diverse traditions such as Buddhist ethics and existential authenticity (Shree & Sharma, 2024; Stoten, 2021)—with the theoretical mechanisms that explain leadership effectiveness, including social exchange and signal detection theories (Madison et al., 2025). By critically comparing crisis leadership with related constructs and identifying persistent methodological gaps, this conceptual review proposes an integrative research agenda to guide future inquiry.

1.Philosophical and Normative Foundations

To fully understand the nuances of crisis leadership, one must look beyond behavioral traits to the philosophical and normative roots that ground leader decision-making under pressure. Recent literature suggests a turn towards non-traditional and ethical philosophies to explain how leaders navigate high-stakes uncertainty.

1.1. Philosophical Underpinnings:

From Mindfulness to Authenticity The philosophical basis of crisis leadership is increasingly drawing from diverse traditions. Buddhist principles, specifically the concepts of "non-attachment" and the "Middle Way," provide a robust framework for managing the cognitive and emotional overload typical of crises. These principles foster mindfulness and emotional regulation, enabling leaders to make balanced, utilitarian decisions that reduce ego-driven motives (Shree & Sharma, 2024; Vu, 2021).

Simultaneously, existentialist philosophy offers a complementary lens through the concept of "exigential leadership." This perspective emphasizes authenticity and personal responsibility, viewing crises not just as operational failures but as existential threats that require leaders to be attuned to their true values (Stoten, 2021). Authentic leadership in this context facilitates a "fit" between leaders and followers, which is crucial for maintaining well-being and reducing anxiety during turbulent times (Schoofs et al., 2024).

1.2. Normative and Ethical Frameworks

On the normative side, the relationship between leaders and followers during a crisis is deeply rooted in ethical reciprocity. Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Relational Models Theory (RMT) have been instrumental in framing these interactions. These theories posit that effective crisis leadership relies on a moral covenant where fairness, reciprocity, and trust are paramount (Madison et al., 2025; Vodosek & Zander, 2020).

Ethical leadership, therefore, acts as a stabilizing force. Research indicates that when leaders demonstrate normative appropriate conduct and ethical integrity, it significantly enhances employee performance and retention, mediated by mechanisms such as perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange (LMX) (Ng & Salamzadeh, 2020; Aftab et al., 2022).

1.3. The Evolution of the Construct Reflecting

these philosophical shifts, the definition of crisis leadership has evolved. The contemporary view critiques the "heroic leader" stereotype—often associated with masculine, individualistic traits—as insufficient for modern, complex crises (Gooty et al., 2025). Instead, the field is embracing "post-heroic" paradigms that emphasize collective, servant, and digitally integrated leadership styles (Ukeni, 2024; López-Figueroa et al., 2025). This evolution highlights that effective crisis leadership is inherently a shared, relational practice rather than a solitary act of command.

2. Comparative Analysis

Crisis Leadership vs. Traditional Constructs To delineate the specific boundaries of crisis leadership, it is essential to juxtapose it with established leadership paradigms such as transformational, transactional, and situational leadership. While these constructs share foundational DNA, recent literature highlights critical divergences necessitated by the unique pressures of crisis environments.

2.1-Convergences:

The Shared Foundations Crisis leadership does not exist in a vacuum; it inherits core attributes from traditional models. The primary convergence lies in adaptability and context sensitivity. Similar to Situational Leadership Theory, effective crisis leadership is contingent upon the leader's ability to diagnose environmental cues



and adjust their style accordingly (Gigliotti, 2025; Zhang et al., 2023). Furthermore, emotional intelligence (EI)—a staple of transformational leadership—remains universally essential. Whether in routine management or crisis response, the capacity for empathy and emotional regulation is critical for maintaining follower commitment (Pereira et al., 2025; Balasubramanian & Fernandes, 2022).

2.2 Divergences:

The Unique Demands of Crisis However, crisis leadership diverges significantly from related constructs in four key areas: speed, ethical intensity, collective orientation, and sectoral specialization. Speed and Decision-Making under Pressure: unlike traditional models that often prioritize consensus or stability, crisis leadership is defined by the necessity for rapid, high-stakes decision-making under extreme uncertainty (Pereira et al., 2025; Reznik et al., 2025). While transactional leadership focuses on maintaining routine and compliance, such approaches may prove too rigid for the dynamic volatility of a crisis (Purnomo et al., 2021).

