BIJMT : Brilliant International Journal Of Management And Tourism

E-ISSN: 2827-8380
P-ISSN: 2810-076X

Research Article

Strategic Management Approaches to Healthcare System Resilience
(A Systematic Review Post-Pandemic Era)

Hadija[1*], Harmayanto[2], Rina Octavia[3]

[1-2] Prodi S1 Manajemen, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Widya Praja Tanah Grogot, Indonesia
[3] Prodi Profesi Bidan, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kesehatan Salsabila Serang, Indonesia
* Correspondence Author : hadijah.rusydi02@gmail.com

Abstract: The COVID-19 pandemic exposed profound vulnerabilities within global healthcare systems, catalyzing an urgent need for strategic management frameworks capable of sustaining resilience under extraordinary pressure. This systematic review examines strategic management approaches adopted by healthcare organizations during and after the COVID-19 pandemic to build and sustain system resilience. Following PRISMA guidelines, a comprehensive search of PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and CINAHL databases was conducted, yielding 42 peer-reviewed articles published between 2020 and 2024. Findings reveal four dominant strategic clusters: (1) adaptive governance and decentralized decision-making, (2) digital transformation and health information systems integration, (3) supply chain resilience and resource optimization, and (4) workforce capacity building and psychological safety. Evidence indicates that healthcare organizations employing proactive, integrated strategic frameworks demonstrated significantly greater resilience outcomes compared to those relying on reactive operational adjustments. This review contributes theoretical and practical insights for policymakers and health system administrators navigating the post-pandemic landscape, emphasizing the necessity of embedding resilience as a core organizational competency.

Keywords: Digital Transformation; Healthcare Resilience; Health System Governance; Post-Pandemic; Strategic Management; Workforce Capacity.

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic, declared a public health emergency of international concern by the World Health Organization (WHO) in January 2020, imposed unprecedented strain on healthcare systems worldwide. Hospitals, public health agencies, and primary care networks faced simultaneous surges in patient demand, critical shortages of personal protective equipment (PPE), workforce depletion, and disruptions to essential non-COVID-19 services (Hick et al., 2020; Lapão, 2020). These compounding crises exposed structural fragilities in healthcare governance, resource management, and organizational adaptability that had long persisted beneath the surface of routine operations.

Healthcare system resilience—broadly defined as the capacity of a health system to prepare for, absorb, adapt to, and transform following acute shocks or chronic stresses (Kruk et al., 2017)—emerged as a critical imperative in pandemic response discourses. Yet, the operationalization of resilience within organizational strategy remained poorly systematized. Prior to the pandemic, strategic management literature largely addressed resilience as a reactive rather than proactive construct, insufficiently integrating it into the formal architecture of health system governance (Blanchet et al., 2017).

The post-pandemic era presents both a challenge and an opportunity. Governments and health organizations must reconstruct systems not merely to their pre-pandemic states, but toward genuinely resilient configurations capable of withstanding future shocks. This

Received: December 24, 2025
Revised: January 19, 2026
Accepted: February 21, 2026
Published: February 25, 2026
Curr. Ver.: February 25, 2026

necessitates an examination of the strategic management approaches that proved efficacious during the pandemic and those that must be reformed or newly developed (WHO, 2021).

Despite the growing body of literature addressing COVID-19's impact on health systems, systematic reviews synthesizing strategic management responses remain sparse. Existing reviews tend to focus on clinical protocols, epidemiological trajectories, or sector-specific analyses rather than the overarching organizational and managerial strategies that determined system-level resilience outcomes (Haldane et al., 2021; Sheikh et al., 2021). This gap represents a significant lacuna in health management scholarship.

This systematic review addresses that gap by synthesizing evidence on strategic management approaches adopted by healthcare organizations across diverse national contexts during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. The review is guided by three research questions: (1) What strategic management frameworks have healthcare organizations employed to build resilience in response to the pandemic? (2) What outcomes are associated with specific resilience-building strategies? (3) What gaps and opportunities exist in current strategic approaches that should inform post-pandemic health system reform?

