

The Ontology of Leadership in Crisis: Beyond the Directive Model Toward Collaborative-Adaptive Leadership

Imaduddin Fadhlurrahman

UIN Alauddin Makassar

*Corresponding Author: E-mail: imaduddin@uin-alauddin.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received 12 Dec, 2025

Revised 21 Jan, 2026

Accepted 14 Feb, 2026

Keywords:

Breastfeeding Dam, Education
Learning Videos, Third
Trimester Mothers, Knowledge,
Prevention

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine whether leadership in crisis situations is ontologically distinct from leadership under normal conditions, and to demonstrate that collaborative-adaptive leadership constitutes the most ontologically honest response to the nature of crisis. This study employs philosophical library research through three complementary analytical approaches: philosophical inquiry, hermeneutical analysis, and critical comparative analysis. The directive model operates on three erroneous assumptions reality as already known, the sovereign singular subject, and time as linear sequence all of which collapse when crisis occurs. The phenomenology of Heidegger (Mitsein), Husserl (Einfühlung), and Arendt (plurality) demonstrates that crisis can only be responded to collectively, manifesting through three dimensions: collaboration as recognition of ontological complexity, empathy as ontological capacity, and trust as the foundation of a new shared world. Directive leadership is ontologically incompatible with the nature of crisis as a condition of human being-in-common (being-in-common). This study affirms the importance of integrating ontological, epistemological, and axiological dimensions in leadership theory, while simultaneously opening space for dialectical inquiry into phenomenologically-grounded leadership.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership crises in disaster conditions and social disruption are one of the urgent problems in contemporary leadership studies. When disasters strike an area, often the government's response relies on a directive model that emphasizes a formal command system, a strict hierarchy of authority, and standard procedures that have been codified in various regulations. Thousands of residents were affected, hundreds of thousands of housing units were damaged, and millions of people needed immediate coordination. At this level, the directive model seems reasonable and even necessary.

But what happened after that revealed something deeper than just a managerial problem. The rehabilitation and reconstruction that took many years, especially the construction of housing, still left many problems such as the affected residents not being involved in planning, the location of the residence far from the source of livelihood, and the building area was inadequate for the needs of the family. Boana identified similar phenomena in various post-disaster contexts when leadership focused on physical speed and procedural compliance impacted with the human needs of neglected communities (Boano, 2009).

In the aspect of leadership studies, it touches on a very basic space. Sott and Bender in a systematic review affirm that adaptive leadership differs from traditional leadership because of the speed with which it responds philosophically to changing conditions so that it does not simply adapt techniques (Sott & Bender, 2025). For example, in the context of agile leadership (*Agile Leadership*) in post-pandemic conditions is not only a matter of the speed of decision-making, but also a matter of recognition of the ontological complexity of the conditions faced. Leadership built on philosophical grounding has a strong depth of vision and ethical sensibility (Istianah & Castrawijaya, 2025). The implications of philosophical paradigms, especially ontology, epistemology, and axiology, directly shape the character of critical, committed, and humanist leadership (Asmar et al., 2026).

However, these studies generally discuss the philosophical dimension of leadership separately from crisis situations and examine crises solely from the point of view of management without touching its ontological foundations. Studies that explicitly question the ontological directive leadership model in accordance with the nature of the crisis situation are still unfamiliar. This gap is the basis for why reviewing the ontological foundation is fundamental. In line with the perspective of Islamic educational philosophy which emphasizes the importance of understanding nature (ontology) as the basis for action that the ontological question of leadership is a legitimate and urgent question (Zarita et al., 2025).

This study tries to see that the directive leadership model is ontologically incompatible with the nature of the crisis situation. The most appropriate leadership perspective to use is collaborative-adaptive leadership because it is the only form of leadership that is ontologically honest about the condition of crisis as a *being-in-common condition* that requires a collective reconstruction of meaning.

In this regard, the author conducted a more in-depth study by taking four systematic steps. First, explore the ontological assumptions hidden behind the directive leadership model. Second, it shows how phenomenology with the views of Heidegger, Husserl, and Arendt offers fundamentally different understandings of crises. Third, it shows that collaborative-adaptive leadership is an ontologically honest response to a crisis.

