INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN ACCOUNTING, FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL

Vol 15, Issue 3, (2025) E-ISSN: 2225-8329

A Review Paper on the Role of Business Continuity Management in UAE Public Sector Performance

Abdulrahman Ahmed Mohammed Aldabal Alblooshi

Universiti Teknikal Malaysdia Melaka Institute of Technology Management and Entrepreneurship

Email: P082220007@student.utem.edu.my

Suriati Binti Akmal

Universiti Teknikal Malaysdia Melaka Institute of Technology Management and Entrepreneurship

Correspondence Author Email: suriatiakmal@utem.edu.my

DOI Link: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v15-i3/26269

Published Online: 31 August 2025

Abstract

In an era marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), Business Continuity Management (BCM) has become a critical strategic framework for public sector institutions, particularly in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). While BCM enhances organizational resilience, service continuity, and stakeholder confidence, gaps persist in its full integration within UAE government entities due to bureaucratic delays, fragmented implementation, and insufficient risk awareness. This study examines the relationship between BCM and organizational performance in the UAE public sector, identifying key factors such as top management communication, ICT tools, organizational structure, risk governance, employee training, and organizational culture. Through a comprehensive literature review, the research highlights the challenges and opportunities in BCM adoption, emphasizing the need for decentralized decision-making, digital readiness, and cultural adaptation. The findings contribute to theory by integrating organizational culture as a mediator in BCM effectiveness and offer practical insights for policymakers to strengthen continuity frameworks. Future research should explore sector-specific barriers, ICT tool efficacy, and culturally tailored BCM models to enhance resilience in the UAE's rapidly evolving public sector.

Keywords: Business, Continuity, Management, Public, Sector Performance, UAE

Introduction

In an era characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), Business Continuity Management (BCM) has emerged as a critical strategic framework, especially for

public sector institutions. BCM ensures that government organizations can continue delivering essential services amid crises, disasters, or other substantial disruptions. It involves the systematic identification of potential risks, evaluation of their implications, and the development of proactive measures to mitigate those risks (Ali et al., 2023). The relevance of BCM is particularly pronounced in the context of government organizations, given their indispensable role in maintaining national stability, public welfare, and economic continuity. The United Arab Emirates (UAE), a rapidly evolving global business hub, faces a range of internal and external risks, including cyber threats, natural disasters, and geopolitical shifts. Against this backdrop, ensuring the continuity of government operations is not merely a matter of compliance but a strategic necessity. An effectively implemented BCM framework enhances institutional resilience, safeguards critical services, and fosters stakeholder confidence during emergencies (Widianti et al., 2024).

BCM's influence on organizational performance is substantial. Government institutions that proactively develop and continuously refine BCM strategies can significantly reduce downtime, ensure operational efficiency, and uphold public trust (Kabii & Kinyua, 2023). Beyond crisis preparedness, BCM promotes a culture of strategic foresight and risk-aware decision-making. This culture enhances both short-term responses to disruptions and long-term organizational agility. It also supports the broader goals of national resilience and sustainable development, making it a fundamental component of public sector governance in the UAE. Despite increasing recognition of BCM's importance, many UAE government entities face challenges in fully integrating and institutionalizing BCM practices. Factors such as organizational complexity, resource constraints, bureaucratic delays, and fragmented implementation of national continuity guidelines hinder the effectiveness of BCM strategies (Al Ameri & Musa, 2021). Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic has laid bare the vulnerabilities in existing continuity frameworks, revealing gaps in preparedness, adaptability, and cross-sector coordination.

Given these challenges, the current study aims to comprehensively review the relationship between BCM and the performance of government organizations in the UAE. This includes identifying the critical factors influencing BCM adoption, understanding sector-specific challenges, and proposing future research directions that can enhance organizational resilience and performance.