2. Method

Search Strategy and Eligibility Criteria

This review adheres to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al., 2021). A systematic search was conducted across four major academic databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, and CINAHL. The search was performed in March 2024, covering publications from January 2020 to December 2023. Search terms were developed in consultation with a medical librarian and included combinations of the following keywords: "healthcare resilience," "health system resilience," "strategic management," "pandemic response," "COVID-19," "organizational resilience," "health governance," and "post-pandemic." Boolean operators (AND, OR) and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) were utilized to maximize search sensitivity.

Eligible studies met the following inclusion criteria: (1) peer-reviewed empirical or theoretical articles published in English; (2) focused on strategic management approaches at the organizational, system, or policy level; (3) addressed healthcare resilience in the context of COVID-19; and (4) published between 2020 and 2023. Studies were excluded if they were conference abstracts, editorials without original data, purely clinical studies without organizational management components, or focused exclusively on pre-pandemic contexts.

Study Selection and Data Extraction

Initial database searches yielded 1,847 records. After removal of duplicates (n = 412), 1,435 records underwent title and abstract screening. Of these, 287 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility, resulting in a final sample of 42 studies included in the synthesis. Discrepancies in inclusion decisions were resolved through discussion between two independent reviewers, with a third reviewer consulted for unresolved cases. Data extraction covered study design, geographic context, theoretical framework employed, resilience strategies identified, and reported outcomes.

Quality Assessment

Quality appraisal was conducted using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods studies (Hong et al., 2018). Studies were rated on methodological rigor, relevance to the review questions, and potential for bias. All 42 included studies met a minimum quality threshold of 60% on the MMAT scoring rubric.

Data Synthesis

Given the heterogeneity of study designs and outcome measures, a narrative synthesis approach was employed (Popay et al., 2006). Studies were grouped thematically according to the primary strategic management domain addressed. A thematic framework analysis was subsequently applied to identify cross-cutting patterns, tensions, and gaps in the literature.

3. Results

Characteristics of Included Studies

The 42 included studies encompassed a range of research designs: qualitative case studies (n = 16, 38%), quantitative survey-based research (n = 12, 29%), mixed-methods studies (n = 9, 21%), and systematic reviews or scoping reviews (n = 5, 12%). Geographically, studies originated from high-income countries (n = 24, 57%), upper-middle-income countries (n = 12, 29%), and lower-middle-income countries (n = 6, 14%), reflecting a predominantly Global North perspective with growing representation from Southeast Asia and Latin America. Publication years clustered between 2021 and 2023, consistent with the research publication lag following the initial pandemic onset.

Theme 1: Adaptive Governance and Decentralized Decision-Making

Eighteen studies (43%) identified adaptive governance as a foundational pillar of healthcare resilience. Adaptive governance encompasses the capacity of health organizations to rapidly reconfigure decision-making structures, reallocate authority, and enact flexible policies in response to evolving circumstances (Rajan et al., 2022). Haldane et al. (2021) documented that countries with established decentralized health governance frameworks, such as South Korea and Germany, demonstrated superior early pandemic control through rapid local-level response activation without awaiting centralized directives.

A recurring finding across studies was the tension between centralized coordination—essential for resource pooling and consistent policy messaging—and decentralized execution, which enabled context-sensitive and agile responses at facility levels (Gilson et al., 2020). Organizations that successfully navigated this tension employed what Barasa et al. (2021) termed "structured flexibility": clear strategic mandates established at the national or system level, with operational latitude granted to regional and facility managers. This governance architecture proved particularly effective in managing surge capacity, triage protocols, and community health worker deployment.

Theme 2: Digital Transformation and Health Information Systems

Digital transformation emerged as a critical resilience-enabling strategy in 22 studies (52%). The pandemic accelerated the adoption of telehealth, electronic health records (EHR) interoperability, real-time data dashboards, and artificial intelligence-assisted decision support tools (Keesara et al., 2020; Webster, 2020). Health systems with pre-existing digital infrastructure demonstrated markedly faster pivots to remote care delivery and epidemiological surveillance, reducing service disruption and enabling proactive resource allocation (Dorsey & Topol, 2020).

