

UDC: 005.96:005.334
 COBISS.SR-ID 198449417
 doi: <https://doi.org/10.61837/mbuir040126029n>

ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC PAPER

RECEIVED: 30. 4. 2026.
 ACCEPTED: 19. 5. 2026.

STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE PLANNING IN CRISIS SITUATIONS: A FRAMEWORK FOR ENHANCING ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE

Miloš M. NIKOLIĆ

MB University, Faculty of Business and Law,
 Belgrade, Serbia

nikolic2206@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0690-8047>

Miloš Z. DIMITRIJEVIĆ

MB University, Faculty of Business and Law,
 Belgrade, Serbia

midi1983@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3168-1509>

Miloš TRAJKOVIĆ

Independent researcher, Vranje, Serbia

milosmeckar@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7050-0740>

Abstract: Contemporary organizations operate in conditions of increased uncertainty, complexity, and frequent crises, which necessitates the transformation of traditional approaches to human resource management. In this context, strategic human resource planning represents a key mechanism for building organizational resilience and adaptability. The aim of this paper is to analyze the role of strategic human resource management in crisis conditions, with particular emphasis on workforce planning, competency development, and leadership. The paper argues that the integration of human resources into crisis management systems significantly enhances organizational stability and performance. The findings indicate that organizations that systematically develop strategic HR mechanisms demonstrate higher levels of flexibility, faster responses to crises, and greater long-term sustainability.

Keywords: strategic management, human resources, crisis, resilience, adaptability

1. INTRODUCTION

The contemporary business environment is characterized by a high degree of uncertainty, dynamism, and complexity, which significantly affects organizational functioning [1], [2]. Crisis events, whether economic, health-related, security-related, or technological, are becoming increasingly frequent and pose continuous challenges for organizations [3]. As a result, organizations are required to develop new management approaches that enable them

to respond effectively to rapidly changing conditions.

In such an environment, human resource management can no longer be viewed solely as an operational function, but rather as a key strategic component of organizational development and sustainability [4], [5]. Strategic human resource management enables organizations to align workforce policies with long-term objectives and to build adaptive capacities necessary for navigating uncertainty [6], [7].

Strategic human resource planning represents a process of aligning human capital with the long-term goals of the organization, while simultaneously anticipating future needs and potential risks. In crisis conditions, this function becomes even more critical, as it directly influences an organization's ability to respond to disruptions, maintain business continuity, and mitigate negative consequences.

Particular importance is attributed to the transformation of the HR function from an administrative role to a strategic one [8]. However, despite the formal adoption of strategic HR approaches, a significant gap often exists between defined strategies and their actual implementation in practice [9].

The aim of this paper is to analyze the importance of strategic human resource planning in crisis situations and to identify key factors that contribute to organizational resilience and adaptability. Special emphasis is placed on the integration of human resources into crisis management systems.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS

Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) represents one of the key concepts of modern management, based on the assumption that human resources are not merely an operational or administrative element of the organization, but rather a strategic asset that can serve as a source of sustainable competitive advantage. Unlike traditional human resource management, which is primarily focused on recruitment, record-keeping, compensation, and administrative support, SHRM emphasizes the alignment of HR policies with long-term organizational goals, mission, and strategic direction [6], [7].

The literature particularly highlights that a strategic approach to human resources is grounded in the concepts of "vertical fit" and "horizontal fit." Vertical alignment refers to

the consistency between HR practices and the overall organizational strategy, while horizontal alignment denotes the internal coherence among HR practices such as selection, training, performance appraisal, compensation, and career development [10]. In crisis conditions, this alignment becomes even more critical, as fragmented or reactive HR mechanisms typically lead to organizational confusion, delayed responses, and weakened institutional resilience.

Contemporary organizations operate in environments characterized by globalization, digitalization, technological disruption, volatile labor markets, and increasingly frequent crises. In such conditions, SHRM acquires a new role: not only to ensure the placement of "the right person in the right position," but also to develop the organization's capacity for learning, adaptation, and rapid resource reconfiguration. For this reason, recent literature increasingly examines SHRM through the lens of dynamic capabilities, defined as the organization's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies in response to environmental changes [11], [12].