RESEARCH METHODS

The method in this study is a *philosophical library research* that contains theories relevant to the research problem. The problem in this study is to explore the meaning of leadership ontology in crisis. In this section, the author conducts a study of the concept and theory of normative leadership from several literature reviews. This approach is further to know the study of leadership philosophy because its main focus is on the exploration of ideas, theories, and concepts that are normative, reflective, and conceptual. The primary sources used in this study are books and journals that contain leadership concepts, the thoughts of phenomenological figures, and post-disaster literature.

To analyze the findings, the author carried out three modes that complemented each other. First, *Philosophical inquiry* to unravel the ontological assumptions hidden in the directive leadership model. Second, by conducting hermeneutic analysis to interpret primary philosophical texts contextually. Third, conduct a critical comparative analysis to bring together phenomenological traditions with contemporary leadership literature (Istianah & Castrawijaya, 2025).

THEORETICAL STUDIES

Ontology and Leadership

The term ontology in the context of leadership refers to the question of the nature of existence that underlies the actions of leaders and leadership relationships. Leadership philosophy questions the deepest substance of leadership through ontological, epistemological, and axiological approaches so that leadership is asked not only how it is run, but also why and for what it exists (Istianah & Castrawijaya, 2025). The implications of the philosophical paradigm directly affect the character of leadership with an ontological dimension that forms a critical character, epistemology forms a commitment to truth, and axiology forms a humanist orientation (Asmar et al., 2026).

In the modern management tradition, this ontological question is rarely raised explicitly. The mainstream leadership literature as depicted in the compilation of dominant leadership theories tends to be dominated by functional-managerial approaches that are more interested in the question of "what should leaders do" than "what is the nature of leadership relations themselves" (Northouse, 2025). The absence of this ontological question makes many leadership models operate on assumptions that have never been tested such as assumptions about the nature of reality, the nature of the subject in charge, and the nature of the time in which the action takes place.

Phenomenology as an Alternative Framework

Phenomenological philosophy, particularly the traditions developed by Husserl, Heidegger, and Arendt, offers a framework for understanding leadership from fundamentally different perspectives. Husserl introduced the concept of intersubjectivity (*Einfühlung*) as a constitutive structure of experience that we do not first present as isolated individuals who then interact with others, but rather togetherness is a condition that precedes individuality (Husserl, 1960). Moreover, Husserl shows that *Einfühlung* has cosmological implications because each ego constitutes another person as a subject who also experiences the same world, so the world itself is constituted as an intersubjective world not my private world, but a world that is equally inhabited and equally interpreted by all subjects who acknowledge each other. Husserl affirmed that the world did not exist to me as my own synthetic formation, but as an intersubjective world that really existed for everyone (Husserl, 1960).

The implications for leadership in a crisis are very direct if the world is from there already the world is together, then a leader's attempt to hold on his own the meaning of the crisis experienced together is a denial

of the most basic structure of reality itself. Heidegger developed this further with the concept of *Mitsein* (*With*). This means that human existence is essentially a co-existence, and the world we inhabit is a world shared with others in a common constructed language, practice, and meaning (Heidegger, 1962). Heidegger also reminds that in everyday life, togetherness can actually be depersonalized in which human beings tend to fall into the mode of *das Man* ('the general') where no one really decides because everyone just follows what 'people usually do'. Crisis is a moment that has the potential to liberate *Dasein* from this anonymous mode, but only if the leadership present provides space for each individual to appear as a unique and distinct subject, rather than forcing everyone to merge into a single will (Heidegger, 1962).

Arendt, in *The Human Condition* (1958), developed an understanding of action (*Stuart T*) that is different from mere behavior or work. Action is the activity of the highest degree of humanity. The way humans introduce something new into the world, which always happens in front of others in a public space filled with a diversity of perspectives that cannot be reduced to one. This framework has direct implications for leadership theory. Philosophically, this implies that leadership that emphasizes diversity means removing the conditions that allow for true action (Arendt, 1958).

