Institutional Resilience, Accountability and Effective Public Administration

Jonathan Reeves, Grace Adebayo

Article type: Editorial

Volume 1, Issue 1 (2026)

Read Current Issue →

Abstract

Public institutions are increasingly required to maintain essential services through health emergencies, economic shocks, environmental hazards, infrastructure failures, migration pressures, technological disruption, and fiscal stress. Resilience, however, cannot be reduced to organizational survival or rapid restoration of pre-crisis routines. This editorial argues that effective public-sector resilience combines continuity, adaptation, learning, legitimacy, and accountability. Institutions that absorb disruption but cannot correct failed practices are brittle in a different form, while flexible emergency action without oversight can erode rights, trust, and procedural safeguards. The current evidence base connects crisis management, organizational resilience, policy capacity, interagency networks, adaptive governance, continuity planning, and public accountability. Major challenges include rigid procedures, coordination failures, information bottlenecks, uneven workforce capacity, emergency powers, infrastructure dependencies, and inequitable service disruption. Priorities include resilience measurement, scenario planning, institutional learning, workforce and digital resilience, intergovernmental coordination, emergency accountability, and long-term post-crisis evaluation. Resilient administration should ultimately be judged by whether institutions can preserve essential public value while adapting transparently and learning from disruption.

Keywords: institutional resilience; crisis governance; public administration; accountability; adaptive governance; organizational learning; state capacity

Citation

Reeves, J., & Adebayo, G. (2026). Institutional Resilience, Accountability and Effective Public Administration. Applied Policy, Institutions & Public Management, 1(1). https://eldranacademic.com/apipm/articles/2/

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
16 February 2026	16 April 2026	06 May 2026	21 May 2026

Copyright

© 2026 Jonathan Reeves, Grace Adebayo. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) ↗. Use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original authors and copyright owners are credited and the original publication in this journal is cited in accordance with accepted academic practice.

Disclaimer

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, the publisher, the editors or the reviewers. Any product evaluated in this article, or claim made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Context and Problem Framing

Public institutions now operate in an environment where disruption is recurrent rather than exceptional. Economic shocks, pandemics, extreme weather, infrastructure failures, cyber incidents, migration pressures, and fiscal stress can simultaneously affect demand for services and the administrative capacity available to deliver them. Crisis-management scholarship has long emphasized that public authorities must make consequential decisions under uncertainty, time pressure, fragmented information, and intense scrutiny (Boin et al., 2016). More recent work on transboundary crises shows that disruptions increasingly cross jurisdictional, sectoral, and organizational boundaries, making resilience a problem of institutional design as well as emergency response (Boin & Lodge, 2016). The relevant question is not whether administration can avoid every shock, but whether institutions can continue essential functions while adapting without losing legitimacy.

Resilience is often used imprecisely to describe persistence, recovery, flexibility, or robustness. Public administration requires a more demanding interpretation. Duit (2016) cautions that resilience concepts imported from ecological systems can understate politics, competing values, and institutional conflict. Boin and van Eeten (2013) similarly distinguish resilient organizations from those that simply resist change, emphasizing anticipation, adaptation, and the capacity to recover. Organizational-resilience research also increasingly treats resilience as a capability that develops before, during, and after disruption rather than as a trait revealed only during emergencies (Duchek, 2020). In public institutions, this capability must include service continuity, learning, coordination, and the ability to revise routines when established procedures no longer fit conditions.

1.2 Why the Issue Matters

The distinctive public-sector problem is that flexibility must coexist with accountability. Crises may require accelerated procurement, delegated authority, emergency spending, extraordinary data use, and rapid changes in service delivery. Yet these same measures can weaken transparency, procedural safeguards, and opportunities for review. Christensen et al. (2016) therefore argue that effective crisis management requires both governance capacity and governance legitimacy. Christensen and Lægreid's (2020) analysis of Norway's pandemic response likewise links administrative competence to trust, communication, and legitimacy rather than capacity alone. The proposition advanced here is that institutional resilience should be evaluated as accountable adaptation: the ability to absorb disruption, maintain essential public value, learn, and reconfigure action while preserving defensible lines of responsibility and public justification.

