Leadership Styles in Implementing Change During and After a Crisis: A Theoretical Exploration

Mohamed Mostafa Labib

Graduate School of Business

Arab Academy for Science and

Technology and Maritime Transport

mohamedmostafalabib@gmail.com

Dr. Cherine Soliman

Assistant Professor of Management

Dean Graduate School of Business Smart Village

Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport

cherine.soliman.aagsb@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores the critical role of leadership styles in successfully implementing change during and after a crisis. It begins with the assumption that the leaders' capability to navigate the unique challenges associated with each period is a crucial factor in achieving successful change outcomes. Considering the continuous and unpredictable nature of global challenges such as Covid-19, war, and climate change, along with the specific leadership skills required to address crisis-related challenges, the article aims to address two key questions: Firstly, which leadership style is most effective in implementing change during crisis management? Secondly, which leadership style is most effective in implementing change in the aftermath of a crisis? Through a theoretical exploration drawing on existing literature and frameworks, the article identifies essential leadership behaviors, strategies, and challenges associated with change implementation during and after crises. The research findings provide valuable insights for leaders and organizations undertaking change initiatives triggered by crises, highlighting the significance of leadership styles in driving successful outcomes during and after a crisis. By understanding and leveraging appropriate leadership styles, organizations can enhance their ability to navigate change and achieve resilience in the aftermath of a crisis.

Keywords*: Leadership Styles, Crisis Management, Challenges, Adaptability.*

Introduction

The Economic Times (2023) highlights that "different leadership styles have their strengths and weakness in crisis situations". The meaning of the word "crisis" has evolved over time and carries different connotations in contemporary usage compared to its ancient Greek origins. While typically today it refers to a moment of intense difficulty, danger, or instability that requires immediate attention and decisive action, the ancient Greek concept of crisis first appeared in law, medicine and theology and "imposed choices between stark alternatives - right or wrong, salvation and damnation, life or death" (Kosellek & Richter, 2006). The word "crisis" has its roots in the Greek word "krino" which means "to separate, to choose, to judge; to decide, as a means of measuring oneself, to quarrel, or to fight" and in fact evolved being used in many fields with economics interpretating it as a state of more or less permanence or a term to address an existential analysis in the fields of psychology and theology (Kosellek & Richter, 2006). Recognizing that language and its meanings constantly evolve, the words "crisis" can acquire new layers of meaning and significance, reflecting the changing realities and perspectives of the times in which it is being used.

In times of crisis, we seek guidance and reassurance from leaders. This reliance on leaders begins in childhood, as we turn to our parents for support during difficult times and their leadership helps us navigate

uncertainty and shapes our understanding of leadership. As we grow older and become part of organizations and societies, our focus shifts to the leaders who hold positions of authority and in organizations, effective leaders provide stability, clear communication, and purpose during crises, inspiring confidence and fostering resilience. Extensive research has been conducted on the relationship between organizations and their leaders. Effective leaders play a crucial role in supporting the organization during internal and external disruptions and contribute to the organizational culture through their personal style, traits, vision, and performance, ultimately influencing how the organization responds in various situations (Bowers et al., 2017) including crisis. Therefore, leadership is widely recognized as the driving force that sets the tone, values, and behaviors that penetrate the organization and contribute to its overall culture (Thomas, 2023).

Successful change implementation during a crisis requires leaders to navigate a range of unique challenges. First, leaders must address the urgency and time pressure that crises bring (Dóci, Hofmans, Nijs & Judge, 2020), requiring swift action and decision-making, they must overcome resistance to change which is a challenge even within a normal organizational setting and not limited to a crisis (Pardo del Val & Fuentes, 2003), as crises often trigger fear and a desire for stability. Leaders must find ways to work with limited resources (Livornese & Vedder, 2017), whether financial, human, or logistical. Effective communication and coordination are another challenge in implementing change during a crisis (Johansson & Bäck, 2017), despite disrupted channels and structures, are vital in ensuring that change initiatives reach stakeholders. Research also extensively recognized that leaders must also attend to the emotional and psychological impact of the crisis, providing support and showing empathy (Bhadur, 209) whether it's in the context of a Chinese hospital facing a global pandemic such as COVID 19 (Fawad, Fuqiang, & Naveed, 2020) or in the context of school principals in New Zealand dealing with an earthquake disaster (Mutch, 2015). Additionally, leaders deal with uncertainty and changing circumstances, adjusting their strategies as the crisis progresses as well as being faced with the task of striking a balance between immediate priorities and long-term objectives, carefully managing the tension between addressing urgent matters and striving for sustainable transformation. In recent years, there has been a shift in the understanding and perception of data-driven decision making in leadership, including its role in implementing change during crisis management.

While a phrase like 'CEO's makes decisions using only 10% of data' may have circulated on digital platforms in the past, today's emphasis is on the value and importance of data-driven decision making. This shift in mindset driven by the increased availability of data, improved analytical capabilities recognizes that leveraging data is crucial for effective leadership. This is valid especially in times of crisis. Bowers, Hall & Srinivasan (2017) state that the core issue in crisis management evolves around culture and leadership however also recognize few crisis leadership principles such as the need for additional resources, avoiding distraction such as managing public perception or minimizing negative publicity and rather focus on executing an action plan to adress the crisis and minimize its consequences. In addition, they make a tought-provoking statement "the first casualty of a crisis is perspective" (Bowers, Hall & Srinivasan, 2017).

Post crisis reflection is being encouraged, along with resilience, aiming for speed over elegance, clarity of decision-making, empathy, displaying bounded optimism, effective communication (including direction-giving, meaning-making, and empathy), agile decision-making, and adaptability with proactive change engagement (Mather, 2020).

Other skills are emphasized as crucial attributes and behaviors that leaders must possess to effectively navigate the post-crisis landscape, enabling them to guide their organizations towards success in the "next normal" namely evaluation (Broekema, Eijk & Torenvlied, 2018), continual learning (Chebbi & Pündrich, 2015), long-term perspective (Fragouli & Ankunda, 2016), organizational resilience (Barone, 2014), change management (Kovoor-Misra, 2020).

The required skills for change implementation during, and post-crisis form the basis for effective leadership, which, in turn, influences the choice and application of appropriate leadership styles. Leadership styles, in conjunction with the skills, are then applied within the framework of change management models to facilitate successful change implementation during and after a crisis. Thus, there is a need for a theoretical exploration to understand the role of leadership styles in addressing these challenges. While extensive research has been conducted on leadership styles in various organizational contexts, the specific relationship between leadership styles, challenges and change outcomes during crises and in their aftermath remains relatively underexplored in the literature. Understanding how different leadership styles yackle challenges and influence change implementation during crises and post crises is crucial for leaders and organizations seeking to navigate the complexities of turbulent times effectively. By examining the theoretical underpinnings of leadership styles and their handle on callenges along with their implications for crisis management, this study aims to bridge the existing gap in the literature and contribute to a deeper understanding of effective leadership in crisis contexts.

Research Methodology

This study begins with the assumption that the leaders' capability to navigate the unique challenges associated with crisis and post crisis is a crucial factor in achieving successful change outcomes. To investigate this assumption and explore the role of leadership styles in implementing change during and after a crisis, the research methodology employs an exploratory approach, incorporating a systematic review of literature, frameworks, and empirical studies.

