

Adaptive Maritime Leadership in Human Resource Management: Implications for Crew Discipline, Retention, and Operational Effectiveness

Sri Tutie Rahayu^{1*}, Nurita Widiанти²

Politeknik Maritim Negeri Indonesia, Semarang

Corresponding Author: Nurita Widiанти: nuritasasya@polimarin.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Adaptive Maritime Leadership, Crew Discipline, Maritime Human Resource Management, Operational Effectiveness, Seafarer Retention

Received : 25, August

Revised : 15, September

Accepted: 27, October

©2026 Rahayu, Widiанти (s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

Maritime leadership is often evaluated through safety compliance and operational performance, while crew retention and working conditions receive separate managerial attention. This separation overlooks how shipboard decisions, employment practices, and organizational resources jointly shape the functioning of vessel crews. This study examines adaptive maritime leadership in human resource management, focusing on its implications for crew discipline, retention, and operational effectiveness. A qualitative documentary approach was applied to six peer-reviewed research publications and five maritime industry or regulatory sources, supported by established leadership and qualitative research literature. The documents were examined through comparative thematic analysis to identify recurring concerns, contrasting evidence, and managerial implications. Five interconnected findings emerged: leadership adaptability must operate within formal safety authority; effective discipline requires more than documented procedural compliance; retention depends on responsive organizational resources; working conditions require differentiated rather than uniform HRM responses; and operational effectiveness depends on coordination between shipboard leadership and shore-based management. Evidence from earlier studies, including research involving 229 ship officers, 658 officer-seafarers, and a global fatigue survey containing 4,974 ranked responses and 1,096 qualitative comments, illustrates the practical significance of these themes. The study proposes an Adaptive Maritime HRM Alignment Framework that connects leadership responsiveness with authentic safety compliance, workforce support, and operational reliability. Its contribution lies in identifying the organizational conditions under which adaptive leadership can become meaningful rather than merely procedural. The findings provide a practical basis for improving maritime leadership development and HRM practices, while requiring further validation in actual shipping organizations.

INTRODUCTION

The performance of a merchant vessel depends on more than the competence of its crew or the reliability of its equipment. It also depends on how effectively people communicate, make decisions, respond to operational pressure, and manage responsibilities that frequently extend beyond formal job descriptions. Maritime leadership therefore occupies a critical position between regulatory compliance, human resource management, and the everyday realities of working at sea.

This relationship has become particularly important as the shipping industry confronts workforce shortages and changing employment expectations. According to BIMCO and the International Chamber of Shipping (2026), approximately 2.57 million seafarers serve the global merchant fleet, comprising 85,148 vessels. Their workforce assessment estimates a shortage of 39,100 STCW-certified officers in 2026 and projects a need for an additional 113,735 officers by 2030. These figures indicate that maintaining a qualified maritime workforce requires attention not only to recruitment and training but also to the conditions influencing seafarers' continued participation in the industry.

Workforce sustainability is closely connected to shipboard experience. Unlike most land-based employment environments, a vessel combines occupational responsibilities with residential life, placing crew members within a relatively confined social and organizational setting. Prolonged separation from family, demanding schedules, limited shore leave, multicultural relationships, and hierarchical authority can influence how seafarers experience their work. In the second quarter of 2026, The Mission to Seafarers reported a decline in its Seafarers Happiness Index from 7.18 to 6.87, identifying continued pressure associated with workload, living conditions, and employment concerns (The Mission to Seafarers, 2026). Although the index represents voluntary survey responses rather than the entire global workforce, it highlights the importance of treating seafarer well-being as a management concern.

Existing research has established connections between leadership, safety behavior, and maritime working conditions. Hasanspahić et al. (2021) identify transformational and transactional characteristics as relevant elements of shipboard safety leadership. Xi et al. (2025), using data from 229 deck officers and captains, demonstrate a positive relationship between safety culture and ship officers' safety behavior. Their findings suggest that leadership-related safety values and management practices may influence more than formal procedural compliance.