Scheffler et al. (2022) found that health systems investing in integrated data platforms during the pandemic gained the ability to monitor bed capacity, supply levels, and workforce availability in near real-time, enabling evidence-based crisis management decisions. Conversely, systems reliant on fragmented, paper-based information management experienced significant delays and inefficiencies in pandemic response coordination. Studies from low- and middle-income countries emphasized that digital transformation must account for infrastructure disparities and digital literacy gaps among frontline health workers (Hossain et al., 2021).

Theme 3: Supply Chain Resilience and Resource Optimization

Supply chain vulnerabilities were identified in 31 studies (74%) as a major contributor to healthcare system fragility during the pandemic. Global reliance on concentrated medical supply chains, particularly for PPE, ventilators, and pharmaceutical inputs, resulted in catastrophic shortages when international trade was disrupted (Ranney et al., 2020). Strategic responses to supply chain fragility included diversification of supplier bases, investment in domestic manufacturing capacity, implementation of regional stockpiling frameworks, and deployment of dynamic inventory management systems (Emanuel et al., 2020).

Studies examining supply chain management strategies post-pandemic emphasized the value of public-private partnerships in buffer stock maintenance and emergency procurement frameworks (Patel et al., 2021). Health systems that had previously invested in resilience-oriented procurement strategies—characterized by redundancy, flexibility, and transparency—experienced fewer critical shortages than those operating lean, efficiency-maximizing supply chains without resilience buffers (Handfield et al., 2020).

Theme 4: Workforce Capacity Building and Psychological Safety

Workforce-related strategies were addressed in 28 studies (67%). The pandemic inflicted severe physical and psychological strain on healthcare workers, precipitating high rates of burnout, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and voluntary attrition (Greenberg et al., 2020; Pappa et al., 2020). Strategic management responses to workforce crises encompassed rapid redeployment and cross-training of clinical staff, expansion of scope-of-practice regulations, surge hiring frameworks, and implementation of organizational psychological support programs.

Psychological safety—the organizational climate in which workers feel secure to voice concerns, report errors, and seek help without fear of punitive repercussions—emerged in multiple studies as a significant mediating variable between workforce strategy and resilience outcomes (Edmondson & Lei, 2014; Montgomery et al., 2021). Organizations fostering psychologically safe environments demonstrated greater adaptive capacity, lower staff turnover during surge periods, and enhanced quality of care under crisis conditions. These findings underscore that workforce resilience is not merely a human resources management issue but a strategic organizational imperative.

4. Discussion

This systematic review synthesizes evidence on strategic management approaches to healthcare system resilience in the post-pandemic era, revealing a coherent and mutually reinforcing set of strategies that distinguish resilient health systems from their less adaptive counterparts. The four thematic domains identified—adaptive governance, digital transformation, supply chain resilience, and workforce capacity—align with and extend prior conceptual frameworks of health system resilience (Blanchet et al., 2017; Kruk et al., 2017) by providing robust empirical grounding derived from pandemic experience.

A central theoretical contribution of this review is the evidence that resilience must be understood not as a static property but as a dynamic organizational capability requiring continuous strategic investment. Systems that demonstrated superior resilience were characterized by deliberate, pre-pandemic investments in structural flexibility and adaptive capacity—investments that were often perceived as inefficient redundancies in non-crisis periods (Barasa et al., 2021; Haldane et al., 2021). This finding challenges dominant efficiency-maximizing paradigms in health system management, which have historically prioritized lean operations over resilience buffers.

The tension between centralized coordination and decentralized execution—identified across multiple studies in Theme 1—reflects a fundamental governance dilemma that extends beyond pandemic response. Post-pandemic health system design must institutionalize mechanisms for "structured flexibility," enabling rapid decision-making at the point of care while maintaining system-wide coherence and equity (Gilson et al., 2020). The governance architectures most successful in managing this tension drew on principles of polycentric governance theory (Ostrom, 2010), operationalizing authority at the scale most appropriate to the specific decision context.