The Research Methodology Consists of the Following Steps:

1- Literature Review: A comprehensive review of relevant scholarly articles, books, and reports is conducted to gather theoretical insights and empirical findings on leadership styles, change management theories/models, crisis management, and the challenges associated with change implementation during and after a crisis. The literature review serves as the foundation for understanding the complexities of change in crisis contexts and identifying the key leadership styles and change management theories/models to be analyzed.

2- Identification of Leadership Styles: Based on the literature review, thirteen commonly discussed leadership styles are identified and categorized along with two new concepts namely "crisis leadership" and "adaptive leadership". The leadership styles will be examined to determine their suitability and effectiveness in addressing the unique challenges encountered during and after a crisis.

3- Identification of Change Management Theories/Models: Four organizational change management theories/ models including Kotter's Theory of Guiding Coalitions, Lewin's Change Management Model, the Situational Crisis Communication Model, the Adaptive Crisis Management Model, and the Organizational Resilience Theory are identified and analyzed. These theories/models provide frameworks for understanding and managing change in different periods, including crisis situations.

4- Mapping Leadership Styles and Challenges: Taking into consideration the challenges identified during and after a crisis, a mapping exercise is conducted to determine the alignment between different leadership styles and these challenges. This mapping aims to identify which leadership styles are most suitable for addressing specific challenges in crisis contexts.

5- Comparative Analysis: A comparative analysis is performed to explore the compatibility and effectiveness of the identified leadership styles with the change management theories/models. This analysis seeks to identify potential synergies and determine which combinations of leadership styles and change management theories/models are most effective in achieving successful change outcomes during and after a crisis.

The findings from the literature review, mapping exercise, and comparative analysis will be synthesized and presented, highlighting the effectiveness of different leadership styles in addressing crisis-related challenges and their compatibility with the identified change management theories/ models. This synthesis will provide valuable insights into the critical role of leadership in navigating change during and after a crisis, supporting the assumption that leaders' capability to address unique challenges is essential for successful change outcomes.

By employing this research methodology, the study aims to contribute to the existing literature on change management by emphasizing the importance of leadership styles in crisis contexts. The findings will provide guidance to leaders and organizations, enabling them to better understand the challenges they may face and make informed decisions to drive successful change in times of crisis.

Expected Contributions and Significance of the Study

This study will contribute to our theoretical understanding of leadership and it's challenges in crisis and post-crisis contexts by exploring the role of different leadership styles. It aims to expand the existing knowledge base and theoretical frameworks for crisis and leadership while also shedding light on how leadership styles influence post-crisis recovery, resilience-building, and long-term organizational success. The findings will provide valuable insights and recommendations for leaders and organizations navigating change initiatives during and after a crisis. By understanding the impact of different leadership styles on change outcomes, leaders can make informed decisions and adopt appropriate strategies for successful change implementation. Ultimately, this study aims to bridge the gap in the literature and provide practical insights that will contribute to effective crisis management, change implementation, and long-term organizational resilience.

Literature Review

Leadership research has proposed various styles of leadership styles and theories but the earliest leadership theory was "**The Great Men Theory**" which is often considered one of the earliest and foundational theories of leadership, "as old as the kings who caused the records of their deeds to be cut in stone" (Boring, 1950) and stated that influential leaders are born with innate qualities that enable them to bring about significant societal changes and it attributed leadership effectiveness to inherent characteristics such as intelligence, charisma, and courage thus inferring to the folks tale that "great leaders are born not made". While it is true that the "Great Men" theory is considered one of the earliest theories of leadership, the theory has attracted significant criticism and has limited applicability in contemporary leadership research as the theory's focus on innate qualities and the idea that great leaders are born, not made, has been challenged by subsequent research. A prevalent critique of the "Great Men" theory is that it overlooks the role of situational factors and the influence of context on leadership effectiveness and it fails to consider the complex interactions between leaders and their environments, including social, cultural, and organizational dynamics and also the theory has been criticized for its gender bias, as it predominantly focuses on male leaders and overlooks the contributions and potential of women leaders (Landis, Hill, & Harvey, 2014). Thus, while the "Great Men" theory holds historical significance as one of the earliest leadership theories, it has limitations and does not fully capture the complexity and diversity of leadership making it unsuitable to be discussed in the context of implementing change during crisis versus implementing change post crisis. Contemporary leadership theories have expanded our understanding of leadership by considering a broader range of factors and emphasizing the importance of behaviors and relationships rather than solely relying on innate qualities.

The 18th and 19th centuries witness significant improvements with shifts from manual production to mechanized manufacturing and largescale industrial production due to the appearance of the steam engine, textile machinery and iron production (Britannica, 2023). This industrialization, led to the emergence of modern organizations thus the population shifted from being predominantly preoccupied with farming to working in factories or organizations and as such for the first time in history we have formal organizations with large

groups of people having to work with each other achieving specific goals, thus formal structures, management systems, and specialized divisions of labor were established to optimize production and facilitate coordination among workers. During the era of industrialization, the concept of leadership evolved as a crucial factor in guiding organizations through the transformative changes brought about by mechanized manufacturing. It encompassed various aspects such as setting a clear vision, adapting to new technologies, effectively managing talent, making informed decisions, and motivating the workforce. Frederick Taylor's Principles of Scientific Management played a foundational role in shaping the management practices of these modern organizations and revolutionizing organizational practices by advocating for systematic analysis, standardization, and efficiency improvement to optimize productivity and achieve better outcomes (Nelson, 1975).

Notably, it had a significant influence on the development of the earliest modern leadership theory known as "**bureaucratic leadership**." Bureaucratic leadership, introduced by Max Weber early 20th century, is a management approach emphasizing rigid adherence to rules and hierarchical authority, commonly employed in the public sector where consistency and regulatory compliance are valued, but it is generally deemed unsuitable for the contemporary fast-paced and agile business environment. Additionally, subsequent theories, such as **Theory X** and **Theory Y**, have emerged in the field of leadership with Theory X assuming that individuals dislike work and require direction, control, and motivation through rewards and punishments, making it suitable for authoritarian leaders and in contrast, Theory Y suggesting that people are self-directed and motivated by their own goals, fostering a pseudo-democratic work environment (Chartered Management Institute, 2015).

Also, Max Weber and management scholar Robert House were among the early proponents of the concept of charismatic leadership, a leadership style where individuals, due to their unique personal qualities and charisma, inspire and motivate their followers, emphasizing the emotional bond charismatic leaders establish with their followers, leading to loyalty, commitment, and devotion. However, this leadership style has potential pitfalls as charisma can lead to emotional manipulation, followers might abandon rational thought, accepting ideas uncritically. Charismatic leaders, often receiving unquestioning approval, may become prone to distorted judgment and distraction from their goals. This reciprocal dependence may lead to a distorted perception of reality for both leaders and followers with research showing that charismatic leadership is effective up to a point. A study led by Jasmine Vergauwe of Gent University found that perceived effectiveness of leaders increased with charisma, but only up to a certain level (around the 60th percentile). Beyond this, effectiveness began to decline. Highly charismatic leaders showed strategic ambition but had difficulty managing day-to-day operations (Shonk, 2023).