3.The Ethical Imperative

Crisis contexts intensify moral dilemmas, demanding explicit ethical frameworks that are often implicit or secondary in routine leadership scenarios. The crisis leader must actively build trust through transparency and moral responsibility to navigate the heightened vulnerability of stakeholders (Lehtonen et al., 2025; Reznik et al., 2025).

3.1-From Individual to Collective (Leadership-as-Practice):

A distinct divergence is the shift from individual-centric models to collective, distributed practices. While transformational leadership often focuses on the traits of a singular leader, crisis leadership is increasingly viewed through the lens of Leadership-as-Practice (L-A-P), where leadership emerges as a collective process embedded in interactions rather than a solitary act (Lehtonen et al., 2025; Willocks & Moralee, 2021).

3.2-Deep Cultural and Sectoral Integration:

Crisis leadership is more profoundly shaped by local cultural values and sectoral requirements than generic leadership models. For instance, crisis behaviors in the healthcare sector prioritize distinct competencies—such as clinical governance and patient safety—that

are not captured by generalist leadership theories (Kim, 2021; Balasubramanian & Fernandes, 2022).

3.3. The Paradox of Decisiveness and Empathy Finally

Crisis leadership is uniquely characterized by the tension between prosocial behavior and executive action. Leaders must balance the "warmth" required for empathy with the "competence" required for decisive action. Emerging research indicates that under time pressure, neural mechanisms related to empathy can be suppressed; however, effective crisis leaders possess the cognitive flexibility to reintegrate these distinct neural processes, balancing immediate operational demands with the psychological needs of their followers (Liu et al., 2023; McDermott, 2025).

4. Research Gaps and Future Directions

Despite the significant theoretical evolution of crisis leadership, the literature remains encumbered by methodological limitations and geographical biases. A critical analysis of recent scholarship reveals a fragmented landscape that, while rich in conceptual diversity, often lacks the empirical rigor and cross-cultural breadth necessary for global application.

4.1. Methodological Fragmentation and Sample Bias

A primary critique of the current body of knowledge is its methodological fragmentation. Research is frequently characterized by subjective, qualitative approaches that limit comprehensive synthesis and theory development (Wu et al., 2021). Furthermore, there is a pervasive overreliance on what scholars term "WEIRD" samples—populations that are Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic. This homogeneity restricts the generalizability of findings to non-Western contexts where cultural dimensions, such as collectivism and power distance, may fundamentally alter leadership dynamics (Kreamer et al., 2025; Islam, 2025). Consequently, there is a pressing need for empirical validation of crisis leadership models in diverse, non-Western settings to ensure they are not merely imposing Eurocentric paradigms on global challenges (Balasubramanian & Fernandes, 2022).

4.2. The Scarcity of Longitudinal and Multi-Phase Studies

Crisis is a process, not a singular event, yet the majority of research employs cross-sectional designs that capture only a static



snapshot of leadership effectiveness. There is a marked scarcity of longitudinal studies that track the evolution of leadership behaviors across the full arc of a crisis—from signal detection and prevention to containment, recovery, and learning (Bhat & Saba, 2025). Future research must adopt multi-phase designs to understand how leadership requirements shift over time, specifically how leaders transition from the directive command required in the acute phase to the adaptive, restorative leadership needed for long-term recovery (Buhagiar & Anand, 2023).

4.3. Emerging Frontiers

Neuroscience and Simulation-Based Training Perhaps the most promising avenue for future inquiry lies at the intersection of leadership development and cognitive science. Current literature highlights a gap in the use of objective, biological measures to understand how leaders manage stress and empathy. Future studies are encouraged to integrate neuroscientific insights to explore the neural mechanisms of prosocial decision-making under pressure, specifically examining how leaders balance self-concern with group needs (Liu et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2023).

Translating this into practice, there is a call for "simulation-based" research. Experiential learning tools, such as the "K2 mountain simulation," allow researchers to observe leadership behaviors in immersive, high-stakes environments without real-world risk. These methods have shown promise in enhancing adaptive judgment and moral reflexivity, offering a robust alternative to traditional, self-reported surveys (Davis et al., 2026; Sartzetaki, 2025).