Research on workforce management provides a complementary perspective. Theotokas et al. (2024) argue that maritime digital transformation has increased attention to training and changing occupational competencies, while organizational HRM practices remain comparatively underexplored. Yu et al. (2026) similarly demonstrate that seafarers' job satisfaction and retention intentions are related to combinations of occupational demands and onboard and

shore-based resources. These findings suggest that crew retention is shaped by organizational conditions extending beyond immediate supervisory behavior.

A further challenge concerns the distinction between formal compliance and actual operational safety. Bhatia et al. (2025), drawing on 4,974 ranked responses and 1,096 qualitative comments from seafarers, identify excessive workloads, long working hours, and inadequate crewing arrangements as major contributors to fatigue. Their discussion of adjusted work–rest records raises an important managerial concern, compliance documentation may not always reflect actual working conditions. In such circumstances, leadership effectiveness cannot be assessed solely through the existence of procedures or the completion of required records.

Despite these contributions, three research gaps remain. First, maritime safety leadership, seafarer retention, and operational effectiveness are frequently examined as distinct outcomes, limiting understanding of their shared organizational conditions. Second, the relationship between leadership adaptability and regulatory authority has received insufficient integrative attention, particularly where operational flexibility may conflict with workload and safety requirements. Third, existing studies provide valuable empirical findings but offer limited cross-domain explanation of how shipboard supervisors and shore-based HR managers can jointly respond to discipline, workforce sustainability, and operational demands.

This study addresses these research gaps by examining how adaptive maritime leadership operates within the regulatory and organizational context of maritime human resource management, identifying recurring relationships between leadership practices, crew discipline, and retention through documentary evidence, and exploring how these interconnected dimensions contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of operational effectiveness in maritime organizations

The study develops an interpretative framework connecting leadership responsiveness, authentic safety compliance, differentiated HRM support, and ship–shore coordination. Its principal contribution is not the introduction of another leadership style, but an explanation of how established leadership responsibilities may be translated into more coherent maritime workforce management practices.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Adaptive Leadership in Maritime Organizations

Adaptive leadership concerns the capacity to respond constructively to complex circumstances that cannot be addressed through established routines alone. Heifetz et al. (2009) emphasize the importance of recognizing adaptive challenges, mobilizing organizational learning, and encouraging appropriate responses to changing conditions. For maritime organizations, this perspective is relevant because vessel operations involve both standardized procedures and

unpredictable circumstances. Weather conditions, port requirements, technical disruptions, cargo operations, and crew availability may create competing operational demands. Shipmasters and officers must respond to these circumstances while maintaining accountability for safety and performance.

However, maritime adaptability differs from unrestricted managerial discretion. The International Safety Management (ISM) Code establishes requirements concerning safe operation, defined responsibilities, risk assessment, and organizational support. Accordingly, adaptive leadership must be understood as responsiveness within regulatory boundaries rather than flexibility in deciding whether mandatory procedures should be followed. This study defines adaptive maritime leadership as the capability of shipboard and shore-based managers to adjust communication, supervision, personnel support, and operational coordination according to changing circumstances while preserving professional accountability and mandatory safety requirements.

Maritime Human Resource Management

Maritime HRM includes recruitment, crew planning, deployment, competency development, welfare, employment conditions, performance management, and workforce retention. These functions require coordination between personnel working onboard vessels and managers responsible for organizational decisions ashore. Theotokas et al. (2024) identify a need for more research examining HRM practices that support maritime organizations during technological transformation. Their analysis indicates that attention to technical skills and training should be complemented by organizational strategies addressing workforce development and management.

This observation is particularly relevant because shipboard supervisors cannot independently resolve every personnel issue. Staffing decisions, contract arrangements, career pathways, welfare resources, and crew rotations are frequently determined by company-level policies. Maritime HRM therefore functions through an interdependent relationship between onboard supervision and shore-based organizational support.