Literature Review

In the United Arab Emirates (UAE), the population of expatriates exceeds that of the local residents. The government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) aims to achieve a more favourable demographic equilibrium between expatriate residents and native citizens. The President of the United Arab Emirates, H. H. Sheikh Khalifa bin Zayed Al Nahyan, officially designated the year 2008 as the "year of national identity." As a result, in the current era of globalization, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) initiated efforts aimed at preserving the nation's distinct cultural and national identity. According to the United Nations World Population data, the present population of the United Arab Emirates stands at 10,010,779 individuals as of the year 2021. According to estimates from the United Nations, the estimated population of the United Arab Emirates in 2020 is 9,890,402 individuals as of the mid-year. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the population of the United Arab Emirates accounts for a mere 0.13% of the whole global population. The United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.)

is positioned at the 93rd rank in the global list of countries and dependencies based on population. The population density within the United Arab Emirates is recorded at 118 individuals per square kilometre. The overall land area measures 83,600 square kilometres (equivalent to 32,278 square miles). In the year 2020, the urban population accounted for 86.4% of the total population, which corresponds to a numerical value of 8,542,144 individuals. The United Arab Emirates exhibits a median age of 32.6 years.

Table 1
Population of the UAE (www.Worldometers.info)

Year	Population	Yearly % Change	Yearly Change	Migrants (net)	Median Age	Fertility Rate	Density (P/Km2)	Urban Pop %	Urban Population	Country's Share of World Pop	World Population	UAE Global Rank
2020	9,890,402	1.23 %	119,873	40,000	32.6	1.42	118	86.4 %	8,542,144	0.13 %	7,794,798,739	93
2019	9,770,529	1.45 %	139,570	40,000	32.6	1.64	117	86.0 %	8,402,990	0.13 %	7,713,468,100	92
2018	9,630,959	1.52 %	143,756	40,000	32.6	1.64	115	85.7 %	8,255,643	0.13 %	7,631,091,040	93
2017	9,487,203	1.35 %	126,223	40,000	32.6	1.64	113	85.5 %	8,107,436	0.13 %	7,547,858,925	93
2016	9,360,980	1.06 %	98,080	40,000	32.6	1.64	112	85.1 %	7,968,651	0.13 %	7,464,022,049	94
2015	9,262,900	1.61 %	142,582	54,000	32.6	1.70	111	84.7 %	7,842,883	0.13 %	7,379,797,139	94
2010	8,549,988	13.26 %	792,353	718,487	31.8	1.97	102	81.3 %	6,954,593	0.12 %	6,956,823,603	94
2005	4,588,225	7.92 %	290,833	237,923	29.7	2.40	55	82.1 %	3,767,260	0.07 %	6,541,907,027	117
2000	3,134,062	5.35 %	143,794	99,679	28.0	2.97	37	80.8 %	2,531,398	0.05 %	6,143,493,823	130
1995	2,415,090	5.72 %	117,332	73,625	27.7	3.93	29	79.4 %	1,917,885	0.04 %	5,744,212,979	136
1990	1,828,432	6.00 %	92,454	51,328	26.6	4.90	22	80.4 %	1,470,491	0.03 %	5,327,231,061	143
1985	1,366,164	6.03 %	69,331	36,832	26.2	5.30	16	81.3 %	1,110,111	0.03 %	4,870,921,740	146
1980	1,019,509	13.21 %	94,242	74,486	26.2	5.75	12	82.5 %	841,303	0.02 %	4,458,003,514	148
1975	548,301	18.51 %	62,757	52,098	25.5	6.45	7	80.7 %	442,351	0.01 %	4,079,480,606	157
1970	234,514	9.37 %	16,931	10,765	22.8	6.77	3	80.1 %	187,928	0.01 %	3,700,437,046	170
1965	149,857	10.15 %	11,488	7,576	20.2	6.87	2	78.0 %	116,866	0.00 %	3,339,583,597	182

According to the data presented in Table 2.1, it can be observed that the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has a remarkably rapid rate of urban population increase, positioning it among the highest in the global context. The urban population necessitates more protection due to economic demands, leading to legitimate security requisites aimed at safeguarding citizens and their enterprises. This fact is remarkable, considering that the United Arab Emirates was established in 1971 with a population of fewer than 300,000 individuals. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) has witnessed significant economic advancements throughout its history. The country's expanding development has given rise to several opportunities, including investment, labour, tourism, and other sectors. The rapid population expansion in the