2.0 Current Landscape

2.1 Institutional Capacity

Crisis-governance research provides the most developed account of how public institutions perform under severe stress. Ansell et al. (2010) identify coordination, information sharing, and institutional arrangements as central to managing transboundary crises, while Moynihan (2009) shows how incident-command systems create networked governance structures that must combine hierarchy and collaboration. Kapucu (2006) demonstrates the importance of boundary spanners in interagency communication, and Comfort (2007) frames crisis performance around cognition, communication, coordination, and control. These studies collectively show that formal emergency plans are insufficient when organizations lack trusted relationships, information channels, and practiced coordination routines.

Organizational-resilience scholarship adds a longer time horizon. Lengnick-Hall et al. (2011) link resilience to human-resource and organizational capabilities, while Linnenluecke (2017) demonstrates that resilience research spans adaptation, reliability, recovery, and strategic renewal. Kim et al. (2021) provide public-sector evidence that interorganizational network structures can strengthen organizational resilience, especially where local actors develop relationships before emergencies. Weick and Sutcliffe (2007) similarly emphasize mindful attention to weak signals and unexpected events in high-reliability settings. These perspectives shift resilience from emergency improvisation toward institutional preparation and learning.

2.2 Coordination

Public-sector capacity research further clarifies why apparently similar shocks produce different administrative outcomes. Fukuyama (2013) treats governance quality partly as the state's capacity to make and enforce rules and deliver services, while Andrews et al. (2017) emphasize capability building through iterative problem solving rather than imported best practice. Wu et al. (2018) distinguish analytical, operational, and political capacities that governments need to act effectively. During the COVID-19 crisis, Mazzucato and Kattel (2020) argued that dynamic public-sector capabilities - learning, coordination, production, and data governance - were essential to response. Mardiyanta and Wijaya's (2023) review of Asian cases similarly identifies recurring trade-offs involving technology, privacy, trust, centralization, and policy capacity.

2.3 Accountability Systems

Accountability scholarship reminds us that resilience is not normatively neutral. Bovens (2007) conceptualizes accountability as a relationship in which actors must explain and justify conduct to a forum capable of questioning and consequences. Brandsma and Schillemans (2013) operationalize dimensions of accountability more precisely, while crisis-specific scholarship shows that public demands for explanation intensify after major failures. Effective institutions therefore need mechanisms that permit temporary adaptation without making emergency exceptions permanent by default. Resilience and accountability should be designed together rather than treated as sequential phases of response and post-crisis review.

2.4 Service Continuity

Comparative experience also demonstrates why preparedness cannot be inferred from emergency plans alone. Comfort et al. (2010) emphasize the design of resilient systems before extreme events, including relationships, information architectures, and response capacities that can be mobilized under stress. Boin et al. (2021) show through the pandemic that mega-crises unfold across political, administrative, and societal arenas and require repeated adjustment rather than one decisive intervention. Joyce (2021) similarly illustrates how formal claims of

preparedness can diverge from practical agility when strategy, implementation, coordination, and public confidence are tested simultaneously. Resilience is therefore an empirical property of institutional performance across phases of disruption, not a label that follows from the existence of plans or emergency structures.

3.0 Critical Challenges

3.1 Capacity Constraints

A first challenge is procedural rigidity. Rules protect legality, consistency, and equality, but highly specified procedures can slow response when established categories no longer match rapidly changing conditions. Conversely, broad emergency discretion can create inconsistency and weak traceability. Ansell and Boin (2019) describe deep uncertainty as a defining feature of strategic crisis management and argue for pragmatic, iterative approaches rather than false confidence in prediction. The administrative task is to design controlled flexibility: procedures that identify which constraints are essential safeguards and which can be adapted when conditions exceed planning assumptions.