Arendt developed this further through the concept *Nativity* that every human being, being born into the world as a newcomer (*newcomer*), brings a new principle of beginnings the ability to start something that has never existed before. True action (*Stuart T*), different from labor (*labor*) and manufacturing (*Work*), is an expression of *Nativity* which always brings something new into the world. But importantly, this kind of action always takes place within the existing web of human relations and no action takes place in isolation because each action directly enters and transforms the network of relations already inhabited by many different perspectives (Arendt, 1958). Leadership that suppresses diversity means removing the conditions that allow for true action

Adaptive and Collaborative Leadership

Adaptive leadership in crisis situations, identifies eight core characteristics of adaptive leaders, namely flexibility, empathy, transparent communication, innovation, adaptability, collaboration, long-term vision, and resilience. These characteristics are not a separate list of technical skills, but rather a manifestation of a fundamental orientation in which recognition of the reality of the crisis is complex, uncertain, and requires a collective response (Sott & Bender, 2025). In the context of governance, the inability of one institution to independently address the complexity of crises makes inter-organizational collaboration not just a managerial choice, but a structural need of the governance system itself (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003)

The integration of philosophical values such as virtue ethics (*Virtue Ethics* Aristotle and moral responsibility become important as the foundation of leadership that is not only effective but oriented towards long-term sustainability (Adzkie et al., 2025). Effective transformational leadership must have the ability to steer organizations in new directions that is only possible if there is room for diversity to speak and act (Suratno, 2024).

RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

Ontological Assumptions of the Directive Model: A Stable World and a Single Subject

To understand why the directive leadership model is problematic ontologically in crisis situations, the author identifies the fundamental assumptions that form its foundation. These assumptions are rarely articulated explicitly because they are so basic that they appear to be unquestionable common sense. These three assumptions correspond directly to the three dimensions of philosophy identified in the scope of ontology, epistemology, and axiology (Asmar et al., 2026).

The first assumption is reality that has been known to be an epistemological fallacy. The directive leadership model departs from the assumption that the reality faced is basically already known or can be known by the leader. Goals are clear, obstacles can be mapped, and the task of leadership is to transmit the right instructions through a predetermined chain of command. This kind of epistemological position as Information Bias because leaders who do not have honest epistemological methods to verify data and minimize bias in policymaking (Asmar et al., 2026). In more technical language, directive leadership operates *traditional leadership approach* that is, a leadership approach that focuses on maintaining the status quo and implementing established solutions to familiar problems (Sott & Bender, 2025).

The second assumption is that a single subject is sovereign as an ontological fallacy. The directive leadership model inherits the tradition of modern subject philosophy that adheres to a coordinate system in which the determination of a single thinking subject is the center of the whole of reality (Descartes, 2008). This means that there is one subject who thinks about deciding and acting, while the other responds to his instructions. Legitimacy comes from position, not from relationships. Ontological fallacy asserts that the ontological foundation of leadership requires leaders to understand themselves not as rulers, but as moral actors who must realize their responsibilities to fellow human beings (Istianah & Castrawijaya, 2025). In contrast, adaptive leadership is fundamentally at odds with this single-subject model. Because he actually recognizes the importance of diverse perspectives and experiences. The approach actively seeks to integrate

various points of view (Sott & Bender, 2025). Historically empirically, the narrative of a single, effective strong leader is a myth that the most successful leadership has always relied on the distribution of power and collaboration, not centralization (Brown, 2014)

The third assumption is time as a linear sequence as an axiological error. The directive leadership model operates on the assumption that actions can be ordered in a linear manner. The order is very rigid and systematic for crisis situations that require flexibility. It must be planned, then implemented, until it ends in evaluation. A crisis is a condition in which a normal sequence of time collapses by events coming before readiness and need arise before resources are available. Leadership that is ontologically capable of acting responsively and is not committed to results alone, but to the process of seeking truth. This shows that leadership is actually an axiological transformation that rejects the assumption of timeliness linearity (Asmar et al., 2026).

The Ontology of Crisis: A Collapsing World and Co-existence

The philosophy of phenomenology offers an understanding of crisis that is fundamentally different from a managerial understanding. Heidegger distinguishes two modes of human existence, the first the *Zuhandenheit* mode (*ready-to-hand*) than *Vorhandenheit* (*present-at-hand*). In normal everyday life, we interact with the world in *Zuhandenheit* fashion. These interactions include tools, procedures, and social orders that function transparently. Crisis is the *Unzuhandenheit* moment when the world's equipment breaks down and its transparency disappears. What is more important is that the crisis reveals that the world order that we consider natural is actually a construction that is built and may one day collapse (Heidegger, 1962).

This phenomenon empirically shows that crises are characterized by high pressures and uncertainties that force organizations to restructure organizational frameworks as an implicit recognition that the old world has collapsed and needs to be rebuilt. This is not just a technical-managerial problem, but an ontological problem (Sott & Bender, 2025).