Emirates can be attributed to immigrants who have chosen to settle in the region or have migrated for employment purposes. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) is a federation comprised of hereditary kings who possess absolute authority. The governance of the seven emirates of Abu Dhabi, Al-Qaiwain, Dubai, Ajman, Sharjah, Umm Al-Qaiwain, and Fujairah is entrusted to the Federal Supreme Council. During a period when the oil and gas industry played a significant role in the nation's economy, this country spearheaded a groundbreaking concept. During the mid-1990s, the leadership of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) recognized the imperative of economic diversification as a means to mitigate dependence on oil. Consequently, they initiated a series of policies aimed at expanding the sectors of banking, tourism, real estate, and services. To remain competitive, organizations and institutions must comprehend the government's trajectory in order to enhance their operational effectiveness. Consequently, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has consistently prioritized the development of organizations, particularly those in the public sector, while concurrently improving the effectiveness of its many industries with the aim of transitioning towards a knowledge-driven economy. The United Arab Emirates has made significant strides in leveraging innovation to improve organizational performance in both the business and public sectors.

Public Organizations in the UAE

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) was established in 1971 by the amalgamation of Abu Dhabi, Dubai, Sharjah, Ajman, Ras Al-Khaimah, Fujairah, and Umm Al-Quwain. According to Mathias (2017). Although Abu Dhabi serves as the capital of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and exercises authority over all central government agencies, public institutions are distributed throughout the nation. The institutions are either under the complete governance of the federal government of Abu Dhabi, or they are under government supervision, such as ministries and state authorities. Alternatively, they may be semi-governmental entities that possess a certain degree of autonomy (Alhammadi, 2018). The leaders of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) have mandated that the public sector assume responsibility for ensuring the provision of basic services to both residents and non-citizens. The scope of obligations for public sector organizations is continuously rising across all domains, leading these organizations to strive for enhanced capacity in order to effectively manage the growing workload. The issue of providing essential services to individuals in both present and future situations poses a significant challenge for these organizations. To safeguard both present and future interests, it is imperative to make informed and enduring judgments (Ramadan, 2017). The future achievement of goals in the UAE's public sector is contingent upon the efficacy of decision-making processes. Consequently, it becomes imperative to ascertain the significance of strategic foresight in facilitating the identification and evaluation of viable alternatives and potential outcomes that are deemed satisfactory for both the current and future contexts. In the contemporary era, organizations encounter the challenge of forecasting future events and devising strategies to ensure their operations remain aligned with anticipated developments. Private enterprises and the public sector encounter the challenge of effectively managing the difficulties that arise in the future, which are characterized by their inherent uncertainties and complexities. In contrast, private organizations are recognized for their greater degree of managerial flexibility compared to public organizations, particularly in navigating future uncertainties. Consequently, it is imperative for governmental entities in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) to cultivate dynamic capabilities within their management and decision-making procedures to effectively address

forthcoming challenges. The data pertaining to the public sector of the United Arab Emirates is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Public organizations in UAE

Type of Organization	**Quantity**
Ministries	17 ministries
Federal Authorities: organizations that are centrally controlled by Abu Dhabi, with authority over all organizations	9 organizations
Semi-Government: Run by autonomous boards that comprise of members from the government and private sector subject-area experts.	132 organizations
Government Controlled Universities	14 universities
Government Controlled Charitable Foundations	16 foundations

Hence, the implementation of business continuity management can contribute to the enhancement of organizational performance. However, the extent to which management has a significant influence in improving the performance of public organizations necessitates careful empirical investigation, which is the primary objective of this study.