From this perspective, strategic human resource management in crisis situations involves more than simple workforce rationalization. It includes the development of mechanisms for early risk identification, competency building for crisis decision-making, enhancement of internal communication, succession planning, preservation of organizational knowledge, and ensuring the psychological and professional stability of employees. In practice, this implies that organizations must develop predefined scenarios for workforce shortages, operational disruptions, emergency redeployment of personnel, functioning in distributed teams, and operating under conditions of heightened stress.

However, although SHRM is often presented in the literature as a rational and highly efficient model, a critical perspective reveals that its practical implementation is not always consistent. In many organizations, HR strategies exist formally but are not fully integrated into key decision-making processes. The HR function often remains subordinate to operational

management, lacking sufficient autonomy and access to strategic planning at the highest level. This becomes particularly problematic in crisis situations, where rapid and complex responses are required from HR without prior positioning as a strategic partner [13].

From a critical standpoint, one of the key challenges of SHRM is the risk of excessive instrumentalization of human resources. If employees are viewed solely as “resources” for achieving organizational goals, their psychological, ethical, and social dimensions are neglected. In crisis situations, this can lead to decreased motivation, increased stress, burnout, and resistance to change. Therefore, contemporary approaches increasingly emphasize sustainability, employee well-being, and the ethical dimension of human resource management [14], [15].

According to the theory of dynamic capabilities, organizations must continuously develop and adapt their resources in order to respond to environmental changes [11], [12]. In this context, human resources play a central role in fostering adaptability and innovation [13]. Furthermore, recent studies indicate that integrated HR systems have a significant impact on organizational performance and long-term sustainability [16].

The essential importance of SHRM in crisis situations lies precisely in the integration of strategic, adaptive, and human-centered approaches. Organizations that treat human resources as carriers of resilience, knowledge, and transformation, rather than merely as operational costs, are far more likely to withstand crises, maintain performance, and successfully transition into phases of recovery and development.

2.2. CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND THE ROLE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Crisis management represents a systematic process of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from events that may seriously threaten an organization's operations, resources, reputation, security, or survival. Traditional models typically conceptualize

crisis management through several phases: threat identification, preparation and planning, immediate response, stabilization, and post-crisis recovery [17]. However, contemporary approaches emphasize that crisis management is not merely a matter of procedures and operational protocols, but fundamentally a question of organizational capability to mobilize people, knowledge, and leadership under conditions of disruption.

In this context, human resources represent a central element of crisis management. No business continuity plan can be effective if employees are not adequately prepared, if roles and responsibilities are unclear, if leaders are not trained to operate under uncertainty, or if the organization lacks a culture of trust and coordination. For this reason, recent literature emphasizes that crisis management must be deeply integrated with SHRM practices [18], [3].

The COVID-19 pandemic provides a clear illustration of this relationship. Organizations that had already developed remote work practices, flexible workforce models, internal communication systems, and rapid reskilling capabilities demonstrated significantly higher levels of resilience compared to those with rigid structures and limited digital readiness. In many cases, business continuity depended less on technology itself and more on the ability of human resources to reorganize quickly, adopt new work patterns, and maintain functionality under conditions of high stress and uncertainty [19].

This is particularly evident in sectors such as healthcare, security, logistics, and critical infrastructure. In such environments, the human factor plays a dual role: it is both the primary agent of crisis response and a subject exposed to the consequences of crisis, including exhaustion, pressure, risk, ethical dilemmas, and potential burnout. Therefore, crisis management that neglects the human dimension remains inherently incomplete.

From a strategic perspective, the role of HR in crisis management encompasses several interrelated functions. First, workforce risk assessment involves identifying critical roles,

evaluating workforce vulnerability, and planning contingency solutions. Second, competency development includes training for crisis response, decision-making under pressure, leadership in uncertainty, and internal coordination. Third, the communication function is crucial, as timely and reliable information flow is essential for maintaining trust and discipline within the organization. Fourth, HR plays a key role in post-crisis stabilization, including restoring motivation, reintegrating teams, and preserving organizational knowledge.