Coordination failures form a second challenge. Crises often require simultaneous action by central ministries, local government, regulators, emergency services, health systems, infrastructure operators, and private suppliers. Network density alone does not guarantee effective coordination. Moynihan (2008) shows that learning and communication in crisis networks are shaped by institutional relationships and prior experience. Boin and Lodge (2016) similarly emphasize that transboundary resilience requires institutions capable of working across organizational and jurisdictional boundaries. Without predefined authorities, interoperable information, and trusted channels, crises can expose responsibility gaps precisely when action must accelerate.

3.2 Fragmented Authority

Information bottlenecks are a third challenge. Decision makers need timely operational data, but crisis information is often incomplete, rapidly changing, and generated by systems not designed for cross-agency use. Digital dependence creates additional vulnerabilities when critical databases, identity systems, cloud services, payment platforms, or communications networks fail. Resilience therefore increasingly includes digital continuity, cybersecurity, data backup, and manual fallback capacity. Woods (2015) argues that resilience requires the ability to adapt when systems approach performance boundaries, an insight that applies directly to digitally mediated public services.

3.3 Accountability Trade-Offs

Workforce and institutional memory create a fourth challenge. Emergency plans have little value if key staff lack authority, skills, surge capacity, or practical knowledge of interagency routines. Turnover can erase lessons from previous disruptions, while chronic austerity may leave institutions with little slack. Lodge and Wegrich (2014) frame state performance in terms of problem-solving capacity, highlighting that administrative capability depends on organizational resources and institutional arrangements developed over time. Resilience cannot therefore be produced only through temporary crisis teams; it requires investment in routine administrative competence.

3.4 Institutional Learning

The final challenge concerns accountability and equity under emergency conditions. Exceptional powers may be necessary, but accelerated decision processes can weaken procurement scrutiny, data protections, consultation, and review. Service disruption is also rarely evenly distributed: people with greater dependence on public services, limited digital access, disability, insecure housing, or precarious employment may bear disproportionate costs.

McConnell (2011) cautions that crisis-management success is multidimensional and contested; rapid operational restoration may coexist with political, social, or distributive failure. Long-term evaluation must therefore examine who retained access to services, whose rights were constrained, and whether emergency measures were withdrawn or institutionalized.

4.0 Discussion and Priorities

4.1 Integrative Discussion

Institutional resilience should be distinguished from resistance to change. An institution that restores the same fragile routines after every disruption may appear stable while remaining structurally vulnerable. Duchek's (2020) capability approach - anticipation, coping, and adaptation - is useful because it treats resilience as a sequence of capacities rather than a return to equilibrium. Public institutions must similarly learn from disruption and modify structures, workforce practices, data systems, or intergovernmental arrangements when evidence shows that previous designs are inadequate.

At the same time, adaptation without legitimacy can undermine the institution it is intended to protect. Public authority depends on more than technical continuity. Citizens and oversight bodies need reasons, information, review mechanisms, and identifiable responsibility for exceptional decisions. Bovens (2007) and Christensen et al. (2016) converge on the idea that institutional performance is partly relational: capable administration must remain explainable and legitimate. Resilience strategies should therefore specify both operational authorities and accountability pathways before crises occur.

The interaction between continuity, adaptation, learning, and accountability also explains why resilience is context dependent. Centralized command may improve speed in some emergencies while suppressing local information in others. Decentralization may increase local responsiveness while complicating national coordination. Networked governance can expand resources yet make authority ambiguous. Resilience cannot be reduced to one preferred organizational form. The research task is to identify configurations that match specific risks, administrative traditions, and service dependencies while preserving core public values.

Complementary scholarship informing this synthesis includes Christensen (2020); and Mardiyanta (2023). These works broaden the evidentiary base considered across the field.