Another leadership style is the **democratic leadership** style, also known as participative leadership, coined by Kurt Lewin in the 1930s (Carlin, 2019) and emphasizes the involvement of followers in decision-making processes and encourages collaboration and shared responsibility. The democratic leadership style aligns with McGregor's Theory Y assumptions, emphasizing that people enjoy work, are self-motivated, and accept responsibility. This style promotes participation and involvement, which helps overcome resistance to change and is considered effective in managing change. It fosters trust, respect, and commitment through communication, collaboration, and team leadership. However, decision-making can become challenging due to an influx of opinions. Democratic leaders treat subordinates fairly, listen, and seek support, taking a collective approach by consulting with subordinates. According to Chynoweth (2008) "many brains are better than one" but then in the context of a crisis having many brains input might be too lengthy and hinder fast action. In crisis situations, leaders often have to balance the benefits of collaboration and diverse perspectives with the need for swift decision-making and action. Effective crisis leadership involves being able to assess the situation, gather relevant information efficiently, and make informed decisions under pressure.

Kurt Lewin also coined the terms **authoritarian leadership** and **laissez-faire leadership**. Authoritarian leadership refers to a style where the leader holds all decision-making power and closely directs and controls the followers while laissez-faire leadership, on the other hand, is characterized by a hands-off approach, where the leader provides minimal guidance or involvement, allowing the followers to

make decisions and take responsibility for their own actions (Carlin, 2019). Authoritarian leadership is used interchangeably with the term "autocratic leadership".

Advantages	Disadvantages
Appropriate when there is a high degree of urgency in decision making such as crisis	Doesn't account for suggestions and insights
Allows for fast decision to be taken	May be viewed as restrictive and constraining by followers
Useful when a team is new and diverse requiring initial direction and clear parameters	Not useful when dealing with highly motivated experts who expect to give input into the decision-making process
Useful when the situation is complex, and the leaders has more expertise and experience	Overlooks the opportunity to foster an environment of openness and support

Table Advantages and Disadvantages of Autocratic Leadership (Adapted from "Leadership: Regional and Global Perspectives" by Nuttawuth Muenjohn, Adela McMurray, Mario Fernando, James Hunt, Martin Fitzgerald, Bernard McKenna, Ali Intezari, Sarah Bankins, 2018)

The Laissez-faire style is characterized by minimal influence and nominal leadership engagement (Northouse, 2009). It differs from both Theory X and Theory Y. In this style, leadership responsibilities are shared among all team members and rely on teamwork and good interpersonal relationships (Northouse, 2009). **Servant leadership**, introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf in the 1970s, emphasizes the leader's role as a servant to their followers. It emphasizes empathy, humility, and a commitment to the growth and well-being of others (Greenleaf, 2002). Servant leaders prioritize serving the needs of their team members and empowering them to reach their full potential.

Daniel Goleman, a renowned psychologist, and leadership expert, in his book Leadership synthesizes prior leadership styles but also popularizes the concept of emotional intelligence and brings forward two new leadership styles that have distinct impacts on organizational climate and performance. Two of these styles are the **Pace-setting style** and the **Coaching style** (Goleman, Leadership: The Power of Emotional Intelligence, 2010). Goleman's Pace-setting style is characterized by a focus on achieving quick results from a motivated and competent team. However, this style can have a negative impact on the overall organizational climate (Goleman, Leadership: The Power of Emotional Intelligence, 2010). Leaders employing the Pace-setting style set high standards and demand excellence from their employees, often stretching them beyond their capabilities. While effective for short-term goals, this style may not be suitable for long-term change efforts and can be detrimental to the organization's well-being. On the other hand, Goleman's Coaching style is centered around the development of employees and building their long-term strengths (Goleman, Leadership: The Power of Emotional Intelligence, 2010). This style works best when employees are willing to improve their performance. However, it is the least utilized by leaders, primarily due to time constraints in highly competitive business environments (Goleman, Leadership: The Power of Emotional Intellegence , 2010). Coaching leaders invest in training new leaders and helping employees learn and develop their skills, even if it takes time and does not immediately align with organizational goals (Goldsmith & Lyons, 2006). Understanding these different leadership styles, as stated by Goleman, can provide valuable insights into how leaders can effectively navigate various situations and drive organizational success.

Another concept in leadership is **authentic leadership**, which emphasizes self-awareness, optimism, trust, and ethical decision-making (Avolio, Fred & Walumbwa, 2004). Authentic leadership seeks to help individuals find meaning and connection at work. There are different perspectives on the definition of authentic leadership, with some focusing on being true to oneself and personal convictions (Shamir, 2005) and others emphasizing a positive moral perspective (Avolio & Luthans, 2003). The development of authentic leaders involves ongoing processes of self-awareness and establishing open, trusting relationships (Avolio & Gardner, Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership., 2005). Understanding these different leadership styles and concepts, as identified by Goleman, Northouse, and Avolio, can provide valuable insights into the various approaches' leaders can adopt to drive organizational success.

Transformational Leadership, as described by Bass & Riggio (2005), emphasizes the ability of leaders to inspire and motivate their followers, stimulate creativity, and demonstrate individual attention. The theory suggests that transformational leaders act as initiators and catalysts for change. They possess four key components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. These components enable leaders to promote exceptional performance and drive significant transformations within individuals and organizations. Muenjohn, et al., (2018) state further "a leader can be called transformational when he/she behaves in ways that influence followers such as having: perceived connection to and identification with the leader, degree of emotional and motivational arousal, experience of a greater sense of valence towards the goals or vision articulated by the leader, sense of self-esteem and self-efficacy, level of trust and confidence in the leader".

Collaborative Leadership, while not being a theory put forward by a specific individual it has emerged as a management practice and has gained attention in recent years as organizations recognize the value of collaboration in achieving goals. Collaborative leaders emphasize teamwork, cooperation, and creating a shared vision among team members and also, they encourage open communication, mutual trust, and collective problem-solving to drive innovation and achieve desired outcomes (Hurley, 2011).

The literature review highlights that leading and managing change is the most challenging aspect of a business, given the fast-paced economic and social changes in the business environment and managing human resources is the main challenge in leading change. Kotter (1999) emphasizes the need for strong leadership in managing change, stating that "More change demands more leadership." Additionally, Nilakant & Ramnarayan (2006) emphasize the importance of leadership during each phase of change, particularly the execution stage. While crisis management literature often overlooked the role of leadership, the COVID-19 pandemic brought attention to the significant impact of leadership on staff well-being and business operations. McKinsey & Company's D'Auria & Smet (2020) argues that leaders should possess behaviors and mindsets that prevent overreaction and facilitate forward-looking decision-making. Rather than relying on predefined response plans, leaders should establish clear priorities and empower others to develop and implement solutions. The pause-assess-anticipate-act cycle is crucial, allowing leaders to maintain deliberate calm and avoid overreacting to new information. Cognitive behaviors such as updating and doubting help leaders assess and anticipate effectively. Responsible leadership during the pandemic also encompasses inclusivity and innovation, as leaders strive for positive impact in their communities and organizations.