Despite this, many organizations still fail to fully recognize the importance of HR in crisis management. Crisis teams are often dominated by operational, financial, technical, and security experts, while the human dimension is treated as secondary. As a result, organizations may have plans for technical continuity, but not for workforce continuity. Moreover, the importance of psychological resilience, emotional strain, and interpersonal dynamics is often underestimated, even though these factors are frequently decisive in determining success or failure during crises.

An additional challenge is that crisis management in many organizations remains reactive rather than proactive. Instead of systematically building crisis capabilities in advance, organizations tend to respond only after disruptions occur. From a human resource perspective, this means that recruitment, training, leadership development, and contingency workforce planning are often implemented too late. Both research and practice indicate that the most successful organizations are those that treat crises not as exceptions, but as realistic scenarios for which they prepare systematically [3].

Therefore, crisis management and human resource management should not be viewed as separate systems. Their integration represents a fundamental prerequisite for organizational resilience. When HR becomes an active participant in the design of crisis strategies, organizations are more likely not only to survive crises, but also to emerge from them with stronger

capabilities, greater internal cohesion, and a higher level of organizational learning.

2.3. ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE AND ADAPTABILITY

Organizational resilience refers to the ability of an organization to absorb disruptions, adapt to change, maintain core functions during crises, and recover or even improve its performance afterward. In contemporary literature, this concept is increasingly associated with adaptability, organizational learning, and dynamic capabilities, as resilience is not merely about “withstanding shocks,” but also about the capacity for transformation under pressure [30]. Organizational resilience involves not only recovery, but also adaptation and transformation in crisis conditions [21].

Modern approaches emphasize the importance of sustainable human resource management [20] and employee well-being [14], while resilience itself is closely linked to human resources as key carriers of adaptive capacity [13].

From this perspective, organizational resilience should not be understood as a passive ability to maintain the status quo, but as an active capacity to reconfigure systems under conditions of instability. This includes the ability to recognize early signals of disruption, adjust organizational structures, reallocate resources, activate backup capacities, and, when necessary, redefine priorities. In all these processes, human resources play a crucial role.

Strategic human resource planning and organizational resilience are closely interconnected, as human capital represents the foundation of organizational knowledge, cross-functional coordination, innovative response, and operational stability. An organization may possess advanced technology, financial resources, and formal procedures, but without capable, motivated, and well-trained employees, its resilience remains limited. Consequently, numerous studies emphasize that organizational resilience cannot be fully understood without analyzing workforce capabilities, organizational culture, and leadership mechanisms [13].

From the perspective of adaptability, a particularly important capability is the organization's ability to learn quickly and adjust to new circumstances. Resilient organizations are not defined solely by plans and protocols, but also by a strong culture of feedback, openness to change, institutional learning, and innovation. For example, companies that rapidly transitioned to hybrid work models, implemented digital HR platforms, and redefined managerial practices during the pandemic demonstrated higher levels of adaptive maturity compared to those that attempted to return to pre-crisis models without meaningful adjustments.

However, a critical perspective reveals that the concept of resilience is often used in a normative and declarative manner. Many organizations emphasize resilience in strategic documents without developing operational mechanisms to support it. In practice, resilience is frequently reduced to employees' ability to "endure more" and "be more flexible," while inefficient processes remain unchanged, training investments are insufficient, contingency workforce capacities are underdeveloped, and systemic vulnerabilities are not addressed. Such an approach is problematic, as it shifts responsibility from the organization to the individual, rather than treating resilience as a systemic organizational capability.

Another important issue concerns the relationship between resilience and performance standards. In some organizations, resilience is interpreted as constant availability, extreme flexibility, and acceptance of increased workloads, which may lead to long-term negative consequences such as decreased job satisfaction, burnout, higher turnover, and reduced organizational commitment. This finding is consistent with research indicating that effective human resource management has a direct impact on organizational performance [23]. Therefore, contemporary approaches emphasize that resilience must be based on sustainable HR policies, psychological support, sound leadership practices, and a balance between operational demands and employee well-being [22].