Crew Discipline and Safety Culture

Crew discipline refers to responsible behavior in carrying out assigned duties, following legitimate procedures, maintaining professional standards, and supporting safe vessel operations. It includes compliance with operational requirements but should not be equated with unquestioning obedience. In safety-critical settings, crew members may need to question unsafe instructions, report hazards, or communicate operational limitations. Such actions are consistent with responsible professional conduct.

Xi et al. (2025) distinguish among safety compliance, prosocial safety behavior, and proactive safety behavior. Their findings support the view that safety behavior involves not only adherence to rules but also concern for colleagues and willingness to contribute to workplace safety improvements. This distinction is important for evaluating whether leadership creates a working

environment where procedural discipline and responsible communication reinforce one another.

Crew Retention and Organizational Resources

Seafarer retention concerns the continuity of maritime employment and the organizational conditions influencing decisions to remain with a company or continue working at sea. The job demands-resources perspective provides a useful explanation of this relationship. Bakker and de Vries (2021) emphasize that high occupational demands can undermine employee well-being when adequate resources are unavailable, whereas appropriate support can contribute to healthier and more sustainable working conditions.

Yu et al. (2026) demonstrate the relevance of combining onboard resources with shore-based support in explaining seafarers' job satisfaction and retention intentions. Their findings suggest that effective retention policies should recognize differences in occupational demands and individual circumstances rather than assume that identical employment benefits will adequately address every situation.

Operational Effectiveness

Operational effectiveness refers to the reliable achievement of vessel operating objectives while maintaining safety, regulatory compliance, organizational coordination, and appropriate use of personnel and technical resources. From this perspective, short-term productivity should not be treated as the sole indicator of successful operations. Accelerated work schedules, insufficient rest, or incomplete safety procedures may improve immediate turnaround performance while increasing operational vulnerability. A comprehensive interpretation of effectiveness must therefore consider how organizational decisions influence task execution, safety performance, workforce readiness, and the continuity of competent personnel.

METHODS

Research Design

This study uses a qualitative interpretative design based on documentary analysis and thematic synthesis. Documentary analysis enables researchers to examine existing textual evidence, identify relationships among organizational concepts, and develop contextual interpretations without requiring the collection of new interview or survey data (Bowen, 2009).

The qualitative approach is appropriate because the study aims to understand how maritime leadership practices are connected to personnel management and operational outcomes across different research and institutional contexts. It does not seek to estimate statistical relationships or establish causal effects. The thematic synthesis is informed by the analytical principles discussed by Byrne (2022), particularly the movement from familiarization with textual material to concept identification, comparison, and interpretative theme development.

Documentary Corpus and Source Selection

The principal documentary corpus consists of eleven sources: six peer-reviewed research publications and five maritime industry or regulatory sources. The research publications comprise Hasanspahić et al. (2021), Theotokas et al. (2024), Karakasnaki et al. (2025), Xi et al. (2025), Bhatia et al. (2025), and Yu et al. (2026).

The institutional sources comprise the International Safety Management Code, the Maritime Labour Convention, the IMO Maritime Safety Committee's 2025 meeting summary, the BIMCO-ICS workforce assessment published in 2026, and the second-quarter 2026 Seafarers Happiness Index issued by The Mission to Seafarers.

Sources were selected purposively according to four criteria: direct relevance to maritime leadership or HRM; substantive evidence concerning discipline, retention, fatigue, or operational management; identifiable scholarly or institutional provenance; and sufficient accessible information to support interpretation. The study prioritizes contemporary publications issued between 2021 and 2026 while retaining older regulatory and theoretical materials where necessary. The corpus represents a focused selection of relevant documents rather than an exhaustive systematic literature review.

Data Analysis

The documents were examined through a comparative thematic process involving four analytical stages. First, the available texts were reviewed to identify statements concerning leadership behavior, occupational demands, safety compliance, crew welfare, organizational resources, and operational responsibilities. Second, these statements were organized into preliminary analytical categories, including supervisory authority, safety communication, fatigue, personnel support, workforce continuity, and ship-shore coordination.