In the context of change management theories, Kotter's Theory of Guiding Coalition emphasizes the significance of creating a powerful guiding coalition during organizational change. According to Kotter's 8-stage change process, strong line leadership plays a crucial role. The process involves establishing a sense of urgency, forming a guiding coalition, developing a vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, empowering action, generating short-term wins, consolidating gains, and anchoring new approaches in the organizational culture (Kotter, Akhtar & Gupta, Change, 2022). By demonstrating initiative and leadership, individuals can successfully implement these steps and act as change agents, thereby minimizing resistance to change.

In addition to Kotter's theory, other change management theories provide valuable insights. Lewin's Change Management Model, developed by Kurt Lewin, consists of three stages: unfreeze, change, and refreeze. This model emphasizes creating awareness of the need for change, implementing the desired changes, and stabilizing them within the organization's culture (Lewin, 1947). It is a simple and practical framework for managing change, the first stage, "unfreeze," is about preparing the organization to accept that change is necessary, which involves breaking down the existing status quo and developing a compelling message showing why the current way of doing things cannot continue, the second stage, "change," is where people begin to resolve their uncertainty, exploring new behaviors, processes, or ways of working; this stage is typically filled with confusion and uncertainty, and therefore, transition support like coaching, mentoring, and training is crucial, while in the final stage, "freeze" or "refreeze," establishes stability after the

changes have been made, where the changes are accepted and become the new norm. This model suggests that change is a process, not an event, and successful change occurs when employees at all levels "unfreeze" their old behaviors, explore new ones, and then "refreeze" them into normal business operations. There is consensus in literature about the role that leadership plays in each of these phases which also tackles aspects such as ethics, motivating employees, influencing them to achieve desired outcomes or the proposed vision (Hussain, Lei, Akram, Haider & Hussain, 2018).

In the context of crisis management, the **Situational Crisis Communication Theory** (SCCT) by Timothy Coombs focuses on communication strategies during crises. It is a framework used for guiding an organization's communication with stakeholders during a crisis, with the aim of protecting and rebuilding its reputation. The theory is premised on the idea that stakeholders' perceptions of crisis responsibility and the associated reputational threat vary based on the type of crisis. According to SCCT, crises fall into three clusters based on the level of attributed responsibility: the Victim Cluster where the organization is seen as a victim (e.g., natural disasters, rumors), the Accident Cluster where crises occur unintentionally (e.g., technical errors), and the Preventable Cluster where crises occur due to the organization's intentional actions (e.g., human errors, organizational misdeeds) (Coombs, 2022). The theory proposes matching the crisis response to the crisis to manage stakeholder perceptions effectively. Communication strategies range from denial strategies for situations where the organization has minimal responsibility, to rebuilding strategies, such as offering an apology, compensation, or corrective action for situations where the organization bears full responsibility. The ultimate goal of SCCT is guiding organizations to choose the most effective crisis response to minimize damage and, where possible, restore their reputation. However, the SCCT provides guidelines and not absolute rules, and a successful crisis response also depends on other factors like the organization's prior reputation, the public's relationship with the organization, and the timeliness and consistency of the response.

Therefore, new concepts such as "crisis leadership" for "an effective crisis response" (Chaskar & Upadhyay, 2023) with leadership playing a crucial role in diagnosing the type of crisis, determining the appropriate communication strategy, delivering the crisis message effectively, managing stakeholder relationships during the crisis, and conducting post-crisis assessments for future improvements. Effective leadership can significantly influence the success of crisis management, minimizing reputational damage and aiding in the organization's recovery.

The effectiveness of leadership styles, specifically those popular ones discussed in crisis management such as charismatic and transformational leadership, varies in crisis situations with research suggesting that first, a level of charismatic leadership is beneficial during a crisis, effectively influencing followers' perceptions however, its effectiveness plateaus beyond a minimal level, and its impact diminishes faster in non-crisis situations but also, some researchers criticize the concept of charismatic leadership due to theoretical and empirical issues, including unclear definitions and measurement challenges (Wu, Shao, Newman, & Schwarz, 2021). Secondly, transformational leadership has been linked to effectively shaping followers' perceptions, aligning them with the leader's goals and values but this style is associated with constructive crisis response strategies and positive organizational perceptions, and it can also foster positive emotions, reduce negative feelings, and enhance resilience among followers during crises (Wu, Shao, Newman, & Schwarz, 2021). Nevertheless, transformational leadership also faces criticism, including difficulties in differentiating it from other styles, a lack of theory explaining its subdimensions, and mismatches between its conceptualization and measurement (Wu, Shao, Newman & Schwarz, 2021).

In times of crisis, trust becomes a pivotal factor in effective leadership, as it influences followers' perceptions and their willingness to navigate turbulent circumstances, making it essential for leaders to establish and maintain trust throughout the challenging process. Trust in leadership varies: autocratic leadership is associated with higher follower trust during the action phase (such as crisis) due to perceived competence and swift decision-making capabilities, as such this leadership style is effective in time-sensitive situations

however during the transition phase (such as post crisis), democratic leadership is linked to greater follower trust as they are seen as benevolent and inclusive, allowing for follower participation in decision-making and valuing their perspectives and this fosters trust and creates an environment of collaboration and shared responsibility (Rosing, Boer & Buengeler, 2022).

The concept of "adaptability" has indeed gained significant traction within crisis theories, giving rise to the emerging paradigm of "adaptive leadership." This new leadership style emphasizes flexibility, intuitive decision-making, and the capacity to shift between cognitive states in crisis management. It integrates elements such as interpersonal and physical adaptability, intuition, experience, and expertise and promotes a flexible response to changing conditions. Learning from past crises, testing contingency plans, and leveraging instincts can help mitigate the escalation of crises, it distinguishes between traditional reactive crisis management and the more flexible adaptive leadership, which can fluidly transition into the strategic and tactical areas of an organization's leadership framework (Weng, 2009). Other theories, such as the Organizational Resilience Theory emphasizes building resilience within organizations to effectively respond to and recover from crises, it underscores proactive planning, robust communication networks, flexibility, and the ability to learn and adapt in the face of adversity. Lengnick-Hall, Beck, & Lengnick-Hall (2011) describe organizational resilience as the capacity of a firm to absorb effectively, devise situation-specific reactions to, and ultimately partake in transformative actions to leverage disruptive surprises that could potentially jeopardize the survival of the organization.

In a nutshell, leadership skills needed for implementing change during crisis situations include strong change management abilities, clear prioritization, empowered decision-making, deliberate calmness, inclusivity and innovation, the ability to create a guiding coalition, effective communication strategies, adaptive leadership, and a focus on organizational resilience. In continuation, leadership skills needed to implement change post crisis include change management, strategic thinking, effective communication, resilience, collaboration, innovation, decision-making, and stakeholder management.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this research examines how different leadership styles manage crisis specific challenges as well as post crisis specific challenges and can influence change implementation during and after a crisis, aiming to identify the most effective styles for managing change in crisis contexts and those that may hinder the process, examining the relationship between various leadership styles and change implementation during and after a crisis. The methodology syntheses leadership theories and models, namely Great Men Theory, Bureaucratic Leadership, Theory X and Y, Charismatic Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Authoritarian Leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership, Pace-Setting Leadership, Servant Leadership, Coaching Leadership, Authentic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Collaborative Leadership, and new concepts such as Adaptive Leadership, Crisis Leadership and change management models/theories namely Kotter's Theory of Guiding Coalitions, Lewin's Change Management Model, the Situational Crisis Communication Model, the Adaptive Crisis Management Model, and the Organizational Resilience Theory.