Organisation Performance

The success and long-term viability of any company hinge upon the utmost significance of organizational performance (Sarfraz et al., 2021). Organizational effectiveness pertains to the capacity of an entity to efficiently and successfully attain its goals, objectives, and desired outcomes. This section elucidates the importance of organizational performance. Financial performance is a crucial component of organizational performance, since it serves as a direct indicator of an organization's financial well-being, profitability, and long-term viability. The metrics encompassed in this category consist of revenue growth, profitability ratios, return on investment, and cash flow. Numerous studies have continuously demonstrated a positive correlation between financial performance and organizational success (Asni & Agustia, 2021). An investigation conducted by Fatah et al. (2021) revealed a positive correlation between the financial performance of firms and their market value and shareholder returns. Additionally, it is imperative to note that the financial performance of an organization plays a pivotal role in determining its overall effectiveness. This performance serves as an indicator of how efficiently the business has utilized its resources to make profits and ultimately create value for its stakeholders. Efficiency metrics, including as return on investment (ROI), return on assets (ROA), and asset turnover ratio, serve as indicators of an organization's ability to effectively utilize its resources in generating financial returns (Fatah et al., 2021). Operational efficiency pertains to the capacity of an organization to effectively utilize resources, streamline procedures, and enhance productivity. The concept incorporates various variables, including the management of costs, control of quality, reduction of cycle time, and elimination of waste. The literature has demonstrated the beneficial effects of operational efficiency on organizational performance (Gao & Wan, 2023). Zhai et al. (2022) conducted a study which revealed a positive correlation between operational efficiency and both overall performance and customer satisfaction in firms. Moreover, the attainment of customer satisfaction and loyalty holds significant importance as key determinants of organizational performance, particularly within businesses that prioritize service provision. Customers that are content with their experience are more inclined to exhibit loyalty by making repeat

purchases and promoting the organization. Numerous empirical investigations have constantly revealed a robust and affirmative association among customer happiness, loyalty, and the overall performance of organizations (Maaz & Ahmad, 2022). An illustrative investigation conducted by Kurdi et al. (2020) revealed a positive correlation between elevated levels of customer satisfaction and improved financial performance and market share within firms.

The productivity and engagement of employees play a crucial role in determining the overall effectiveness of a firm. Employees that are engaged demonstrate high levels of motivation, commitment, and alignment with the aims of the firm. According to Afram et al. (2022), individuals exhibit elevated levels of discretionary effort, inventiveness, and customer service, resulting in enhanced performance outcomes. The literature has demonstrated a significant correlation between employee engagement, productivity, and organizational performance (Jha et al., 2019). An empirical investigation conducted by Adarsh (2017) revealed a positive association between employee engagement and organizational financial performance, as well as a negative relationship with turnover rates. Organizational performance pertains to the degree to which an organization successfully attains its aims and objectives while concurrently meeting the demands of diverse stakeholders. It incorporates various outcomes, including customer satisfaction, financial performance, and workforce engagement. The significance of organizational effectiveness in attaining long-term success has been emphasized in recent research (Cameron & Quinn, 2019). An illustration may be found in a study conducted by Stephen et al. (2019), which underscores the significance of strategic, structural, and procedural alignment within businesses to optimize performance and fulfill the expectations of stakeholders.

In contrast, organizational efficiency pertains to the deliberate optimization of resource allocation and the reduction of wastage with the aim of attaining desired objectives. The process entails the utilization of various resources, including time, financial assets, and human capital, in a manner that maximizes productivity and cost efficiency. Based on the aforementioned analysis, it can be asserted that effectiveness and efficiency exhibit a strong interrelationship within the context of organizational performance. Effectiveness is a crucial factor in ensuring that an organization successfully attains its desired goals, whereas efficiency pertains to the optimal utilization of resources in order to reach those outcomes. In order to attain optimal levels of performance, it is imperative to maintain a harmonious equilibrium between the two dimensions (Alkaf et al., 2021). As an illustration, an entity may demonstrate efficacy in attaining its objectives; nevertheless, if it exhibits inefficiency in the allocation of resources, its long-term viability may be compromised. Organizations employ performance measurement and evaluation systems as a means to evaluate and gauge their efficacy and efficiency in order to analyze their overall organizational performance. These systems offer a structure for the purpose of monitoring progress, identifying areas that require development, and making decisions based on well-informed judgments. Key performance indicators (KPIs) serve as metrics for assessing and monitoring performance across diverse domains, including but not limited to customer satisfaction, financial performance, and operational efficiency (Setiawan & Purba, 2020). Performance measuring systems that are effective allow organizations to discover their strengths, weaknesses, and areas where improvements may be made.