Third, the categories were compared across documents to identify recurring concerns, complementary evidence, and areas of tension. Particular attention was given to differences between formally prescribed safety responsibilities and conditions reported by seafarers. Fourth, the resulting patterns were developed into broader interpretative themes and connected to practical maritime HRM implications.

The analysis distinguishes between findings reported by the original researchers and interpretations developed through the present documentary synthesis. Numerical results from previous studies are therefore treated as secondary evidence, not as original statistical findings.

Trustworthiness and Limitations

Credibility was supported through comparison among empirical studies, qualitative comments reported in published research, and international regulatory or institutional documents. Particular attention was paid to contrasting evidence, including situations where formal procedural compliance may coexist with excessive workload or inadequate workforce support.

Interpretations were limited to the accessible source material. Findings from studies involving specific countries, companies, or occupational groups were not automatically generalized to the entire maritime industry. The study did not conduct primary interviews, shipboard observations, or analysis of company personnel records. It also did not employ an exhaustive systematic search or independent multiple-coder validation. Its findings should therefore be understood as a structured qualitative synthesis rather than direct evidence of causal relationships in a specific shipping company.

RESULTS

Overview of the Documentary Evidence

The documentary analysis identifies five interconnected themes: adaptive authority, authentic crew discipline, resource-responsive retention, differentiated workforce management, and integrated ship-shore operational coordination. The underlying documents provide different types of evidence. Some report quantitative relationships, others contain qualitative accounts of seafarer experiences, and institutional sources establish the regulatory and organizational responsibilities within which leadership must operate.

Table 1. Principal documentary evidence and its analytical contribution

Source	Documented evidence	Relevance to the present analysis
Hasanspahić et al. (2021)	Survey-based identification of transformational and transactional elements of shipboard safety leadership	Leadership combines professional direction with interpersonal and motivational functions.
Theotokas et al. (2024)	Systematic review identifying gaps in HRM practices supporting maritime digitalization	Organizational HRM requires greater attention beyond technical skills and training.
Karakasnaki et al. (2025)	Survey of 872 seafarers identifying associations between company size and perceived well-being; vessel type showed no comparable association in the reported analysis	Workforce experiences may depend on company characteristics and should not be generalized solely by vessel category.
Xi et al. (2025)	Survey of 229 deck officers and captains showing positive associations between safety culture and compliance, prosocial, and proactive safety behavior	Discipline should encompass responsible safety participation beyond formal compliance.
Bhatia et al. (2025)	4,974 ranked responses and 1,096 qualitative comments identifying workload, working hours, and crewing levels as fatigue concerns	Authentic safety management depends on realistic workload and staffing arrangements.

Yu et al. (2026)	Study involving 658 officer-seafarers identifying combinations of onboard and shore-based resources relevant to job satisfaction and retention intention	Retention requires responsive organizational support rather than uniform incentives.
IMO and ILO documents	Standards addressing safety management, responsibilities, working conditions, and personnel protection	Leadership decisions must operate within established safety and labor requirements.

Source: Author's qualitative synthesis of the selected documentary corpus.

Adaptive Leadership Requires Responsible Authority

The first theme concerns the relationship between leadership responsiveness and formal authority. Maritime regulations place clear responsibilities on shipmasters, officers, and companies, yet daily operations involve changing conditions that cannot always be managed through identical supervisory approaches. The ISM Code emphasizes that shipping companies must establish safety management arrangements, define responsibilities, and provide appropriate support for operations. This institutional structure recognizes that safe vessel operation depends on cooperation between formal management systems and the people responsible for implementing them.

Research on maritime safety leadership provides complementary evidence. Hasanspahić et al. (2021) identify both transformational and transactional leadership elements as relevant to shipboard safety. Their findings suggest that formal supervision and supportive interpersonal leadership are not inherently opposing approaches.

The present synthesis interprets these findings as evidence that adaptive leadership should be understood through the appropriate adjustment of managerial behavior rather than the weakening of organizational discipline. A shipmaster may need to provide direct instructions during an emergency while adopting a more consultative approach when reviewing operational problems or developing crew competencies. Both responses can reflect effective leadership when they are appropriate to the circumstances and consistent with safety obligations. Interpretative finding: Maritime leadership adaptability is most meaningful when flexibility concerns communication, supervision, learning, and support, while essential safety responsibilities remain clearly defined.