Heidegger also affirms that human existence is essentially a co-existent existence (*being with*). Humans do not first present as isolated individuals who then decide to join others. Togetherness is an ontological structure that precedes individuality. Human beings, both individuals and groups, have always been in a world that is shared with others. Always in the same language, in the same social practices, in a mutually constructed sense (Heidegger, 1962). If the world is basically a shared world, then the collapse of the world in crisis is the collapse of that shared world. Its reconstruction cannot be done by a single subject who is directed. Heidegger even asserts that ontological solitude itself can only be understood as a shortcoming of togetherness, not an original condition that is then complemented by others, but a mode that has departed from the more fundamental structure of Being-with. Dasein's world is from there, so a leader's attempt to deal with the crisis alone is not just an unwise choice, but a denial of the most fundamental structure of his own existence as a human being (Heidegger, 1962). Dispersed leadership allows institutions to be more responsive to change (Harris, 2008).

Arendt in *The Human Condition* shows that directive leadership removes the true action dimension of leadership. It reduces social interaction to a series of instructions and responses, eliminating space for plurality to speak (Arendt, 1958). In a crisis situation where innovation and response to the unprecedented are most needed, this actually shows a fundamental shortcoming. The leader in Aristotle's perspective would understand himself as part of an interconnected system, not as a machine that can be controlled from a single point (Adzkie et al., 2025).

Arendt also sharply distinguishes between *Power* (power) and *strength* (individual strength). *Power* It only exists when people act together and immediately disappears when the togetherness is dissolved. That is, only where humans live so close that the potential for action is always present and *Power* can survive with them. Anyone who isolates himself and does not participate in the together, loses *Power* and become helpless, no matter how powerful they are. The implications for leadership in crisis are very concrete because a directive model that centralizes all decisions on a single figure destroys the only source of power available in a crisis situation, namely the collective potential that only grows from acting together (Arendt, 1958)

Collaborative-Adaptive Leadership as an Ontological Response to Crises

The author's analysis above proves that collaborative-adaptive leadership is not just a more inclusive or more democratic model. It is an ontologically honest response to the nature of the crisis. This argument can be developed through three dimensions.

First, collaboration as a recognition of the ontological complexity of collaborative leadership contains a profound epistemological recognition that no single actor has full access to the reality at hand. Therefore, the role of the leader shifts from a single decision-maker to a facilitator that allows various parties to build a common consensus (Chrislip, 2002). In the framework of collaborative governance, this means that the public policy formulation process must rely on deliberation and consensus among all actors involved (Ansell & Gash, 2008). This shows the crucial characteristics of an adaptive leader who is able to recognize and appreciate the unique skills and experiences of each team member. Adaptive leaders also actively seek diverse perspectives

both in terms of practical operationalization and the concept of intersubjectivity (Sott & Bender, 2025). Agile leadership in post-pandemic education manifests not only in quick and flexible decision-making, but also in empathetic communication, collaborative governance, and leadership distribution practices that strengthen resilience. The distribution of leadership to teachers and staff is not just an administrative efficiency, but also an acknowledgment that the reality of the crisis is inter-perspective (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

Second, empathy as an ontological capacity is not just a social skill. Husserl's phenomenology offers a much deeper understanding of empathy. He mentioned the term *Einfühlung* as a constitutive operation that allows human beings to experience and understand others not as objects, but as subjects. This means that humans also feel each other's lives as well as their own internal lives (Husserl, 1960). Empathy as one of the core characteristics of an adaptive leader is the ability to understand the needs, concerns, and perspectives of team members by showing a genuine interest in their well-being. Furthermore, empathy encourages a sense of psychological security that allows team members to feel valued and supported. This is ontologically identical to the conditions for *being-in-the-world* healthy ones (Sott & Bender, 2025). Leadership rooted in correct axiological values is able to create the ontological conditions for meaningful action (Asmar et al., 2026).