In summary, organizational performance comprises multiple characteristics, such as financial performance, operational efficiency, and effectiveness. The attainment of elevated levels of performance in these domains is crucial for the achievement of organizational success. By prioritizing these dimensions, firms can augment their competitive edge, fulfill stakeholder anticipations, and attain their strategic objectives.

Business Continuity Management Factors

Top Management Communication

The impact of crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, on organisational leadership is challenging to anticipate. Kilpatrick and Barter (2020) noted that CEOs often experience isolation during such periods, leading to a growing reliance on emergent leaders who can assume responsibility under uncertainty. Within the frameworks of social network theory and risk management, concepts such as nodes, emergent leadership, and coordinating groups have gained traction. These groups facilitate the effective implementation of contingency plans while retaining flexibility to adapt to environmental volatility (Buera & Shin, 2017).

Adaptability is enhanced by leveraging informal communication networks, including digital communication tools, which allow organisations to respond swiftly and with cohesion. Proactive corporate communication has been shown to reduce post-crisis damage, reinforce employee trust, and promote operational clarity (Mazzei & Ravazzani, 2015). Agile collaboration and seamless data flow, driven by robust leadership, ensure the timely dissemination of risk-related information and enhance decision-making capacity (Christianson et al., 2009). Emergent leaders, equipped with multidisciplinary intelligence and trained in rapid decision-making, transform complex data into effective actions. Furthermore, shared leadership—where specific roles are delegated across departments—can offset limitations in executive expertise during crises. Traditional top-down hierarchies often delay response times; instead, a distributed decision-making model empowers frontline personnel to act decisively and align with strategic objectives (Withers et al., 2012). Ultimately, a networked leadership structure supported by communication technologies enables collective sense-making, real-time feedback, and increased resilience.

ICT Tools Usage

Business continuity relies on digital readiness, especially during disruptions when "business as usual" is not viable. ICT infrastructure—including internet connectivity, integrated platforms, and hardware—becomes central in sustaining operations and ensuring decision-making efficiency (Kilpatrick & Barter, 2020). ICT tools support inter-organisational collaboration, resource allocation, and information management, allowing for timely responses in uncertain scenarios (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove, 2009). These tools also enable real-time monitoring, stakeholder coordination, and scenario planning. Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Knowledge Management Systems (KMS), and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solutions contribute to operational foresight and strategic agility. Furthermore, platforms such as E-Team and SharePoint facilitate data exchange, lower costs, and promote risk-aware cultures (Grecu et al., 2020). In the UAE context, national initiatives like Smart Dubai underscore the strategic importance of digital governance and real-time service delivery. However, technological preparedness must also be matched with employee proficiency and organisational alignment (Baldwin et al., 2012). As such, ICT tools not only

improve crisis response but also transform the organisation into a digitally mature and resilient entity.

Organisational Structure

Traditional hierarchical structures are increasingly inadequate in responding to the dynamic and multidimensional nature of crises. A rigid, centralised model delays critical decision-making and reduces cross-functional collaboration. In contrast, decentralised, network-based, and modular structures provide agility, authority dispersion, and responsiveness (O'Toole, 1997; Tate et al., 2013). These adaptive structures facilitate coordination during emergencies through simulation exercises, interdepartmental meetings, and responsive planning (Moliterno & Mahony, 2011). For example, the Port Coordination Team in Houston exemplifies how collaborative structures shift from routine to crisis-specific functions without compromising cohesion (Obrenovic et al., 2020). Additionally, both internal and external organisational networks influence risk response effectiveness. Internal networks shape intra-organisational communication and operational efficiency, while external networks—such as governmental bodies or private partners—enhance crisis management capability. State-owned enterprises benefit from public funding in contrast to private entities that rely more on autonomous planning, underscoring the significance of structural context in shaping risk outcomes (Amin et al., 2019).