In this sense, organizational resilience is not rigidity, but intelligent elasticity. It implies the ability of the system not to break under pressure, but also not to remain unchanged when change is necessary. This is where strategic human resource planning gains its full significance: it creates the conditions for organizations to rely not on improvisation or individual heroism, but on systematically developed competencies, structures, and practices.

3. STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE PLANNING IN CRISIS CONDITIONS

3.1. WORKFORCE PLANNING UNDER CONDITIONS OF UNCERTAINTY

Strategic human resource planning in crisis conditions requires a systematic approach that includes the analysis, planning, and control of workforce capacities [24], [25]. Organizations that apply scenario-based planning demonstrate higher levels of resilience [17], whereas those that rely on short-term measures, such as cost reduction, often undermine their own capabilities [29]. The development of competencies represents one of the most critical determinants of organizational success [26], while digital competencies are becoming increasingly important in contemporary conditions [27], [28].

From a theoretical perspective, workforce planning in crisis situations must encompass at least four key dimensions: the identification of critical functions, the assessment of workforce vulnerability, the capacity for internal mobility, and the organization's ability to rapidly provide replacements or reallocate human resources. This implies that organizations must understand not only the number of employees they have, but also where their critical points of dependency lie, how teams rely on key individuals, which competencies are essential, and how they can be substituted under disruptive conditions.

Practical evidence from multiple sectors demonstrates that the absence of such planning leads to significant operational challenges.

During the pandemic, many healthcare systems and public services faced not only shortages in personnel numbers, but also a lack of specific competencies at critical moments. Similarly, in the private sector, organizations that depended on a limited number of individuals in key roles exhibited greater vulnerability when faced with illness, absenteeism, turnover, or structural changes in work organization. This suggests that workforce planning in crisis conditions must be based on functional rather than purely nominal logic: it is not sufficient to fill positions; it is necessary to ensure continuity of critical functions.

Furthermore, scenario-based planning becomes particularly important under crisis conditions. Organizations should develop multiple workforce scenarios ranging from minor disruptions to extreme events and define corresponding response measures. These may include reduced staffing models, remote work arrangements, temporary redeployment, reskilling initiatives, and shifts in responsibility structures. For instance, organizations that had developed even minimal remote work and digital collaboration scenarios prior to the pandemic were significantly better positioned than those attempting to implement such systems during the crisis itself.

From a critical perspective, workforce planning is often mistakenly equated with cost-cutting. In crisis situations, many organizations instinctively reduce staff numbers, suspend training programs, and freeze development initiatives. While short-term cost reduction may be justified, such an approach can weaken long-term organizational resilience. Organizations that fully reduce investments in people during crises effectively diminish their own capacity for recovery and adaptation. Therefore, contemporary research emphasizes that crises should not be viewed solely as moments of reduction, but also as opportunities for strategic reconfiguration of human resources [29].

Additionally, workforce planning in crisis conditions must address talent retention. During periods of instability, the most valuable employees are often the most sought-after

in the labor market, increasing the risk of turnover. If organizations fail to maintain motivation, perceived fairness, communication clarity, and a sense of security among key employees, they risk losing precisely those individuals who are most critical for recovery. Thus, workforce planning in crisis conditions is not merely a quantitative issue, but also a qualitative matter of organizational trust and the preservation of critical competencies.

3.2. COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING IN CRISIS CONDITIONS

Competency development in crisis conditions represents one of the most important prerequisites for organizational resilience. Crises often reveal that organizations fail not only due to a lack of resources, but also due to insufficient preparedness of employees to operate under new and non-standard conditions. Therefore, training and competency development extend beyond pedagogical or HR concerns and become a matter of strategic organizational capability.

In a broad sense, crisis situations require a combination of technical, cognitive, communication, and psychological competencies. Technical competencies include knowledge of procedures, safety protocols, digital tools, and operational mechanisms. Cognitive competencies involve decision-making under uncertainty, risk assessment, rapid situation analysis, and prioritization. Communication competencies encompass clear information exchange, team coordination, and conflict management. Psychological competencies relate to stress management, emotional stability, resilience, and the ability to maintain functionality under prolonged disruption.