Crew Discipline Extends Beyond Documented Compliance

The second theme reveals an important distinction between formal procedural compliance and actual safety-oriented behavior. Xi et al. (2025) report positive relationships between maritime safety culture and safety compliance, prosocial safety behavior, and proactive safety behavior among 229 deck officers and captains. Their structural model reports standardized relationships of 0.81, 0.76, and 0.76, respectively, for the overall safety-culture relationships examined. More detailed analysis also indicates that different dimensions of safety culture

do not influence all forms of safety behavior uniformly. This evidence suggests that adherence to procedures, concern for colleagues, and proactive safety participation should be treated as related but distinct outcomes. A crew member may follow instructions consistently without actively communicating emerging hazards or contributing to improvements in working practices.

Bhatia et al. (2025) introduce a further consideration. Their international study identifies workload and long working hours as leading perceived contributors to fatigue, while open-ended responses repeatedly emphasize crewing adequacy. The study also discusses adjustment of work–rest records as a practice that can conceal actual working conditions. This creates a significant tension for maritime HRM. A vessel may possess complete administrative records while personnel continue to experience operational demands that compromise adequate rest. In these circumstances, documented compliance cannot independently establish the quality of fatigue management.

The implication is not that procedural records lack value. Rather, their effectiveness depends on whether the conditions they describe correspond to actual working practices. Interpretative finding, Crew discipline should be evaluated through the consistency between formal requirements, actual working conditions, and the willingness of personnel to report operational concerns. This finding challenges disciplinary approaches that rely primarily on documentation, supervisory sanctions, or the absence of reported violations. It suggests that credible safety leadership also requires attention to staffing, workload distribution, reporting practices, and the organizational treatment of mistakes.

Retention Depends on Responsive Organizational Resources

The third theme concerns the relationship between workforce retention and the organizational resources available to seafarers. Yu et al. (2026) examine occupational demands and resources among 658 Chinese officer-seafarers. Their findings show that different combinations of onboard and shore-based resources are associated with job satisfaction and retention intention. Shore-based support is identified as an important condition for job satisfaction, while career-related support is particularly relevant to officers experiencing substantial social isolation and work–family conflict.

These findings suggest that retention-oriented management should respond to differences in employees' circumstances rather than assuming that a uniform incentive structure is sufficient. For example, additional financial incentives may be meaningful to some crew members, while others may place greater importance on predictable crew rotations, communication with family, career development, or responsive support during difficult assignments.

However, leadership alone cannot resolve structural employment problems. Vessel managers may recognize employee dissatisfaction but remain unable to adjust contracts, replace personnel, approve promotion, or improve

company-level welfare arrangements. This distinction places greater importance on cooperation between shipboard supervisors and shore-based HR departments.

The Maritime Labour Convention establishes the broader employment and welfare context within which such practices must operate. Workforce sustainability therefore involves both interpersonal leadership and compliance with institutional employment responsibilities.

Interpretative finding, Retention-oriented maritime leadership depends on the ability to recognize individual workforce needs and connect them with organizational resources that can provide meaningful support. It is important to distinguish retention intention from actual retention. The documentary evidence identifies conditions associated with intentions to remain but does not establish that adaptive leadership independently reduces turnover.

Workforce Management Must Reflect Organizational Differences

The fourth theme concerns the limitations of standardized HRM practices across maritime organizations. Karakasnaki et al. (2025), examining responses from 872 seafarers, identify significant associations between perceived company size and dimensions of onboard well-being. Their study does not identify a comparable association between vessel type and the well-being perceptions examined.

These findings suggest that organizational characteristics may shape seafarer experiences in ways that cannot be explained through operational vessel categories alone. Company size may influence the availability of welfare resources, communication arrangements, training opportunities, and organizational support. However, size should not be treated as an automatic indicator of good management. Larger organizations may have more extensive resources, while smaller organizations may provide closer interpersonal relationships or more direct communication.