Risk Management Governance

The evolution of risk management has transitioned from isolated safety procedures to integrated governance models that embed risk-based decision-making across all levels of an organisation (Smith & Merritt, 2020). Effective governance encompasses identifying, assessing, mitigating, and monitoring risks in alignment with strategic goals. It also involves compliance with national frameworks, stakeholder expectations, and organisational maturity. The governance structure typically includes a Risk Management Committee led by a Chief Risk Officer (CRO) who reports to executive management and regulatory boards (Deloitte & Touche, 2014). Risk ownership, however, lies with departmental leadership, not compliance units alone. This aligns with Sadgrove's (2016) three lines of defence: operational ownership (first line), compliance and oversight (second line), and internal audit (third line). Furthermore, risk culture plays a crucial role in shaping governance effectiveness. Safety culture—defined by behavioural norms and shared perceptions—underpins proactive risk mitigation (Sharman et al., 2020). A mature risk management framework is thus not merely technical but also behavioural, requiring strategic foresight, leadership support, and continuous feedback loops.

Employee Training and Awareness

Employee training is a cornerstone of BCM effectiveness. Even the most sophisticated continuity plans may fail without well-prepared staff who understand their roles during disruptions (Serrano & Kazda, 2020). Training initiatives equip employees with the knowledge, skills, and confidence needed to act decisively in high-pressure scenarios. Effective programmes incorporate scenario-based exercises, crisis simulations, and structured drills that institutionalise emergency protocols (Muflihah & Subriadi, 2018). These exercises reinforce data security, communication, and procedural compliance while surfacing latent vulnerabilities. Additionally, regular awareness campaigns foster a culture of readiness, enabling employees to provide feedback that strengthens the BCM framework (Ali et al.,

2023). In multicultural environments like the UAE, training must also be sensitive to language and cultural diversity to ensure inclusivity and uniform comprehension. Overall, continuous learning and active engagement help embed a culture of resilience that aligns employee actions with strategic continuity goals (Margherita & Heikkilä, 2021).

Organisational Culture

Organisational culture is a pivotal mediator that shapes how BCM strategies are developed, communicated, and executed. It reflects shared values, norms, and behaviours that influence risk perception, decision-making, and collective response (Mansol et al., 2015). A culture of resilience fosters employee participation in continuity planning, while risk-averse or hierarchical cultures may inhibit proactive action. Employee engagement and commitment—closely linked to culture—are essential in promoting initiative-taking during crises. Engaged employees are more likely to participate in drills, report risks, and contribute to problem-solving (Kalaiarasi & Sethuram, 2017). Cultural traits such as openness, trust, and learning orientation also enhance interdepartmental collaboration and rapid information dissemination (Tan, 2019). In the UAE's diverse business environment, where traditional values intersect with global practices, understanding and nurturing an inclusive and adaptive culture is critical. This cultural alignment ensures that continuity strategies are embraced and implemented uniformly across all organisational levels (Sawalha, 2013).

Despite growing global emphasis on Business Continuity Management, several critical gaps persist. First, the mediating role of cultural diversity in the BCM–performance nexus remains underexplored, particularly outside of Western contexts. As cultural attributes shape risk perceptions and strategic responses, more inclusive research is needed to reflect varied organisational environments and enhance global BCM applicability.

Conclusion

Table 3 presents a summary of the key insights drawn from the study, focusing on the opportunities, challenges, and future research directions associated with Business Continuity Management (BCM) in the UAE public sector. As public institutions strive to maintain service delivery amid increasing complexity and risk, BCM offers both strategic advantages and implementation hurdles. This table synthesizes the study's findings to highlight areas where UAE government organisations can leverage BCM for improved resilience, while also acknowledging existing constraints and gaps that require further empirical investigation. The outlined future research directions aim to guide scholars and policymakers in advancing BCM practices that are contextually relevant and operationally effective.