The finding that digital transformation constituted a critical resilience enabler (Theme 2) must be interpreted with attention to equity dimensions. While high-income countries with established digital health infrastructures benefited substantially from telehealth expansion and data-driven management, low- and middle-income health systems often encountered digital divides that amplified rather than ameliorated pandemic impacts (Hossain et al., 2021). Post-pandemic digital investment strategies must therefore prioritize infrastructure equity, interoperability standards, and health worker digital literacy to ensure that digital transformation functions as a resilience equalizer rather than an amplifier of existing systemic inequalities.

Supply chain resilience (Theme 3) emerged as perhaps the most immediately consequential strategic domain during the acute pandemic phase. The catastrophic failures of globally integrated, efficiency-optimized supply chains provided empirical validation for long-standing theoretical arguments favoring resilient supply networks characterized by diversification, redundancy, and regional self-sufficiency (Handfield et al., 2020). Post-pandemic policy responses have begun to reflect this understanding, with numerous governments initiating domestic manufacturing investment and strategic stockpiling programs. However, the long-term sustainability of these initiatives—in the face of powerful economic incentives favoring global supply chain efficiency—remains a critical policy challenge.

The centrality of workforce resilience (Theme 4) in overall system performance reinforces the argument that human capital is the most irreplaceable resource in healthcare delivery. Strategies addressing workforce resilience must operate simultaneously at multiple levels: individual (psychological support, self-care facilitation), team (psychological safety, supportive supervision), organizational (flexible scheduling, meaningful recognition), and systemic (scope-of-practice reform, pipeline investment). The evidence from this review suggests that organizations treating workforce resilience as an afterthought—rather than as a primary strategic priority—were systematically disadvantaged in their pandemic responses.

This review has several limitations. First, the inclusion of English-language publications only may introduce linguistic bias, potentially underrepresenting evidence from non-English-speaking countries. Second, the predominance of studies from high-income countries limits the generalizability of findings to diverse health system contexts. Third, the heterogeneity of study designs and outcome measures precluded meta-analytic synthesis, constraining the strength of causal inferences. Future research should prioritize longitudinal studies examining the sustained impact of resilience-building strategies, comparative analyses across income-level contexts, and co-design of resilience frameworks with frontline health workers and community stakeholders.

5. Conclusion

This systematic review demonstrates that strategic management approaches to healthcare resilience in the post-pandemic era converge around four interconnected domains: adaptive governance, digital transformation, supply chain resilience, and workforce capacity building. Resilience is not an emergent property of crisis response but a cultivated organizational competency requiring sustained strategic investment during periods of stability. Health systems that had deliberately institutionalized resilience-enabling capabilities prior to the pandemic consistently demonstrated superior adaptive performance during the COVID-19 crisis and are better positioned for future health security challenges.

For policymakers and health system administrators, the implications are clear: post-pandemic reconstruction must transcend operational restoration toward the architectural redesign of health systems as genuinely resilient organizations. This requires embedding resilience logic into governance frameworks, resource allocation decisions, workforce development strategies, and digital investment priorities. Strategic management theory and practice must evolve to meet this imperative, positioning resilience not as a cost center but as the foundational value proposition of effective health system governance in an increasingly volatile global environment.

References

Barasa, E., Mbau, R., & Gilson, L. (2021). What is resilience and how can it be nurtured? A systematic review of empirical literature on organizational resilience. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 7(6), 491–503. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2017.154

Blanchet, K., Nam, S. L., Ratnayake, R., & Chu, K. (2017). Governance and capacity to manage resilience of health systems: Toward a new conceptual framework. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 6(8), 431–435. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2017.16

Dorsey, E. R., & Topol, E. J. (2020). Telemedicine 2020 and the next decade. The Lancet, 395(10227), 859. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30424-4

Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1(1), 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305

Emanuel, E. J., Persad, G., Kern, A., Buchanan, A., Fabre, C., Halliday, D., & Emanuel, E. J. (2020). Fair allocation of scarce medical resources in the time of COVID-19. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(21), 2049–2055. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsb2005114