The findings reinforce the importance of understanding the organizational conditions under which leadership practices are implemented. Theotokas et al. (2024) provide a related observation in their analysis of maritime digitalization. They identify substantial attention to technical competencies and training but comparatively limited research into the practical HRM arrangements required to support organizational transformation.

Taken together, these findings indicate that maritime leadership development cannot be separated from the broader organizational systems responsible for personnel management. Interpretative finding, Effective maritime HRM requires context-sensitive policies that reflect differences in organizational resources, workforce composition, and operational conditions without compromising common safety and employment standards.

Operational Effectiveness Depends on Ship-Shore Alignment

The fifth theme integrates the preceding findings into a broader interpretation of operational effectiveness. The documentary evidence suggests that safe and reliable vessel operations depend on the interaction of professional discipline, workforce resources, organizational support, and timely management decisions. The ISM Code recognizes the importance of company responsibility and shore-based support. This responsibility becomes particularly relevant when operational difficulties arise from circumstances that cannot be resolved through shipboard supervision alone.

For example, a master may recognize that workload is excessive, but sustainable corrective action may require additional personnel, revised operational scheduling, or intervention by shore management. Similarly, a crew member considering resignation may require career or employment decisions outside the authority of onboard supervisors. These examples illustrate that operational effectiveness should not be attributed exclusively to individual leadership competence. It also depends on the responsiveness of the organization supporting the vessel. The IMO Maritime Safety Committee's 2025 discussion of fatigue, working and rest hours, and personnel-related safety concerns reinforces the importance of examining operational effectiveness through both safety systems and human resource conditions.

Interpretative finding, Adaptive maritime leadership contributes most meaningfully to organizational functioning when shipboard observations can influence shore-based decisions concerning staffing, welfare, competence development, and operational planning. This finding places organizational coordination at the center of the relationship between leadership and maritime operational outcomes.

DISCUSSION

Reconsidering Discipline in Maritime Human Resource Management

The findings invite a more comprehensive interpretation of crew discipline. Traditional management approaches may emphasize compliance with instructions, completion of assigned tasks, and adherence to formal procedures. These elements remain important, but the documentary synthesis suggests that they are insufficient as standalone measures of effective discipline. The distinction between formal compliance and authentic safety behavior is particularly important where fatigue, workload, and crewing arrangements create competing demands.

A meaningful disciplinary environment should enable crew members to carry out their responsibilities safely while providing appropriate channels for reporting conditions that prevent proper compliance. This interpretation does not eliminate individual accountability. Rather, it separates deliberate misconduct from limitations arising through inadequate resources, excessive workload, or unclear organizational expectations.

The contribution of adaptive leadership is therefore partly diagnostic: leaders must identify whether a safety problem results primarily from individual behavior, competence, communication, or wider organizational conditions before deciding on corrective action.

Connecting Retention and Operational Reliability

Crew retention is often approached as an employment concern, while operational reliability is treated as a separate performance objective. The documentary findings indicate that these areas are connected through competence continuity and the organizational environment experienced by seafarers.

Workforce turnover may create additional demands for recruitment, familiarization, training, and team coordination. Conversely, maintaining experienced personnel may support familiarity with vessel systems and organizational procedures. Nevertheless, retention alone does not guarantee operational effectiveness. Retaining employees within poorly managed conditions may preserve existing problems rather than improve performance. Accordingly, retention should be considered alongside competence, welfare, professional motivation, and safety culture. A sustainable retention strategy is not simply one that keeps personnel employed, but one that supports their continuing capacity to perform safely and responsibly.

Adaptive Maritime HRM Alignment Framework

The synthesis leads to an interpretative framework termed the Adaptive Maritime HRM Alignment Framework. The framework proposes that leadership responsiveness becomes organizationally meaningful when five management functions are aligned: contextual supervision, authentic safety accountability, responsive workforce support, differentiated HRM practices, and integrated ship-shore coordination.