A common issue in practice is that organizational training is often reduced to formal compliance activities, without meaningful alignment with crisis scenarios. Many organizations implement training programs that meet regulatory requirements but fail to ensure actual preparedness for high-pressure situations. In contrast, organizations that utilize simulations, case studies, interdisciplinary

workshops, and crisis exercises achieve significantly higher levels of practical readiness. Sectors such as aviation, the military, and emergency services provide strong examples of training systems focused not only on procedural knowledge, but also on performance in unpredictable environments.

Digital competency has become a particularly critical aspect of modern training. As crises are increasingly associated with technological disruptions, cyber risks, and remote collaboration, the ability to effectively use digital tools is essential for organizational preparedness. The pandemic clearly demonstrated that organizations with higher levels of digital maturity transitioned more effectively to new working models, maintained communication continuity, and reorganized processes more efficiently. Consequently, training can no longer be limited to task-specific competencies, but must also include digital flexibility as a general organizational capability [28], [27].

However, not all organizations are capable of systematically investing in human capital development, especially during crises. Budget constraints, operational pressures, and short-term managerial orientations often lead to reduced investment in training precisely when it is most needed. Furthermore, some organizations treat training as an isolated activity rather than as part of a broader system of organizational learning. If training is not aligned with job design, reward systems, performance evaluation, and leadership expectations, its impact remains limited.

Another important issue concerns the fairness and inclusiveness of training programs. In some organizations, crisis training and development opportunities are primarily available to managers and selected employees, while operational and middle-level staff remain insufficiently prepared. This creates a dangerous organizational asymmetry: leadership possesses knowledge, but the broader system lacks the capacity to implement it. Therefore, strategic human resource planning must ensure that competency development is distributed both horizontally and vertically, enabling the entire

organization not just selected segments to develop crisis capabilities.

3.3. LEADERSHIP IN CRISIS SITUATIONS

Leadership in crisis situations is one of the most extensively studied, yet frequently oversimplified aspects of organizational management. In public discourse, crisis leaders are often portrayed as strong individuals who make quick decisions and maintain control. While decisiveness is important, academic literature suggests that effective crisis leadership is a far more complex phenomenon involving strategic judgment, emotional stability, communication precision, moral integrity, and the ability to maintain trust [18].

Within the context of human resource management, crisis leadership is not merely an individual trait, but an institutional capability. It reflects the organization's ability to develop individuals at multiple levels who can act effectively under conditions of uncertainty. This implies that strategic human resource planning must include the identification of leadership potential, systematic managerial development, succession planning, and the creation of a culture in which leadership is not solely based on formal hierarchy, but also on the functional capacity to assume responsibility in critical situations.

Practical experience indicates that the most effective leaders in crises are those who can balance clarity and flexibility. Clarity is essential for reducing uncertainty, preventing misinformation, and maintaining discipline, while flexibility is necessary because crises rarely follow predictable patterns and often require rapid adjustments. For example, during health and security crises, organizations frequently had to modify protocols, team rotations, communication channels, and operational priorities within short timeframes. Leaders who rigidly adhered to predefined rules were generally less effective than those who maintained structure while allowing for adaptive responses.

From a critical perspective, one of the major challenges of crisis leadership is the tendency toward excessive centralization of

decision-making. While centralized coordination may be necessary in the early stages of a crisis, prolonged concentration of decision-making at the top can lead to leadership overload, slower response times, and reduced initiative at lower organizational levels. Consequently, contemporary models of resilience increasingly emphasize the importance of distributed leadership, where multiple organizational levels are empowered to act within clearly defined principles.

Communication represents another critical dimension of crisis leadership. In crisis situations, communication functions both as an operational and psychological tool. Unclear, contradictory, or delayed messages can lead to panic, reduced trust, and weakened discipline. Conversely, overly optimistic or defensive communication may undermine credibility. Effective crisis leadership requires realistic, timely, and consistent communication that combines factual accuracy with the ability to mobilize employees and sustain organizational cohesion.

From a strategic HR perspective, it is essential that crisis leadership is not left to chance. Organizations that proactively develop leadership capabilities through mentoring, simulations, leadership programs, and succession planning are significantly more likely to maintain stability during disruptions. Where leadership is treated as a function of formal authority or personal charisma rather than systematic development, organizations become dependent on individuals and therefore more vulnerable.

4. CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND CRITICAL INTERPRETATION

Based on the preceding theoretical analysis, a conceptual model can be formulated in which strategic human resource planning represents the independent variable, organizational adaptability functions as the mediating mechanism, and organizational resilience and performance stability in crisis situations represent the dependent outcomes. In other words, the model is grounded in the assumption that the mere existence of a strategic HR plan is

insufficient unless the organization develops the capacity to translate that plan into adaptive mechanisms of action.

Accordingly, the conceptual model of the research is based on the following relationship:

SHRM → Adaptability → Organizational Resilience → Performance

Adaptability acts as a mediating factor that enables the transformation of strategy into measurable outcomes [12]. Organizations that develop adaptive capacities demonstrate a greater ability to respond to crises and maintain operational stability [30]. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that human resources are not the sole determinant of organizational resilience. Organizational structure, technology, and leadership also exert a significant influence [1].

This logic is important because it highlights the distinction between formal and functional SHRM. Formal SHRM refers to the existence of strategies, procedures, and formal documents, whereas functional SHRM reflects the organization's actual ability to mobilize people, redefine priorities, and maintain continuity during crisis situations. Adaptability represents the key mediating dimension between these two levels.

More specifically, the model is based on the assumption that if an organization systematically plans its human resources through the identification of critical roles, the development of multi-skilled competencies, leadership development programs, contingency workforce scenarios, and communication protocols, its level of adaptability will increase. Increased adaptability enables faster responses, reduces the degree of disorganization, ensures better preservation of core functions, and contributes to more stable performance in crisis situations. Therefore, it is not the strategy itself that directly generates resilience, but rather the way in which it creates the capacity for adaptation.

This conceptualization also has broader theoretical significance, as it connects SHRM literature with the theory of dynamic capabilities and organizational resilience. Instead of viewing

human resources solely as an object of planning, the model conceptualizes them as active drivers of organizational change. This represents one of the key contributions of this study.

However, a critical perspective requires caution in oversimplifying this relationship. Organizational resilience does not depend solely on human resources. It is also influenced by organizational structure, financial stability, technological capabilities, the quality of top-level decision-making, institutional context, and external shocks. Therefore, strategic human resource planning should be understood as a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for organizational resilience. In other words, a strong HR system cannot fully compensate for weak organizational architecture, although it can significantly mitigate its negative effects.

Furthermore, it is important to critically examine the limits of transferring this model across different sectors. For example, HR strategies that produce strong results in highly regulated systems, such as the military or healthcare, may not be equally effective in private sector organizations operating in more dynamic and market-driven environments. Consequently, this model should be viewed as a general analytical framework, the practical application of which requires sector-specific adaptation.

Another important critical aspect concerns the risk of normative idealization of SHRM. Assuming that every improved HR strategy will automatically lead to greater resilience neglects the real constraints within organizations, such as cultural resistance to change, informal power structures, uneven managerial competencies, and implementation limitations. In practice, organizations often possess well-designed strategies on paper, but lack effective mechanisms for execution. Therefore, it is essential that this conceptual model does not remain at the declarative level, but serves as a stimulus for a thorough reassessment of internal organizational capabilities.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the theoretical analysis indicate that strategic human resource planning in crisis situations cannot be reduced to operational workforce adjustments, but rather represents a broader systemic mechanism of organizational resilience. When examining contemporary crises ranging from pandemics and cyberattacks to security threats and economic shocks, it becomes evident that organizations do not primarily fail due to a lack of procedures, but rather due to insufficiently developed human and leadership capacities to implement them effectively.

The findings suggest that organizations that integrate human resource management into strategic decision-making processes achieve superior outcomes [7], [31]. However, human resources alone are insufficient without accompanying structural and cultural transformations [22]. In this context, the ethical dimension of human resource management is particularly significant, as decisions made under crisis conditions have long-term consequences for both organizations and employees [15].