Leadership Style Suitable for Crises

The suitability of different leadership styles in a crisis can significantly impact the ability to navigate challenges, make crucial decisions, and inspire teams to overcome adversity. However, determining which leadership style is most effective in a crisis is a complex task, as it depends on various factors and contextual considerations.

The table below presents a revised analysis of various leadership styles and their suitability in a crisis. It assigns scores of low, medium, and high to indicate the extent to which each leadership style aligns with the demands of crisis management. The scores are accompanied by explanations that shed light on the specific characteristics and considerations associated with each leadership style. The scores are as follows:

  1-   Low: This indicates that the leadership style may have limitations or challenges in effectively address-

ing the unique demands of a crisis. For example, the Bureaucratic Leadership style, which emphasizes strict adherence to rules and procedures, may lack the flexibility and adaptability required in a crisis.

2- Medium: This suggests that the effectiveness of the leadership style in a crisis is contingent upon specific factors or conditions. For instance, the Theory X and Y (McGregor) style depends on whether an authoritarian or participative approach is adopted. Theory X (authoritarian style) may be less effective due to its low flexibility and limited employee involvement, while Theory Y (participative style) could encourage problem-solving and engagement during a crisis.

3- High: This indicates that the leadership style is well-suited for crisis situations and can effectively address the challenges mentioned. For example, the Authoritarian Leadership style, is adept at fast decision-making, has better levels of trust from his/her team and suits highly complex situations, especially provided the leader has more expertise and experience than their team, all of which are crucial in a crisis.

The suitability of a leadership style in a crisis is not fixed or absolute, it is contingent upon various factors, such as the nature of the crisis, the organizational culture, and the capabilities of the leader and this is called commonly the "leadership contingency theory" (Miner, 2005). The scores and explanations in the table provide a starting point for understanding the potential effectiveness of different leadership styles, but they should be interpreted in the context of the specific crisis scenario at hand.

Leadership Style	Suitability in Crisis	Explanation
Great Men Theory	Medium	As this theory focuses on innate leadership traits, effectiveness depends on whether the leader possesses traits suitable for crisis management and doesn't account for building leadership skills.
Bureaucratic Leadership	Low	This style, emphasizing strict adherence to rules, may lack the flexibility needed in a crisis.
Theory X and Y (McGregor)	Medium	Theory X (authoritarian style) is effective due to quick action but less effective due to low flexibility, while Theory Y (participative style) could encourage problem-solving and innovation but take too long to make decisions in crises.
Charismatic Leadership	Low	Charismatic leaders can inspire and motivate employees during a crisis, but that doesn't last and also this style is weakly defined.
Democratic Leadership	Medium	This leadership style could encourage employee participation and innovative solutions, but decision-making may take longer.
Authoritarian Leadership	High	Quick decisions can be made, clear chain of command which helps communication and coordination during crisis, maintain order and trust is higher.
Laissez-Faire Leadership	Low	This hands-off approach does not provide the decisive action or direction needed during a crisis. It could be suitable in a situation where most/all team members have high expertise.
Pace-Setting Leadership	Medium	Sense of urgency, high standards can drive performance, but it may also increase stress levels during a crisis.
Servant Leadership	Low	By prioritizing the needs of the team, servant leaders can boost morale and collaboration during a crisis but that hinders the fast decision making needed in a crisis
Coaching Leadership	Medium	Focus on personal development can lead to innovative solutions, though it may require more time which is not adequate during crisis.
Authentic Leadership	Medium	Authentic leaders can build trust and show empathy as well as promote open communication, crucial in a crisis not they don't prioritize fast decision making.
Transformational Leadership	High	Agile, able to navigate crisis due to their decisive action and vision, inspiring and challenging the team, they can drive change effectively in crisis situations.
Collaborative Leadership	Medium	This style encourages innovative solutions through teamwork and can be effective for navigating a crisis, but decision making could be slow due to inability to reach consensus among the team.
Adaptive Leadership	High	Adaptive leaders are well-suited for crisis management as they encourage flexibility and responsiveness to change.
Crisis Leadership	High	This concept is specifically tailored for crises, focusing on quick, decisive action, clear communication, and effective management of resources.

Analyzing the table above, it becomes evident that in times of crisis different leadership styles can have varying degrees of suitability for effectively managing and navigating the challenges at hand. Among

the leadership styles discussed, certain styles emerge as more suitable for crisis management. Authoritarian leadership, with its ability to make quick decisions, establish a clear chain of command, and maintain order, proves to be highly effective in crisis situations. Transformational leadership, characterized by its agility, decisive action, and ability to inspire and challenge teams, is also well-suited to navigate crises and drive effective change. Adaptive leadership, which encourages flexibility and responsiveness to change, is particularly adept at managing the complexities of a crisis. Additionally, crisis leadership, specifically designed for crisis situations, focuses on quick, decisive action, clear communication, and effective resource management. On the other hand, leadership styles such as bureaucratic, laissez-faire, charismatic, and servant leadership may have limitations in terms of flexibility, direction, sustainability of inspiration, and fast decision-making, which may make them less suitable for crisis management.

Leadership Style Suitability Post Crisis

Once the crisis has passed, the dynamics and requirements change and in a post-crisis period, a different leadership approach is more suitable to address the challenges of recovery, adaptation, and rebuilding. While some elements of crisis leadership, such as resilience and clear communication, may still be relevant post-crisis, a broader leadership approach that encompasses strategic thinking, organizational resilience, and change management is more suitable and leadership styles that emphasize agility, adaptability, proactive change engagement, and long-term perspective tend to be more appropriate in the post-crisis landscape.

To assess the suitability of different leadership styles post-crisis, a table is presented with three categories: low, medium, and high suitability. These categories indicate the extent to which a leadership style aligns with the challenges and skills mentioned above.

1- A leadership style categorized as "low" in suitability post-crisis may have limitations in addressing the demands of the post-crisis landscape. It may lack the necessary attributes, behaviors, or emphasis on key areas such as effective communication, agility, adaptability, or proactive change engagement.

2- A leadership style categorized as "medium" in suitability post-crisis may have some alignment with the challenges and skills required. It may exhibit certain attributes or behaviors that are relevant but may also have limitations or require additional considerations to fully address the post-crisis landscape.

3- A leadership style categorized as "high" in suitability post-crisis is well-aligned with the challenges and skills emphasized. It demonstrates the necessary attributes, behaviors, and focus on areas like reflection, resilience, speed, clarity of decision-making, empathy, effective communication, agility, adaptability, proactive change engagement, evaluation, continual learning, long-term perspective, organizational resilience, and change management.

The suitability of a leadership style may vary depending on the specific context, organizational culture, and the nature of the post-crisis situation. A leadership style that is categorized as "low" in one context may be more suitable in another. Therefore, leaders should carefully assess the unique needs and challenges of their organizations to determine the most appropriate leadership approach in the post-crisis landscape.