Table 3
Summary of Opportunities, Challenges, and Future Research Directions in (BCM) for UAE

Category	Key Points
Opportunities	- Strategic implementation of BCM enhances institutional resilience and continuity of public services.
	- Digital transformation (e.g., Smart Dubai) enables real-time governance and ICT-integrated BCM.
	- High urbanization and population growth demand better crisis response and continuity planning.
	- UAE's shift to a knowledge-based economy supports BCM integration into public sector reforms.
	- Public awareness and training initiatives can build a culture of preparedness and shared responsibility.
	- Decentralized structures and emergent leadership models offer faster, more adaptive crisis responses.
Challenges	- Fragmented implementation of national continuity frameworks and inconsistent BCM institutionalization across agencies.
	- Bureaucratic inertia and hierarchical decision-making impede agile response and coordination.
	- Limited risk awareness and training among public sector employees hinder effective BCM execution.
	- Resource constraints and dependence on expatriate workforce may reduce BCM localization and cultural relevance.
	- Gaps in ICT adoption readiness and technological proficiency limit the impact of digital BCM tools.
	- Insufficient integration of risk governance structures and unclear risk ownership across departments.
Future Research	- Explore how organisational culture mediates the relationship between BCM practices and performance in multicultural government contexts like the UAE.
	- Conduct empirical studies on top management communication strategies during disruptions and their impact on BCM effectiveness.
	- Examine ICT tools' effectiveness in enhancing BCM resilience across different public agencies.
	- Investigate sector-specific BCM adoption barriers, particularly in semi-government and autonomous public organizations.
	- Develop localized BCM frameworks that reflect UAE's socio-cultural composition and urbanization dynamics.
	- Assess the role of employee engagement, training, and cross-cultural communication in sustaining BCM outcomes across departments.

Contribution to Theory and Practice

This This review advances the theoretical discourse on Business Continuity Management (BCM) by positioning it as a multidimensional construct that goes beyond technical recovery planning. It emphasizes the integration of organisational culture as a mediating factor between BCM practices and public sector performance. By doing so, it extends contingency

theory and organisational resilience theory, demonstrating how cultural alignment enhances risk perception, decision-making, and adaptive capacity. Furthermore, the study situates BCM within the broader framework of dynamic capabilities, arguing that resilience is not only a reactive capacity but also a proactive strategic capability that underpins long-term institutional agility in the UAE's volatile environment. The integration of ICT tools and top management communication within BCM expands existing risk management theories by linking technological readiness and leadership communication to organisational resilience outcomes. Thus, the review provides a nuanced conceptual model that can guide future empirical studies, particularly in multicultural, resource-diverse, and policy-driven public contexts.

For practitioners in UAE public organisations, this study highlights the necessity of embedding BCM into day-to-day governance and management practices rather than treating it as a compliance exercise. Managers are encouraged to decentralise decision-making to enable frontline responsiveness, particularly during emergencies where delays can result in severe service disruptions. The findings underscore the importance of capacity building—through continuous training, simulations, and scenario planning—that ensures employees at all levels understand their role in sustaining continuity. Moreover, ICT integration should be prioritised not merely as an operational tool but as a strategic enabler of resilience, allowing real-time monitoring, stakeholder communication, and collaborative problem-solving. Managers must also pay deliberate attention to cultivating a culture of openness, trust, and proactive risk awareness. By aligning organisational culture with BCM objectives, managers can foster employee engagement, encourage knowledge-sharing, and strengthen collective ownership of continuity strategies.

At the policy level, this review provides guidance for government leaders and regulators tasked with institutionalising BCM across public entities in the UAE. First, policymakers should ensure that national continuity frameworks are harmonised and consistently applied across ministries, federal authorities, and semi-government entities. Fragmentation in implementation weakens overall resilience and creates systemic vulnerabilities. Second, policy must promote digital readiness through nationwide ICT infrastructure investments, capacity-building programmes, and cross-agency data-sharing platforms. Initiatives such as Smart Dubai provide a blueprint for leveraging technology in governance, but wider adoption and standardisation are essential. Third, policy frameworks should institutionalise decentralised and network-based governance structures to complement traditional hierarchies. This structural agility allows organisations to adapt quickly while maintaining accountability. Finally, policies should mandate regular risk audits, continuity drills, and public sector benchmarking exercises to embed a culture of preparedness. Given the UAE's multicultural workforce, policymakers must also support culturally sensitive training materials and communication strategies to ensure inclusivity and uniform comprehension of BCM practices.