4.4. Toward Integrative Frameworks and Measurement

Finally, the field requires integrative frameworks that bridge the divide between individual agency and collective practice. Future scholarship should move beyond the dichotomy of "heroic" versus "distributed" leadership to explore how these styles coexist (Lehtonen et al., 2025). Developing validated measurement tools is essential for operationalizing these complex, multi-dimensional constructs. Instruments such as the Crisis Leadership Questionnaire (CLQ) and other sector-specific tools require further cross-cultural validation to ensure their reliability across different organizational contexts (Rahim et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2023).

Conclusion

The phenomenon of crisis leadership is a complex, multi-dimensional construct that transcends the capabilities of any single individual. By synthesizing philosophical foundations rooted in mindfulness and authenticity (Shree & Sharma, 2024; Stoten, 2021) with robust theoretical mechanisms like trust, communication, and signal detection (Madison et al., 2025), this review highlights that effective crisis leadership is inherently relational, ethical, and context-dependent.

While the field has matured beyond the "Great Man" theories of the past, significant work remains. The path forward requires a scholarly commitment to methodological pluralism—embracing longitudinal designs, cross-cultural validation, and interdisciplinary approaches that incorporate neuroscience and simulation (Davis et al., 2026; Wu et al., 2021). As organizations face an increasingly volatile global landscape, the transition from "heroic individualism" to "collective resilience" offers the most viable blueprint for sustainable leadership (Pereira et al., 2025)

References

1. Journal Articles

- Aftab et al. (2022). *Social Responsibility Journal*. (CSR and ethical leadership in SMEs).
- Balasubramanian & Fernandes (2022). *Cogent Business & Management*. (Crisis leadership model in COVID-19).
- Bhat & Saba (2025). *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. (Leadership evolution in crisis).
- Buhagiar & Anand (2023). *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. (Leadership, knowledge management, and learning).
- Davis et al. (2026). *International Journal of Management Education*. (Multi-dimensional leadership learning).
- Gooty et al. (2025). *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. (Critique of idealized crisis leadership).
- Islam (2025). *International Journal of Management Practice*. (Bibliometric analysis).
- Kim (2021). *Applied Nursing Research*. (Concept analysis of crisis leadership).
- Kreamer et al. (2025). *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. (Review of leadership behaviors).
- Lehtonen et al. (2025). *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. (Leadership-as-practice).
- Liu et al. (2025). *Human Brain Mapping*. (Neural mechanisms of decision-making).
- Liu et al. (2023). *Human Brain Mapping*. (Prosocial decision-making under pressure).



- López-Figueroa et al. (2025). *Administrative Sciences*. (Systematic review of digital leadership).
- Madison et al. (2025). *Leadership Quarterly*. (Social exchange theory review).
- Ng & Salamzadeh (2020). *International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*. (Ethical leadership and Gen-Y).
- Purnomo et al. (2021). *Pedagogika*. (Principal leadership styles in crisis).
- Rahim et al. (2024). *Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management*. (Validation of crisis leadership questionnaire).
- Schoofs et al. (2024). *Current Psychology*. (Authentic leadership and self-actualization).
- Shree & Sharma (2024). *International Journal of Management Practice*. (Buddhist principles in leadership).
- Stoten (2021). *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. (Existential limits of leadership).
- Vu (2021). *Journal of Business Ethics*. (Buddhist perspectives on organizational bribery).
- Wu et al. (2021). *Leadership Quarterly*. (Review and future research agenda).

2. Books and Book Chapters

- Gigliotti (2025). In *Leadership Theories, Frameworks, and Approaches in Practice*. (Situational and contingency theories).
- McDermott (2025). In *Inside The Situation Room*. (Emotions and crisis decision-making).
- Pereira et al. (2025). In *Elgar Encyclopedia of Leadership*. (General leadership in crisis).
- Reznik et al. (2025). *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*. (New approaches to leadership qualities).
- Sartzetaki (2025). In *Integrating Simulation Tools Into Entrepreneurship Education*. (Simulation-based learning).
- Ukeni (2024). In *Leadership During a Crisis*. (Conceptualization of "Leadarchy").
- Vodosek & Zander (2020). In *Research Handbook of Global Leadership*. (Relational models).
- Willocks & Moralee (2021). In *Organizational Behaviour in Healthcare*. (Collective practice in healthcare).

3. Conference Proceedings

- Zhang et al. (2023). *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*. (Scale development of crisis leadership).