In this regard, the findings support the position in the literature that human resources represent key drivers of institutional adaptation. Organizations that develop structured workforce planning systems, continuous training programs, crisis-oriented leadership, and a culture of trust are better positioned to respond rapidly to disruptions and maintain operational stability. This is consistent with the findings that HR systems constitute a fundamental component of resilience rather than a supporting function [13].

A particularly important contribution of this study lies in the argument that adaptability plays a mediating role in the relationship between strategic human resource planning and crisis outcomes. This perspective shifts the analytical focus from the formal existence of strategies to the functional capacity of organizations to implement them. An organization may possess a well-designed strategic plan; however, without developed adaptive

capabilities, such as adequately trained personnel, efficient communication systems, and leadership capable of operating under uncertainty the practical impact of that strategy remains limited. Therefore, adaptability can be understood as the key mechanism through which HR strategy is translated into organizational resilience.

At the same time, a critical perspective requires caution regarding overly optimistic interpretations of SHRM in the literature. In some cases, SHRM is presented as a universal solution to organizational challenges, which is not entirely sustainable. While human resources can significantly strengthen organizational resilience, they cannot substitute for structural and institutional prerequisites of effective organizations. In situations where leadership is unclear, resources are insufficient, procedures are inconsistent, or internal trust is low, HR interventions alone are unlikely to produce substantial improvements.

Furthermore, crisis contexts often generate complex ethical dilemmas in the domain of human resource management. Under pressure, organizations may resort to measures such as intensified workloads, workforce reductions, expanded job roles, or increased employee monitoring through digital technologies. Although such measures may be justified by short-term survival needs, they can undermine trust, organizational justice, and employee motivation in the long run. Therefore, strategic human resource planning in crisis conditions must incorporate a strong ethical dimension, ensuring not only efficiency but also the legitimacy of organizational actions.

The practical implications of this study are multifaceted. First, organizations should develop workforce scenarios for different types of crises rather than relying solely on ad hoc responses. Second, training programs should be oriented toward real crisis-related competencies rather than merely fulfilling formal job requirements. Third, leadership capacities must be developed across multiple hierarchical levels to avoid excessive dependence on a limited number of individuals. Fourth, organizational

resilience should be built through a balanced combination of adaptability, ethical responsibility, and employee well-being, rather than solely through increased pressure and performance demands.

All of the above indicates that strategic human resource planning in crisis situations is not a peripheral issue of organizational management, but one of its central pillars. Where this function is well-developed, organizations are more likely not only to survive crises, but also to use them as opportunities for institutional learning, organizational transformation, and long-term capacity development.

6. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the role of strategic human resource planning in crisis situations indicates that this function represents one of the key pillars of contemporary organizational management. In conditions of increased uncertainty, organizations can no longer rely solely on technical, financial, or structural mechanisms, but must also develop human and institutional capacities that enable adaptability and resilience.

The findings of this study demonstrate that strategic human resource management has a significant impact on an organization's ability to respond to crises, maintain business continuity, and mitigate negative consequences. Particular emphasis is placed on the role of adaptability as a mediating mechanism linking strategic planning with organizational resilience. In other words, it is not sufficient for an organization to possess a strategy; it must also have the capacity to effectively implement that strategy in a dynamic and uncertain environment.

A critical perspective reveals that, in practice, a gap often exists between the formal presence of HR strategies and their actual implementation. The practical implications of this study suggest that organizations should develop systemic HR management mechanisms, including scenario-based planning, continuous competency development, strengthening of leadership capacities, and the enhancement of organizational culture. In addition, the integration of ethical

principles into human resource management is of particular importance, ensuring not only efficiency but also the long-term sustainability of organizational decisions.