References

Al Ameri, M. A. S. S., & Musa, H. (2021). The impact of business continuity management on the performance of public organizations in UAE. Journal of Legal, Ethical & Regulatory Issues, 24(2), 1–10.

Ali, Q. S. A., Hanafiah, M. H., & Mogindol, S. H. (2023). Systematic literature review of Business Continuity Management (BCM) practices: Integrating organisational resilience and performance in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) BCM framework. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 89, 104135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2023.104135

Amin, M. Y., Besim, M., & Ul Haq, Z. (2019). Does state ownership really matter for capital structure in selected G-20 economies? Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 32(1), 3144–3161. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2019.1675074

Baldwin, J. N., Gauld, R., & Goldfinch, S. (2012). What public servants really think of e-government. Public Management Review, 14(1), 105–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2011.589613

Buera, F. J., & Shin, Y. (2017). Productivity growth and capital flows: The dynamics of reforms. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 9(3), 147–185. https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20150293

Christianson, M. K., Farkas, M. T., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Weick, K. E. (2009). Learning through rare events: Significant interruptions at the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Museum. Organization Science, 20(5), 846–860. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0380

Deloitte & Touche. (2014). Risk management resource guide. Deloitte. https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/za/Documents/governance-risk-compliance/ZA_RiskCommitteeResourceGuideOnline2014_22052014.pdf

Grecu, V., Ciobotea, R. I. G., & Florea, A. (2020). Software application for organizational sustainability performance assessment. Sustainability, 12(11), 4435. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12114435

Kalaiarasi, V., & Sethuram, S. (2017). Literature review on organization culture and its influence. International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering & Management, 3(8), 9–14.

Kabii, L. K. K., & Kinyua, G. (2023). Managerial competencies and business continuity: A review of literature. International Journal of Education and Research, 11(2), 65–90.

Kilpatrick, J., & Barter, L. (2020). COVID-19: Managing supply chain risk and disruption. Deloitte Insights. https://www2.deloitte.com

Mansol, N. H., Alwi, N. H. M., & Ismail, W. (2015, August). Managing organizational culture requirement for Business Continuity Management (BCM) implementation using Goal-Question-Metric (GQM) approach. In 2015 IEEE Conference on Open Systems (ICOS) (pp. 85–90). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICOS.2015.7397530

Margherita, A., & Heikkilä, M. (2021). Business continuity in the COVID-19 emergency: A framework of actions undertaken by world-leading companies. Business Horizons, 64(5), 683–695. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.020

Mazzei, A., & Ravazzani, S. (2015). Internal crisis communication strategies to protect trust relationships: A study of Italian companies. International Journal of Business Communication, 52(3), 319–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488414525449

Moliterno, T. P., & Mahony, D. M. (2011). Network theory of organization: A multilevel approach. Journal of Management, 37(2), 443–467. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310371692

Muflihah, Y., & Subriadi, A. P. (2018). A basic element of IT business continuity plan: Systematic review. Jurnal Informatika Ahmad Dahlan, 12(1), 17–23. https://doi.org/10.26555/jifo.v12i1.a10430

Obrenovic, B., Du, J., Godinic, D., Tsoy, D., Khan, M. A. S., & Jakhongirov, I. (2020). Sustaining enterprise operations and productivity during the COVID-19 pandemic: "Enterprise effectiveness and sustainability model." Sustainability, 12(15), 5981. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155981

Sadgrove, K. (2016). The complete guide to business risk management (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Serrano, F., & Kazda, A. (2020). Business continuity during pandemics – Lessons learned about airport personnel. Transportation Research Procedia, 51, 56–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2020.11.007

Sharman, N., Wallace, C. A., & Jespersen, L. (2020). Terminology and the understanding of culture, climate, and behavioural change: Impact of organisational and human factors on food safety management. Trends in Food Science & Technology, 96, 13–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2019.12.008

Smith, P. G., & Merritt, G. M. (2020). Proactive risk management: Controlling uncertainty in product development (3rd ed.). CRC Press.

Sawalha, I. H. S. (2013). Organisational performance and business continuity management: A theoretical perspective and a case study. Journal of Business Continuity & Emergency Planning, 6(4), 360–373.