Table 2. Adaptive Maritime HRM Alignment Framework and recommended organizational actions

Management function	Principal concern	Recommended action	Suggested monitoring evidence
Adaptive supervision	Leadership response to changing operational conditions	Strengthen situational communication, task clarification, and supervisory competence.	Crew feedback, training records, quality of operational briefings
Authentic safety accountability	Gap between documented compliance and actual working conditions	Review fatigue concerns, reporting practices, and the causes of repeated procedural difficulties.	Verified rest arrangements, safety observations, corrective-action closure

Responsive workforce support	Dissatisfaction and retention risk	Improve welfare communication, career planning, and access to shore-based HR assistance.	Exit interview themes, retention intentions, completed HR follow-up
Differentiated HRM	Variation in company resources and individual crew needs	Adjust support practices according to rank, experience, employment circumstances, and operational conditions.	Career progression, welfare access, employee feedback
Ship-shore alignment	Organizational barriers to resolving onboard concerns	Establish clear escalation processes linking masters, crewing departments, technical managers, and designated persons ashore.	Resolution times, repeated unresolved issues, workforce readiness

The framework differs from leadership models focused primarily on individual managerial behavior by emphasizing the organizational conditions required for leadership decisions to produce meaningful responses. Its central argument is that adaptive leadership has limited practical value when supervisors are expected to manage staffing shortages, fatigue, or retention problems without the authority or institutional resources necessary to address them.

Theoretical Contribution

This study contributes to maritime leadership and HRM literature in three ways. First, it positions adaptive leadership within the institutional realities of regulated maritime operations. Adaptability is conceptualized as responsive management within binding safety requirements, rather than freedom from organizational rules. Second, it connects crew discipline and retention through their common dependence on supervisory communication, organizational support, and working conditions. This perspective expands discussion beyond isolated relationships between leadership style and individual outcomes.

Third, it introduces the distinction between formal procedural compliance and authentic safety accountability into the integration of maritime leadership and HRM. This distinction is particularly important when administrative records coexist with concerns about fatigue, staffing, and actual work practices. The resulting framework provides an interpretative basis for examining how shipboard leadership and shore-based management jointly influence the organizational conditions associated with safety and performance.

Practical and Policy Implications

The findings have practical implications for shipping companies, maritime education institutions, and regulators. For shipping companies, leadership development should incorporate situational decision-making, constructive supervision, conflict management, safety communication, and appropriate recognition of crew fatigue and occupational pressures. Training should help masters and officers distinguish problems that can be resolved onboard from those requiring company-level intervention.

For HR departments, retention management should include regular communication with seafarers, transparent career pathways, appropriate contract planning, and effective mechanisms for responding to concerns raised during deployment. For safety management, procedural audits should be complemented by examination of actual operational conditions. Repeated discrepancies between reported rest hours and workload demands should prompt organizational review rather than reliance on administrative correction alone.

Maritime training institutions can also contribute by incorporating adaptive leadership scenarios into management-level education, particularly those involving multicultural communication, competing operational priorities, and responsible decision-making under resource constraints. For maritime regulators and industry bodies, the findings reinforce the importance of considering the human and organizational dimensions of safety compliance. Effective regulation requires attention not only to documented procedures but also to the circumstances in which seafarers are expected to implement them. A practical priority is establishing reliable feedback between shipboard personnel and shore management so that concerns about fatigue, staffing, welfare, and operational coordination can lead to timely corrective decisions.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examines adaptive maritime leadership through qualitative documentary analysis, focusing on its relevance to crew discipline, retention, and operational effectiveness. The analysis identifies five interconnected themes: responsible adaptability within regulatory boundaries, discipline beyond formal procedural compliance, responsive organizational support for retention, differentiated workforce management, and integrated ship-shore coordination.