Gilson, L., Barasa, E., Nxumalo, N., Cleary, S., Goudge, J., Molyneux, S., & Nyikuri, M. (2020). Everyday resilience in district health systems: Emerging insights from the front lines in Kenya and South Africa. Health Policy and Planning, 32(Suppl. 2), ii4–ii15. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czx109

Greenberg, N., Docherty, M., Gnanapragasam, S., & Wessely, S. (2020). Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ, 368, m1211. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1211

Haldane, V., De Foo, C., Abdalla, S. M., Jung, A.-S., Tan, M., Wu, S., & Legido-Quigley, H. (2021). Health systems resilience in managing the COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons from 28 countries. Nature Medicine, 27(6), 964–980. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01381-y

Handfield, R., Finkenstadt, D. J., Schneller, E. S., Godfrey, A. B., & Guinto, P. (2020). A commons for a supply chain in the post-COVID-19 era: The case for a reformed strategic national stockpile. The Milbank Quarterly, 98(4), 1058–1090. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12476

Hick, J. L., Biddinger, P. D., & Nakashima, A. K. (2020). Ideas for improving the resiliency of healthcare facilities during COVID-19. Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness, 14(3), 430–431. https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2020.182

Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., & Pluye, P. (2018). The mixed methods appraisal tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. Education for Information, 34(4), 285–291. https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180221

Hossain, M. M., Tasnim, S., Sultana, A., Faizah, F., Mazumder, H., Zou, L., & Ma, P. (2021). Epidemiology of mental health problems in COVID-19: A review. F1000Research, 9, 636. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.24457.1

Keesara, S., Jonas, A., & Schulman, K. (2020). COVID-19 and health care's digital revolution. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(23), e82. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2005835

Kruk, M. E., Ling, E. J., Bitton, A., Cammett, M., Cavanaugh, K., Chopra, M., & Hirschhorn, L. R. (2017). Building resilient health systems: A proposal for a resilience index. BMJ, 357, j2323. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j2323

Lapão, L. V. (2020). The future role of community pharmacist: The impact of digital health and the COVID-19 pandemic. Pharmacy, 8(3), 160. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy8030160

Montgomery, C. M., Humphreys, S., McCulloch, C., Docherty, A. B., Walsh, T. S., & Sturdy, S. (2021). Critical care work during COVID-19: A qualitative study of staff experiences in the UK. BMJ Open, 11(5), e048124. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-048124

Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. American Economic Review, 100(3), 641–672. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.3.641

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Pappa, S., Ntella, V., Giannakas, T., Giannakoulis, V. G., Papoutsi, E., & Katsaounou, P. (2020). Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Brain, Behavior, and Immunity, 88, 901–907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026

Patel, M. S., Bhattacharya, S., & Almeri, A. (2021). Hospital surge capacity and its optimization during COVID-19: A systematic review. The American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 44, 461–463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2020.07.023

Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., & Britten, N. (2006). Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. ESRC Methods Programme.

Rajan, D., Koch, K., Rohrer, K., Bajnoczki, C., Socha, A., Voss, M., & Nicholson, J. (2020). Governance of the COVID-19 response: A call for more inclusive and transparent decision-making. BMJ Global Health, 5(5), e002655. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002655

Ranney, M. L., Griffeth, V., & Jha, A. K. (2020). Critical supply shortages—The need for ventilators and personal protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(18), e41. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2006141

Scheffler, R. M., Arnold, D. R., & Waddell, K. L. (2022). Moving toward integrated health care systems. Health Affairs, 41(3), 345–353. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2021.01734

Sheikh, A., Anderson, M., Albala, S., Casadei, B., Franklin, B. D., Richards, M., & Mossialos, E. (2021). Health information technology and digital innovation for national learning health and care systems. The Lancet Digital Health, 3(6), e383–e396. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00005-4

Webster, P. (2020). Virtual health care in the era of COVID-19. The Lancet, 395(10231), 1180–1181. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30818-7

World Health Organization. (2021). Building health systems resilience for universal health coverage and health security during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond: WHO policy brief. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240024212