4.2 Research and Practice Priorities

First, resilience measurement should move beyond simple service uptime or recovery speed. Measurement frameworks should distinguish absorptive capacity, adaptive capacity, coordination quality, learning, legitimacy, equity, and the durability of post-crisis reforms. Comparative indicators should be used cautiously because institutional mandates and risk exposure differ substantially across settings.

Second, scenario planning and continuity systems should be connected to empirical organizational testing. Plans should be exercised through simulations, interagency drills, cyber incidents, workforce-loss scenarios, and supply-chain disruptions. The objective is to test decision rights, information flows, fallback procedures, and service prioritization rather than merely confirm the existence of a plan.

Third, institutional learning requires durable mechanisms. After-action reviews, independent inquiries, audit findings, staff debriefs, and citizen feedback should be translated into tracked organizational changes. Weick and Sutcliffe (2007) emphasize learning from weak signals, while Moynihan (2008) demonstrates the importance of learning within crisis networks. Research should examine when lessons alter routines and when organizations revert to pre-crisis practice.

Fourth, workforce and network capacity deserve sustained investment. Cross-training, succession planning, surge staffing, professional development, and pre-crisis interagency relationships can reduce dependence on a small number of individuals. Evidence from organizational networks suggests that resilience benefits from relationships established before disruption rather than improvised after it (Kim et al., 2021).

Fifth, digital resilience should be studied as an administrative capability. Research should examine cybersecurity, interoperability, cloud dependencies, data recovery, continuity of digital identity and payment systems, and the ability to maintain essential services when primary platforms fail. Digital modernization that removes all manual alternatives can create new systemic fragilities.

Finally, emergency accountability requires explicit design. Temporary authorities should have clear legal bases, documentation requirements, review points, sunset provisions where appropriate, and independent oversight. Long-term post-crisis evaluation should assess not only response speed but institutional learning, equity, fiscal consequences, trust, and whether extraordinary measures became normalized.

4.3 Implications for the Journal's Scope

Scholarship on resilient public administration should be institutionally grounded. Valuable contributions include comparative crisis studies, continuity and preparedness research, intergovernmental coordination, public-sector capacity, emergency accountability, organizational learning, workforce resilience, digital continuity, and long-term evaluation of post-crisis reforms. Generic leadership prescriptions are less useful than studies that identify mechanisms, organizational arrangements, trade-offs, and contextual conditions.

The field should also integrate normative and operational analysis. A response can be fast but opaque, adaptive but inequitable, or legally compliant but operationally ineffective. Research designs should therefore connect administrative performance with legitimacy and accountability rather than treating them as separate conversations. This creates a richer understanding of whether institutions can remain capable under stress without sacrificing the public values that justify their authority.

4.4 Conclusion

Institutional resilience is not the ability to endure disruption unchanged. Effective public administration must preserve essential services while absorbing shocks, adapting to new information, learning from failure, and maintaining credible accountability. These demands can conflict, especially when emergencies reward speed while public institutions remain responsible for legality, equity, and justification.

Resilience research should therefore focus on institutional combinations rather than slogans: continuity systems that are exercised, networks that have practiced coordination, workforces with adaptive capacity, digital infrastructures with fallback options, and emergency powers embedded in transparent oversight. The strongest institutions are not those that never change under pressure, but those that can change deliberately without losing institutional memory, legitimacy, or responsibility.

5.0 Declarations

5.1 Author Contributions

The authors contributed jointly to the conceptual development, literature synthesis, critical interpretation, drafting, and revision of the editorial.

5.2 Funding

No external funding was received for the preparation of this editorial.

5.3 Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest or competing interests relevant to this editorial.

5.4 Data Availability

No original datasets were generated or analysed for this editorial.

5.5 AI Use Disclosure

Generative AI was used to support literature organization and language drafting during preparation of this editorial. The authors remain responsible for independently verifying the accuracy of the arguments, citations, references, and final submitted text in accordance with the publisher's policy.

6.0 References

Andrews, M., Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2017). Building state capability: Evidence, analysis, action. Oxford University Press.