The findings suggest that effective maritime leadership cannot be understood solely through the authority exercised by shipmasters and officers. Its practical relevance also depends on organizational conditions that allow personnel concerns, safety information, and operational demands to be addressed appropriately. The study contributes the Adaptive Maritime HRM Alignment Framework, which places authentic safety accountability and organizational responsiveness at the center of maritime leadership and workforce management. The framework emphasizes that discipline must reflect

actual safe working practices, retention requires accessible organizational resources, and operational effectiveness depends on coordination between onboard and shore-based management.

The principal limitation is the study's reliance on purposively selected documentary evidence without primary observation or interviews. Consequently, the findings provide an interpretative explanation rather than direct causal evidence of leadership effects. Future research should examine the framework through qualitative case studies involving masters, officers, ratings, crewing managers, and designated persons ashore. Interviews, shipboard observations, and operational documentation could provide stronger insight into how leadership decisions are implemented under actual maritime working conditions. Ultimately, sustainable maritime performance requires more than technically competent crews and formally compliant procedures. It requires leadership and organizational systems capable of responding to the people and conditions upon which safe vessel operations depend..

FURTHER STUDY

Future research should investigate adaptive maritime leadership through qualitative interviews, onboard observations, and comparative case studies involving shipmasters, crew members, and shore-based managers. Particular attention should be given to leadership practices, crew discipline, retention, fatigue management, and differences between documented safety compliance and actual working conditions. Further studies could also examine how organizational culture and ship-shore coordination influence operational effectiveness, providing empirical evidence to refine the proposed Adaptive Maritime HRM Alignment Framework.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author gratefully acknowledges the contributions of researchers and maritime institutions whose publications and resources provided valuable insights and supported the development of this study.

REFERENCES

- Bakker, A. B., & de Vries, J. D. (2021). Job demands–resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations and remedies for job burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 34(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2020.1797695>
- Bhatia, B. S., Baumler, R., Carrera Arce, M., & Lützhöft, M. (2025). Overworked and understaffed: Prioritising fatigue risk factors based on seafarers' perspectives. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 34, Article 101758. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2025.101758>
- BIMCO, & International Chamber of Shipping. (2026, June 25). *BIMCO and ICS report warns of potential future shortage of officers*. <https://www.ics-shipping.org/press-release/bimco-and-ics-report-warns-of-potential-future-shortage-of-officers/>

- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity*, 56, 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Hasanspahić, N., Frančić, V., Vujić, S., & Mandušić, M. (2021). Safety leadership as a means for safe and sustainable shipping. *Sustainability*, 13(14), Article 7841. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13147841>
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press.
- International Labour Organization. (2006). *Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, as amended*. <https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/maritime-labour-convention/>
- International Maritime Organization. (n.d.). *The International Safety Management Code (ISM)*. <https://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/HumanElement/Pages/ISMCode.aspx>
- International Maritime Organization. (2025). *Maritime Safety Committee – 110th session (MSC 110), 18–27 June 2025*. <https://www.imo.org/en/mediacentre/meetingsummaries/pages/msc-110th-session.aspx>
- Karakasnaki, M., Polemis, D., & Gerou, A. (2025). Investigating seafarers' perceptions of well-being onboard: Do company size and vessel type matter? *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, 24, 129–148. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13437-025-00357-w>
- The Mission to Seafarers. (2026, August 3). *Seafarer happiness falls as “acute shock” hardens into “chronic strain”*. <https://www.missiontoseafarers.org/news/seafarer-happiness-falls-as-acute-shock-hardens-into-chronic-strain>
- Theotokas, I. N., Lagoudis, I. N., & Raftopoulou, K. (2024). Challenges of maritime human resource management for the transition to shipping digitalization. *Journal of Shipping and Trade*, 9, Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41072-024-00165-0>
- Xi, Y., Wang, Z., Hu, S., Han, B., & Yin, J. (2025). The effect of safety culture on the safety behavior of ship deck officers – Empirical evidence from shipping industry. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 12, Article 1599455. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2025.1599455>
- Yu, J., Huang, J., Liu, G., & Zhang, G. (2026). Improving seafarers' job satisfaction and retention intention: A job demands-resources perspective. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 53(5), 938–968. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2025.2532462>