Third, trust as the foundation of a new shared world. Ontologically, crises destroy trust entirely. This can damage trust in various lines of life ranging from environmental stability, to one's own abilities, to institutions and leaders. Therefore, transparent communication is needed as one of the important organizational factors. Open and transparent communication at all levels of the organization is essential to creating an environment conducive to adaptive leadership (Sott & Bender, 2025). This transparency is not just a communication strategy but an act of rebuilding ontological trust that collapsed with the crisis. which in a collaborative framework is the basic condition for the work of consensus between actors (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Sincere and empathetic communication from the leader they refer to as a practice '*encourage the heart*' has been shown to be effective in maintaining emotional stability and strengthening social cohesion in communities facing stress (Kouzes & Posner, 2006)

The Character of an Ontological-Responsive Leader

From the integration of various perspectives that the author discusses, an image emerges of the character of an ontological responsive leader. That character in dealing with crisis situations gives rise to the most systematic framework with three of the most prominent leadership characters, namely critical (rooted in ontology), committed (rooted in epistemology), and humanist (rooted in axiology) (Asmar et al., 2026).

Critical character means that the leader does not accept reality as it is. He questioned the construction presented and dared to face the real conditions. In the context of a crisis, this means not imposing the old procedures on fundamentally different situations. Committed character means that the leader is committed to an honest truth-seeking process. Humanist character means that leaders put human dignity above the achievement of targets. Prioritizing principles that become crucial when humans are in the most vulnerable condition.

Sott and Bender formulated their empirical equivalents in eight characteristics of adaptive leaders: flexibility, empathy, transparent communication, innovation, adaptability, collaboration, long-term vision, and resilience. What is noteworthy is that these characters are not lists of technical skills that can be learned separately, but the manifestation of one fundamental ontological orientation (Sott & Bender, 2025). In the context of disaster management in Indonesia, similar principles can be identified as the core of collaborative leadership. Achadi identifies several principles of collaborative leadership that include empathy, high integrity, solid team-building abilities, networking, and openness to criticism and suggestions (Achadi, 2022). This convergence between international findings and local contexts reinforces the argument that responsive ontological orientation is not an abstract concept, but rather a capacity that can be identified and developed in real praxis. So that the recognition of the reality of the crisis is a shared reality that can only be responded to together through collaborative leadership.

Philosophical Foundations: Beyond Pragmatism

The arguments developed in which the author writes actually go beyond the technical debate about which leadership model is more effective. He challenged the way the question itself was formulated. The more appropriate question is not "which model is more effective in a crisis situation?" but "which model is ontologically appropriate to the nature of a crisis situation?" Leadership philosophy questions the deepest substance of leadership so that leadership is asked not only how it is run, but also why and for what it exists (Istianah & Castrawijaya, 2025). In the context of leadership for the public good, the issues faced are often of a '*Shared problem*' which can only be resolved through '*Shared power*' so that collaboration is not just an ethical choice but a structural condition of leadership that is responsible for the public interest (Crosby & Bryson, 2005)

One of the most common justifications for directive leadership in emergency situations is the speed at which precious seconds are to save lives and a lengthy deliberative process is an unbearable luxury. However, this argument contains confusion that needs to be unraveled. The speed of emergency response (the first phase

of the crisis) and the speed of reconstruction of meaning (the post-disaster recovery phase) are two fundamentally different things. Lester and Krejci show this when analyzing formal incident management systems that centralized command systems may be functional for short-term emergency response, but create structural barriers to sustainable post-crisis leadership that require horizontal collaboration and local autonomy (Lester & Krejci, 2007). For example, in disaster management, rapid development that does not involve the community only produces housing that physically exists but is not inhabited with the meaning of a dwelling that does not become a home (Boano, 2009). Leaders who focus only on short-term results are no longer adequate in the face of the complexity of modern challenges (Adzkie et al., 2025).

There is a cycle of virtue (*virtuous cycle*) in adaptive leadership (Sott & Bender, 2025). First, through conducive organizational factors so as to create an environment for adaptive leadership. Then adaptive leadership strengthens high-performing teams. Then a high-performing team strengthens an innovative organizational culture so that it further strengthens the capacity of adaptive leadership. This insight shows that responsive ontological leadership is not just an individual choice of a leader, but a condition that needs to be created systematically. In the framework of collaborative governance, the systemic conditions include three interdependent layers: a collaborative system that determines who is involved and with what mandate, a collaborative dynamic that builds trust and mutual understanding, and collaborative actions that translate those dynamics into tangible and sustainable actions, and all three are highly determined by the political, socio-economic, and institutional capacities that surround them (Emerson et al., 2012). This can only be realized if you are able to make reflective efforts on activities ranging from the largest to the smallest. Such as an effort to reflect on ontological reflection in every strategic meeting to face reality honestly. Then an epistemological ritual to ensure the validity of the knowledge used in decision-making. To axiological audits to ensure that every decision really benefits all parties (Asmar et al., 2026).