Leadership Style	Suitability Post-Crisis	Explanation
Great Men Theory	Medium	The Great Men Theory may still be moderately suitable post-crisis as leaders reflect on the lessons learned, exhibit resilience, and aim for quick but effective decision-making. However, it may not fully address the need for empathy, effective communication, and proactive change engagement.
Bureaucratic Leadership	Low	Bureaucratic leadership may have low suitability post-crisis as it lacks the agility, adaptability, and speed required in the "next normal." It may also hinder effective communication and proactive change engagement, which are crucial in the post-crisis landscape.

Leadership Style	Suitability Post-Crisis	Explanation
Theory X and Y (McGregor)	Medium	The suitability of Theory X and Y styles post-crisis remains moderate. Theory X (authoritarian style) can exhibit speed over elegance in decision-making, but it may lack empathy and effective communication. Theory Y (participative style) can encourage reflection, empathy, and effective communication, but it may require longer decision-making processes.
Charismatic Leadership	Low	Charismatic leadership may have limited suitability post-crisis as it may not emphasize clarity of decision-making, effective communication, or proactive change engagement. While it can display bounded optimism, it may lack the necessary focus on agility and adaptability.
Democratic Leadership	Medium	Democratic leadership can encourage reflection, effective communication, and empathy in the post-crisis landscape. However, it may require balancing the need for speed with the long-term perspective, continual learning, and proactive change engagement.
Authoritarian Leadership	High	Authoritarian leadership can exhibit speed, clarity of decision-making, and effective communication in the post-crisis context. It can also display empathy and bounded optimism while embracing agility, adaptability, and proactive change engagement.
Laissez-Faire Leadership	Low	Laissez-faire leadership may have limited suitability post-crisis as it may not emphasize clarity of decision-making, effective communication, or proactive change engagement. It may lack the necessary direction and long-term perspective required in the "next normal."
Pace-Setting Leadership	Medium	Pace-setting leadership can exhibit speed and clarity of decision-making in the post-crisis landscape. However, it may need to prioritize effective communication, empathy, and proactive change engagement while maintaining a long-term perspective and promoting continual learning.
Servant Leadership	Medium	Servant leadership can display empathy, effective communication, and proactive change engagement in the post-crisis context. However, it may need to balance the need for speed and clarity of decision-making while embracing agility, adaptability, and a long-term perspective.
Coaching Leadership	Medium	Coaching leadership can encourage reflection, effective communication, and continual learning in the post-crisis landscape. It may require adapting to agile decision-making, proactive change engagement, and a long-term perspective while emphasizing clarity in decision-making.
Authentic Leadership	Medium	Authentic leadership can exhibit empathy, effective communication, and bounded optimism in the post-crisis context. It may need to emphasize agility, adaptability, and proactive change engagement while maintaining clarity in decision-making and a long-term perspective.
Transformational Leadership	High	Transformational leadership is highly suitable post-crisis as it encompasses many crucial attributes and behaviors. It encourages reflection, resilience, speed, clarity of decision-making, empathy, bounded optimism, effective communication, agility, adaptability, and proactive change engagement.
Collaborative Leadership	Medium	Collaborative leadership can encourage reflection, effective communication, and continual learning in the post-crisis landscape. It may need to balance the need for speed, clarity of decision-making, and proactive change engagement while embracing a long-term perspective and organizational resilience.
Adaptive Leadership	High	Adaptive leadership is highly suitable post-crisis as it emphasizes agility, adaptability, proactive change engagement, effective communication, and a long-term perspective. It encourages reflection, resilience, speed, clarity of decision-making, empathy, and bounded optimism.
Crisis Leadership	Low	Crisis leadership, with its focus on quick, decisive action, clear communication, empathy, agility, adaptability, and proactive change engagement, may have some relevance in the post-crisis landscape but needs to be supplemented with leadership styles that emphasize strategic thinking, long-term perspective, and organizational resilience.

Based on the provided table, several leadership styles exhibit varying levels of suitability in the post-crisis landscape. The Great Men Theory and Bureaucratic Leadership have moderate to low suitability as they may not fully address the need for empathy, effective communication, and proactive change engagement. Theory X and Y, Charismatic Leadership, and Laissez-Faire Leadership also have limited suitability due to their potential lack of emphasis on crucial post-crisis attributes.

On the other hand, leadership styles such as Authoritarian Leadership, Pace-Setting Leadership, Servant Leadership, Coaching Leadership, Authentic Leadership, Collaborative Leadership, and Crisis Leadership show moderate to high suitability. They exhibit aspects such as effective communication, empathy, clarity of decision-making, agility, adaptability, and proactive change engagement. However, it's important to note that Crisis Leadership, while still relevant to some extent, needs to be supplemented with leadership styles that emphasize strategic thinking, long-term perspective, and organizational resilience.

Transformational Leadership and Adaptive Leadership stand out as highly suitable in the post-crisis landscape. They encompass a wide range of crucial attributes and behaviors, including reflection, resilience, effective communication, agility, adaptability, proactive change engagement, and a long-term perspective.

In conclusion, leadership styles that prioritize strategic thinking, effective communication, empathy, agility, adaptability, proactive change engagement, and a long-term perspective are generally more suitable in the post-crisis landscape. Understanding the specific context and challenges of the post-crisis period is crucial in determining the most appropriate leadership approach.

Change Management Model Suitability for Implementing Change During and Post Crisis

In the context of crisis management, effective change implementation requires strong leadership that can navigate the complexities of the crisis and drive successful outcomes. The integration of change management models with leadership approaches is crucial for organizations seeking to implement change during and after a crisis. This section aims to examine the interplay between change management models and leadership in crisis contexts. Building upon the previously discussed change models, including Kotter's Theory of Guiding Coalitions, Lewin's Change Management Model, the Situational Crisis Communication Model, and the Adaptive Crisis Management Model, we will explore how different leadership styles and behaviors can enhance the effectiveness of these change models. By examining the alignment between leadership approaches and change management models, we aim to provide insights into the critical role of leadership in driving successful change outcomes during and after a crisis. Through this exploration, we will shed light on the leadership qualities, strategies, and challenges associated with implementing change in crisis situations, ultimately offering valuable guidance for leaders and organizations undertaking change initiatives in the face of crisis-induced disruptions.

Change Model	Leadership Styles Suitable During Crisis	Leadership Styles Suitable Post-Crisis
Kotter's Theory of Guiding Coalitions	Authoritarian, Transformational	Adaptive, Transformational, Authoritarian
Lewin's Change Management Model	Authoritarian, Transformational	Adaptive, Transformational, Authoritarian
Situational Crisis Communication Model	Authoritarian, Transformational	Adaptive, Transformational, Authoritarian
Adaptive Crisis Management Model	Transformational	Adaptive, Transformational, Authoritarian

Kotter's Theory of Guiding Coalitions:

- During a crisis: This change model suggests that both authoritarian and transformational leadership styles can be suitable. An authoritarian leadership style may be necessary to provide clear direction, make quick decisions, and establish a command structure during the crisis. On the other hand, a transformational leadership style can inspire and motivate individuals to work collaboratively and adapt to the changing circumstances.