Ansell, C., & Boin, A. (2019). Taming deep uncertainty: The potential of pragmatist principles for understanding and improving strategic crisis management. Administration & Society, 51(7), 1079-1112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399717747655

Ansell, C., Boin, A., & Keller, A. (2010). Managing transboundary crises: Identifying the building blocks of an effective response system. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 18(4), 195-207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2010.00620.x

Boin, A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2016). The politics of crisis management: Public leadership under pressure (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Boin, A., & Lodge, M. (2016). Designing resilient institutions for transboundary crisis management: A time for public administration. Public Administration, 94(2), 289-298. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12264

Boin, A., & van Eeten, M. J. G. (2013). The resilient organization. Public Management Review, 15(3), 429-445. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.769856

Boin, A., McConnell, A., & 't Hart, P. (2021). Governing the pandemic: The politics of navigating a mega-crisis. Palgrave Macmillan.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. European Law Journal, 13(4), 447-468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Brandsma, G. J., & Schillemans, T. (2013). The accountability cube: Measuring accountability. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 23(4), 953-975. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus034

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2020). Balancing governance capacity and legitimacy: How the Norwegian government handled the COVID-19 crisis as a high performer. Public Administration Review, 80(5), 774-779. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13241

Christensen, T., Lægreid, P., & Rykkja, L. H. (2016). Organizing for crisis management: Building governance capacity and legitimacy. Public Administration Review, 76(6), 887-897. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12558

Comfort, L. K. (2007). Crisis management in hindsight: Cognition, communication, coordination, and control. Public Administration Review, 67(s1), 189-197. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00827.x

Comfort, L. K., Boin, A., & Demchak, C. C. (Eds.). (2010). Designing resilience: Preparing for extreme events. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. Business Research, 13, 215-246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7

Duit, A. (2016). Resilience thinking: Lessons for public administration. Public Administration, 94(2), 364-380. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12182

Fukuyama, F. (2013). What is governance? Governance, 26(3), 347-368. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12035

Joyce, P. (2021). Public governance, agility and pandemics: A case study of the UK response to COVID-19. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 87(3), 536-555. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523209834O6

Kapucu, N. (2006). Interagency communication networks during emergencies: Boundary spanners in multiagency coordination. The American Review of Public Administration, 36(2), 207-225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074005280605

Kim, K., Andrew, S. A., & Jung, K. (2021). Building resilient organizations: Organizational resilience as a network outcome. International Journal of Public Administration, 44(15), 1319-1328. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2020.1758720

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001

Linnenluecke, M. K. (2017). Resilience in business and management research: A review of influential publications and a research agenda. International Journal of Management Reviews, 19(1), 4-30. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12076

Lodge, M., & Wegrich, K. (Eds.). (2014). The problem-solving capacity of the modern state: Governance challenges and administrative capacities. Oxford University Press.

Mardiyanta, A., & Wijaya, C. N. (2023). Policy capacity during COVID-19 in Asia: A systematic literature review. Journal of Public Affairs, 23(1), e2835. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2835

Mazzucato, M., & Kattel, R. (2020). COVID-19 and public-sector capacity. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 36(S1), S256-S269. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/graa031

McConnell, A. (2011). Success? Failure? Something in-between? A framework for evaluating crisis management. Policy and Society, 30(2), 63-76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2011.03.002

Moynihan, D. P. (2008). Learning under uncertainty: Networks in crisis management. Public Administration Review, 68(2), 350-365. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00867.x

Moynihan, D. P. (2009). The network governance of crisis response: Case studies of incident command systems. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 19(4), 895-915. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mun033

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Woods, D. D. (2015). Four concepts for resilience and the implications for the future of resilience engineering. Reliability Engineering & System Safety, 141, 5-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2015.03.018

Wu, X., Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (Eds.). (2018). Policy capacity and governance: Assessing governmental competences and capabilities in theory and practice. Palgrave Macmillan.