From a theoretical standpoint, this study contributes to the integration of the SHRM concept with the theories of organizational resilience and dynamic capabilities, highlighting

the role of human resources as a key driver of adaptability. Future research should focus on the empirical validation of the proposed model, as well as on the analysis of sector-specific characteristics in the application of strategic human resource management under crisis conditions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daft, R. L. (2016). *Organization theory and design* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- [2] Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2018). *Management* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- [3] Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2017). Crises and crisis management: Integration, interpretation, and research development. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1661–1692. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316680030>
- [4] Becker, B. E., & Huselid, M. A. (1998). High performance work systems and firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 1–24.
- [5] Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Harvard Business School Press.
- [6] Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 295–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639201800205>
- [7] Delery, J. E., & Rumpi, D. (2017). Strategic human resource management and competitive advantage. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.08.005>
- [8] Ulrich, D. (1997). *Human resource champions: The next agenda for adding value and delivering results*. Harvard Business School Press.
- [9] Guest, D. E. (2011). Human resource management and performance: Still searching for some answers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2010.00164.x>
- [10] Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2016). *Strategy and human resource management* (4th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- [11] Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
- [12] Teece, D. J. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and entrepreneurial management in large organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(13), 211–230.
- [13] 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*, 21(3), 243–255.
- [14] Aguinis, H., & Burgi-Tian, J. (2021). Human capital value. *Journal of Management*, 47(1), 248–252.
- [15] Saks, A. M. (2021). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100835.
- [16] Jiang, K., & Messersmith, J. G. (2018). Strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 6–33.
- [17] Mitroff, I. I. (2005). *Why some companies emerge stronger and better from a crisis*. AMACOM.
- [18] Boin, A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2017). *The politics of crisis management*. Cambridge University Press.
- [19] Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 183–187.
- [20] Aibaghi-Esfahani, S. A. E. E. D., et al. (2017). Sustainable HRM. *AD-minister*, (30), 195–215.
- [21] Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2011). Crisis strategic planning. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5619–5635.
- [22] Boon, C., Eckardt, R., Lepak, D. P., & Boselie, P. (2019). Strategic HR integration. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(1), 34–67.
- [23] Shin, D., & Konrad, A. M. (2017). High-performance systems and performance. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 973–997.
- [24] Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page.
- [25] Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management*. Pearson.
- [26] Noe, R. A. (2020). *Employee training and development*. McGraw-Hill.

- [27] Marler, J. H., & Parry, E. (2021). HRM and digitalization. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(1), 1–27.
- [28] Bondarouk, T., & Brewster, C. (2016). HRM and technology. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(21), 2652–2671.
- [29] Cascio, W. F. (2020). Managing human resources during COVID-19: New realities and challenges. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(4), 100716. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100716>
- [30] Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience. *Business Research*, 13, 215–246.
- [31] Agustian, K., et al. (2023). HR strategies and competitive advantage. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management*, 1(2), 108–117.

СТРАТЕШКО ПЛАНИРАЊЕ ЉУДСКИХ ПОТЕНЦИЈАЛА У КРИЗНИМ СИТУАЦИЈАМА: ОКВИР ЗА ЈАЧАЊЕ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЈСКЕ ОТПОРНОСТИ

Резиме: Савремене организације делују у условима повећане неизвесности, комплексности и учес- талих кризних поремећаја, што намеће потребу за трансформацијом традиционалних приступа управљању људским ресурсима. У том контексту, стратегијско планирање људских ресурса пред- ставља један од кључних механизма изградње организационе отпорности и адаптивности.

Циљ рада је анализа улоге стратегијског управљања људским ресурсима у кризним условима, са посебним освртом на планирање кадрова, развој компетенција и лидерство. Раг се заснива на теоријској анализи релевантне литературе из области стратегијског менаџмента, организационе отпорности и управљања кризама.

Резултати указују да организације које систематски развијају стратегијске ХР механизме оства- рују већи степен флексибилности, бржу реакцију на кризе и стабилније перформансе. Посебно је истакнута улога адаптивности као посредујућег механизма који повезује стратегијско плани- рање са организационом отпорношћу.

Практичне импликације рада указују на значај развоја сценаријског планирања, континуиране едукације запослених, јачања лидерских капацитета и изградње организационе културе засно- ване на поверењу и сарадњи. Такође, наглашена је потреба за интеграцијом етичких принципа у управљање људским ресурсима, посебно у кризним условима.

Закључује се да стратегијско планирање људских ресурса представља један од кључних фактора организационе отпорности и да омогућава организацијама не само да преживе кризе, већ и да их искористе као прилику за институционално учење и развој.

Кључне речи: стратешки менаџмент, људски ресурси, криза отпорност, прилагодљивост