- Post-crisis: In the aftermath of the crisis, the model recommends the use of adaptive, transformational, and authoritarian leadership styles. An adaptive leadership style is important to navigate the uncertainties and complexities of the post-crisis period and to foster a culture of continuous improvement. Transformational leadership continues to be valuable in inspiring and guiding teams towards rebuilding and regaining momentum. Additionally, an authoritarian leadership style can help maintain stability and ensure effective implementation of change initiatives during the recovery and rebuilding process.

Lewin's Change Management Model:

- During a crisis: This model indicates that both authoritarian and transformational leadership styles are suitable. An authoritarian leadership style may be beneficial in providing clear direction and

making decisive decisions to manage the crisis effectively. Meanwhile, a transformational leadership style can inspire and motivate individuals to adapt to the changes and work cohesively as a team.

- Post-crisis: In the post-crisis phase, the model suggests the use of adaptive, transformational, and authoritarian leadership styles. An adaptive leadership style is needed to navigate the challenges and uncertainties of the post-crisis period and facilitate continuous improvement. Transformational leadership remains relevant in inspiring and guiding teams towards regaining stability and achieving organizational goals. Additionally, the use of an authoritarian leadership style may be necessary to ensure effective implementation of change initiatives during the recovery phase.

Situational Crisis Communication Model:

- During a crisis: The model suggests that both authoritarian and transformational leadership styles are suitable. An authoritarian leadership style can provide clear and decisive communication during the crisis, ensuring that information is delivered in a timely and controlled manner. A transformational leadership style can inspire trust, promote open communication, and encourage collaboration among stakeholders.

- Post-crisis: In the post-crisis phase, the model recommends the use of adaptive, transformational, and authoritarian leadership styles. An adaptive leadership style is vital to address the evolving needs and challenges in the aftermath of the crisis. Transformational leadership continues to be important in rebuilding trust, fostering innovation, and guiding the organization towards recovery. Additionally, an authoritarian leadership style may be required to maintain control and ensure effective implementation of changes during the recovery and rebuilding process.

Adaptive Crisis Management Model:

- During a crisis: This model emphasizes the importance of a transformational leadership style during a crisis. Transformational leaders inspire and motivate individuals to adapt, innovate, and overcome challenges. By fostering a sense of shared purpose and empowering their teams, they enable a more flexible and adaptive response to the crisis.

- Post-crisis: In the post-crisis phase, the model suggests the use of adaptive, transformational, and authoritarian leadership styles. An adaptive leadership style is crucial to navigate the complexities and uncertainties of the post-crisis period, facilitate organizational learning, and foster resilience. Transformational leadership remains relevant in inspiring and guiding teams towards recovery and growth. Depending on the specific circumstances, an authoritarian leadership style may be utilized to ensure effective implementation of changes and maintain stability.

Findings and Discussion

The study found that leadership styles play a crucial role in successful change implementation during and after a crisis. Both authoritarian and transformational leadership styles were effective during the crisis phase. Authoritarian leadership provided clear direction and enabled quick decision-making, while transformational leadership inspired collaboration and innovation. In the post-crisis phase, adaptive, transformational, and authoritarian leadership styles were recommended.

Aligning the identified leadership styles with change management models supported their relevance. Kotter's Theory of Guiding Coalitions and Lewin's Change Management Model emphasized clear direction and teamwork during a crisis, supporting both authoritarian and transformational leadership styles. The Situational Crisis Communication Model highlighted the importance of effective crisis communication, facilitated by various leadership styles. The Adaptive Crisis Management Model emphasized the need for

adaptive leadership during crises and recommended a combination of adaptive, transformational, and authoritarian leadership styles in the post-crisis period.

By aligning leadership styles with these models, organizations can enhance their ability to navigate crises successfully, inspire teams, and achieve positive change outcomes. Effective leadership addresses challenges such as uncertainty, resource limitations, communication breakdowns, and the need for rapid decision-making. It fosters adaptability, effective communication, collaboration, and maintains focus.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this article has examined the critical role of leadership styles in successfully implementing change during and after a crisis. It has addressed the key questions of which leadership style is most effective in crisis management and which style is most effective in the aftermath of a crisis. Through a theoretical exploration and analysis of existing literature and frameworks, essential leadership behaviors, strategies, and challenges associated with change implementation during and after crises have been identified.

The research findings underscore the significance of leadership styles in driving successful change outcomes during and after a crisis. During a crisis, a combination of authoritarian and transformational leadership styles has proven effective. Authoritarian leadership provides clear direction and facilitates quick decision-making, while transformational leadership inspires collaboration and innovation.

In the aftermath of a crisis, adaptive, transformational, and authoritarian leadership styles are recommended. Adaptive leadership is crucial for navigating uncertainties and complex changes, while transformational leadership continues to inspire and engage employees in the process of rebuilding and implementing change. Additionally, the need for authoritarian leadership may persist to provide clear direction and maintain focus during the recovery and change implementation period. By understanding and leveraging appropriate leadership styles, organizations can enhance their ability to navigate change and achieve resilience in the aftermath of a crisis. This article provides valuable insights for leaders and organizations undertaking change initiatives triggered by crises, emphasizing the importance of aligning leadership styles with the unique challenges of crisis management and post-crisis change implementation.

Considering the continuous and unpredictable nature of global challenges, such as Covid-19, war, and climate change, the study's findings have practical implications for leaders seeking to drive successful change outcomes in the face of adversity. It is recommended that leaders integrate the identified leadership behaviors and strategies into their practices to foster organizational resilience, growth, and success in challenging circumstances.

Further research can build upon this study by exploring the specific contexts of different crises and their impact on leadership styles and change implementation. Additionally, empirical research can provide deeper insights into the effectiveness of different leadership styles in various crisis scenarios, further enriching our understanding of leadership in times of change and uncertainty.

References

- Avolio, B. J. & Gardner, W. L. (2005). *Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership*. doi: https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001

- Avolio, B. J. & Luthans, F. (2003). *Authentic Leadership: A Positive Developmental Approach.*

- Avolio, B. J., Fred, L. & Walumbwa, F. O. (2004). *Authentic Leadership: Theory-Building for Veritable Sustained Performance.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/245558455_Authentic_Leadership_Theory-Building_for_Veritable_Sustained_Performance

- Barone, K. K. (2014). *Analyzing discourse of renewal in post-crisis organizational resiliency among nonprofit organizations*. Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/openview/e4a3def1e2f37dcd7d21df4b8698e41f/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750

- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2005). Transformational Leadership.

- Bhadur, R. M. (2019, April 2). Leveraging culture and leadership in crisis management. *European Journal of Training and Development*. Retrieved September 1, 2023, from https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/EJTD-10-2018-0109/full/html

- Boring, E. G. (1950). Great Men and Scientific Progress. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 94(4). Retrieved May 2023, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3143518

- Bowers, M. R., Hall, R. J. & Srinivasan, M. M. (2017, August). Organizational culture and leadership style: The missing combination for selecting the right leader for effective crisis management. *Business Horizons*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.04.001

- Britannica. (2023, September 26). Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/money/topic/Industrial-Revolution

- Broekema, W., Eijk, C. V. & Torenvlied, R. (2018, October). The role of external experts in crisis situations: A research synthesis of 114 post-crisis evaluation reports in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 20-29. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.03.021

- Carlin, D. (2019, October 18). Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidcarlin/2019/10/18/democratic-authoritarian-laissez-faire-what-type-of-leader-are-you/

- Chartered Management Institute. (2015, October). *Douglas Mcgregor: Theory X and Theory Y*. Retrieved from https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/7496611/mod_folder/content/0/SEB_LYO_McGregor_Thinker.pdf

- Chaskar, A. & Upadhyay, S. (2023, May 21). *Why some hotels get it right and others don't: Perspective of situational crisis communication theory towards crisis response strategies*. Wiley. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12477

- Chebbi, H. & Pündrich, A. P. (2015, May 2015). *Learning crisis unit through post-crisis: characteristics and mechanisms*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/TLO-07-2011-0044

- Chynoweth, C. (2008, February 7). Leaders who put onus on the led. *The Times and Sunday Times*, pp. 1-2.