CONCLUSION

Directive leadership is not just a model that is less effective in crisis situations, but a model that is ontologically incompatible with the nature of the crisis itself. This study found that the directive leadership model operates on three erroneous assumptions, namely reality that has been known to be an epistemological fallacy, a single sovereign subject as an ontological fallacy, and time as a linear sequence as an axiologic fallacy. All three assumptions collapse when a crisis occurs because a crisis is essentially a moment in which the established world order is destroyed and a new reality must be built together in a plural space inhabited by various perspectives that cannot be reduced to one. The phenomenology of Heidegger (Mitsein), Husserl (Einfühlung), and Arendt (plurality) consistently shows that crisis is a *being-in-common* condition that can only be responded to collectively rather than by a single directive subject.

In such conditions, collaborative-adaptive leadership is not just a better choice, but a form of leadership that is ontologically honest to the nature of the crisis. This is manifested through three mutually supportive dimensions, namely collaboration as a recognition of ontological complexity, empathy as an ontological capacity to acknowledge the existence of others as subjects, and trust as the foundation of a new shared world that is being rebuilt after collapse. This research thus challenges the way of formulating the question of leadership in crisis that is not "what is most effective?" but rather "what is most ontologically honest to the human condition in crisis?" This confirms why a philosophical approach is needed to answer it.

REFERENCES

- Achadi, A. H. (2022). Collaborative Leadership in Search and Rescue Operations in Earthquake Disasters. Doctoral dissertation, Gadjah Mada University.
- Adzkie, M. S., Giatman, & Maksum, H. (2025). BUILDING SUSTAINABLE LEADERSHIP WITH A PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH. *Journal of Edu Research Indonesian Institute For Corporate Learning And Studies (IICLS)* Page, 5(4), 714–718.
- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative Public Management*. Georgetown University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt2tt2nq>
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago.
- Asmar, A. F., Sulistyo, D., Budiarti, I., & Rahayu, S. K. (2026). IMPLICATIONS OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE PARADIGM ON LEADERSHIP: FORMING CHARACTER. 15(01), 496–503.
- Boano, C. (2009). Housing anxiety and multiple geographies in post-tsunami Sri Lanka. *Disasters*, 33(4), 762–785. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2009.01108.x>
- Brown, A. (2014). *The Myth of the Strong Leader: Political Leadership in the Modern Age*. Bodley Head. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=leu6AwAAQBAJ>
- Chrislip, D. (2002). *The Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook*. Wiley. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=dFzXJ7EGFGkC>

- Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2005). *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. Wiley. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=KP7gvg94j80C>
- Descartes, R. (2008). *Meditations on first philosophy: With selections from the objections and replies*. Oxford University Press.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: according to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(2), 172–188. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810863253>
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Martin Heidegger - Being and Time* (translated by Macquarrie & Robinson).pdf.
- Husserl, E. (1960). *Cartesian Meditations*. Martinus Nijhoff.
- Istianah, & Castrawijaya, C. (2025). Journal of Management Science and Education Philosophy and Leadership Concepts *Journal of Management Science and Education*. 2(1), 472–484.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *The Leadership Challenge*. Wiley. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=kHt_CeUoVZQC
- Lester, W., & Krejci, D. (2007). Business "Not" as Usual: The National Incident Management System, Federalism, and Leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 67(s1), 84–93. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00817.x>
- Northouse, P. G. (2025). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. SAGE Publications. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=NAo1EQAAQBAJ>
- Sott, M. K., & Bender, M. S. (2025). The Role of Adaptive Leadership in Times of Crisis : A Systematic Review and Conceptual Framework. 1–25.
- Suratno, E. (2024). A Literature Review : The Influence of Effective Leadership and Transformational Leadership on Employee Performance in Business Organizations in the Digital Era *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL , POLICY AND LAW (IJOSPL)*. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL, POLICY AND LAW (IJOSPL)*, 5(1), 15–28.
- Zarita, R., Musthan, Z., & Shaleh, M. (2025). The Philosophy of Islamic Religious Education on Human Nature. 11(1).