- Coombs, T. W. (2022). *Situational Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT).* Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119678953.ch14

- D'Auria, G. & Smet, A. D. (2020, March 16). *Leadership in a crisis responding to the coronavirus outbreak and future challenges*. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/leadership-in-a-crisis-responding-to-the-coronavirus-outbreak-and-future-challenges

- Dóci, E., Hofmans, J., Nijs, S., & Judge, T. A. (2020). Leaders under pressure: time pressure and state core self-evaluations as antecedents of transformational leadership behaviour. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 29*(4). doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1714717

- Fawad , A., Fuqiang , Z., & Naveed , A. (2020, August 6). How and When Does InclusiveLeadership Curb Psychological Distress During a Crisis? Evidence From the COVID-19 Outbreak. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01898

- Fragouli, E. & Ankunda, C. (2016, September). Leadership, crisis management and business sustainability: A case study. *The Business and Management Review*, 8 (2). Retrieved from https://cberuk.com/cdn/conference_proceedings/2019-07-20-12-02-46-PM.pdf

- Goldsmith, M., & Lyons, L. (2005). *Coaching for Leadership: The Practice of Leadership Coaching from the World's Greatest Coaches*. Pfeiffer; 2nd edition. Retrieved March 2023

- Goleman, D. (2011). *Leadership: The Power of Emotional Intelligence*. More Than Sound. Retrieved May 2023

- Greenleaf, R. K., & Spears, L. C. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Paulist Press; 25th edition.

- Hurley, T. J. (2011). *Oxford Leadership*. Retrieved from https://www.oxfordleadership.com/collaborative-leadership-white-paper/

- Hussain, S. T., Lei, S., Akram, T., Haider, M. J., Hussain, S. H., & Ali, M. (2018, September-December). Kurt Lewin's change model: A critical review of the role of leadership and employee involvement in organizational change. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 3(3). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.07.002

- Johansson, C. & Bäck, E. (2017, July 17). Strategic Leadership Communication for Crisis Network Coordination. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 11 (4). doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2017.1341889

- Kosellek, R. & Richter, M. W. (2006). Crisis. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 67 (2), 357-400. Retrieved October 18, 2023, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30141882

- Kotter, J. P. (1999). John P. *Kotter on What Leaders Really Do*. Harvard Business press. Retrieved June 2023, from https://www.google.com.eg/books/edition/John_P_Kotter_on_what_Leaders_Really_Do/P3d8DV0NPUkC?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=John+P.+Kotter+on+What+Leaders+Really+Do&printsec=frontcover

- Kotter, J. P., Akhtar, V. & Gupta, G. (2022). *Change.* Retrieved from https://go.kotterinc.com/l/504001/2022-08-18/31msqv/504001/1660843784Wq2I07mK/8_Steps_eBook_Kotter_2022.pdf

- Kovoor-Misra, S. (2020). *Crisis Management: Resilience and Change*. Retrieved from https://sk.sagepub.com/books/download/crisis-management-resilience-and-change/i2161.pdf

- Landis, E. A., Hill, D. & Harvey, M. R. (2014). A Synthesis of Leadership Theories and Styles. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 15 (2). Retrieved May 3, 2023, from http://www.na-businesspress.com/JMPP/LandisEA_Web15_2_.pdf

- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001

- Kuhn, M. H. (1951). LEWIN, KURT. Field Theory of Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers. (Edited by Dorwin Cartwright.) Pp. xx, 346. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 276(1), 146-147. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271625127600135

- Livornese, K. & Vedder, J. (2017). The emotional wellbeing of nurses and nurse leaders in crisis. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 41(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.1097/NAQ.0000000000000221

- Mather, P. (2020, September 18). *Leadership and governance in crisis: some reflections on COVID-19*. Emerald. Retrieved from https://www.emerald.com/insight/1832-5912.htm

- Miner, J. B. (2005). *Organizational Behavior: Essential Theories of Motivation and Leadership. Routledge*. Retrieved from https://www.routledge.com/Organizational-Behavior-1-Essential-Theories-of-Motivation-and-Leadership/Miner/p/book/9780765615244

- Muenjohn, N., McMurray, A., Fernando, M., Hunt, J., Fitzgerald, M., McKenna, B., Bankins, S. (2018). *Leadership: Regional and Global Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

- Mutch, C. (2015, December). Leadership in times of crisis: Dispositional, relational and contextual factors influencing school principals' actions. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 14 (2). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2015.06.005

- Nelson, D. (1975). Scientific management in transition: Frederick W. Taylor at Johnstown, 1986. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 99 (4), 460-475. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20091003

- Nilakant, V. & Ramnarayan, S. (2006). *Change Management: Altering Mindsets in a Global Context*. SAGE Journals.

- Northouse, P. G. (2020). *Introduction to Leadership: Concepts and Practices*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/introduction-to-leadership/book259156

- Pardo del Val, M. & Fuentes, C. (2003). Resistance to change: a literature review and empirical study. *Management Decision*, 41 (2). doi:10.1108/00251740310457597]

- Rosing, F., Boer, D. & Buengeler, C. (2022, August 3). When timing is key: How autocratic and democratic leadership relate to follower trust in emergency contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.904605

- Shamir, B. & G. E. (2005). *"What's Your Story?" to Life-Stories Approach to Authentic Leadership Development*. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.005

- Shonk, K. (2023, September 21). Charismatic Leadership: Weighing the Pros and Cons. *Harvard*. Retrieved from https://www.pon.harvard.edu/daily/leadership-skills-daily/charismatic-leadership-weighing-the-pros-and-cons/

- The Economic Times . (2023, October 26). *Leadership Styles in Crisis Management: What Works Best?*, Retrieved from https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/jobs/c-suite/leadership-styles-in-crisis-management-what-works-best/articleshow/104730184.cms

- Thomas, D. A. (2023, September 5). *The Power of Leadership: Shaping Your Organization's Identity and Success*. Retrieved from medium.com: https://medium.com/@DebraAThomasMBA/the-power-of-leadership-shaping-your-organizations-identity-and-success-e3e6c7acd9c0

- Weng, Y. K. (2009). *Managing ahead of crises: Rising towards a model of adaptability*. Retrieved from https://www.kent.ac.uk/scarr/events/beijingpapers/Yappp2.pdf

- Wu, Y. L., Shao, B., Newman, A. & Schwarz, G. (2021, May 6). Crisis leadership: A review and future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984321000230