Understanding local crisis management in complex organisational settings. The case of the migration crisis in Germany 2015/16

Paper presented at the Third Northern European Conference on Emergency and Disaster Studies, March 21-23, 2018, Amsterdam

Florian Roth [a], Wolfgang Seibel [b], Lorenz Neuberger [b],
Matthias Fatke [c], Steffen Eckhard [c], Alexa Lenz [c]

[a] ETH Zürich
[b] University of Konstanz,
[c] LMU Munich

Corresponding Author: Florian Roth Roth@sipo.gess.ethz.ch

Suggested citation: Roth, Florian; Seibel, Wolfgang; Neuberger, Lorenz; Fatke, Matthias; Eckhard, Steffen; Lenz, Alexa (2018). Understanding local crisis management in complex organisational settings. The case of the migration crisis in Germany 2015/16. Paper presented at the Third Northern European Conference on Emergency and Disaster Studies, March 21-23, 2018, Amsterdam.

Abstract: This paper offers a first conceptual step towards measuring what effect variation of administrative action in crisis management has on societal resilience during times of crisis. Building on previous work, we see the ability of administrations to moderate the (perceived) legitimacy of their actions in crisis management as the main mechanism for such an effect. Local administrations can enhance legitimacy a) if they create conditions for the participation of organized forms of civic engagement in crisis management, and b) if they manage the crisis effectively. The concept of "organizational hybridity" is introduced to propose four possible styles of administrative crisis management: Street-level bureaucracy; leadership-based administration; consultative administration; and classic-bureaucratic administration. The paper briefly discusses how this concept could be applied in the context of the German "migration crisis" of 2015/16.

1. *Introduction*

Crises can be triggered by natural events such as earthquakes or hurricanes, by technical failure or by political processes, for example state failure or armed conflict. Despite their very diverse causes, crises share some important features: they threaten fundamental structures, values or norms (Rosenthal et al. 1989; Boin et al. 2018). Therefore, they always have significant political and social ramifications. During crises, the legitimacy of political actors is at risk, as the failure to overcome the crisis can quickly and irrevocably undermine public trust in the capabilities of political leaders. Interestingly, crises have the potential to erode, but also to foster social cohesion and societal resilience (Kaniasty & Norris 1993).

Although crises have systemic effects, crisis management primarily works on the local level, where the main resources needed for effective crisis management are held. This includes, among others, emergency response, health care, social welfare and law enforcement. Further, local actors possess important knowledge needed to cope with crises in their local contexts that cannot be found elsewhere (Dekens 2007). Finally, especially in decentralized states, a large share of decision-making during crises takes place on the local level. Notwithstanding the central role of the local level in times of crises, most research has been limited to the national level. Consequently, we know little about how public perception of governmental crisis management correlates with the performances of local authorities. In addition, it remains largely unclear which factors influence effective local crisis management, even though this is of key importance for finding processes and structures suitable for handling future crises.

To explore how local public administrations moderate and influence the societal effects of political crises, this paper develops an analytical framework of hybrid organizations engaged during the "migration crisis" in Germany in 2015/16. The concept of hybrid organizations has its origins in administrative science, where it is used to describe institutional arrangements at the interface between the public, the private and the civil society sectors (Seibel 2015a; Seibel 2015b; Denis et al. 2015). The paper uses the concept of organization hybridity to analyze two main dimensions of successful crisis management practices: First, the ability to react and act flexibly under pressure, to new and surprising challenges, in order to cope with crises. This quality is key, given that two crises are never the same, meaning there is a limit to effective crisis planning. As Boin et al. (2018, 23) note, a defining characteristic of crises is their 'un-ness': "unexpected, undesirable, unimaginable and often unmanageable". The second quality of local crisis management is the involvement of a multitude of diverse actors from the inside

and outside of state bureaucracy. Especially on the local level, crises are never managed by a single actor alone, but by complex networks of public, private and civil society organisations.

Despite the key role of local collaborations of civic society and public administration for successful crisis management, our current knowledge about the factors that enable or inhibit such collaborations is mainly based on reports of single regions or municipalities. Often, these reports come either in the form of "success stories" from local professionals and volunteers working hand-in-hand during crisis, or as a critique of decrepit administrative structures, inefficiency, and frustrated helpers. In comparison, few attempts have been made so far to systematically analyse the performance of such hybrid crisis management institutions and to identify possible factors that influence their performance. To address this research gap, this paper details an analytical model used to examine crisis management solutions by German administrations on the local level, connecting concepts of political legitimacy and social capital. Specifically, it uses the concept of hybrid organisations to describe how different actors and governmental mechanisms interact during crises and the challenges this may create. The study aims to contribute to a better understanding of the challenges of crisis management in complex organisational settings, and to detail the relationships between local crisis management and the social environment in which these relationships take place. The model should also be applicable in the broader European context (and beyond).

The paper is structured as follows: We begin by elaborating on the relationship between crisis management and social cohesion and resilience. Section 3 then introduce the concept of hybrid organizations in crisis management and discusses several challenges associated with this organisational form. Section 4 develops an analytical model that postulates four types of hybrid organizations. Section 5 and 6 then introduce the case of the German "migration crisis" by first reviewing the literature and then suggesting possible means how to study variation in hybridity and crisis management.

2. *Organizational structures of crisis management and their moderation of social capital*

Following a classic definition, crises are characterized by (1) a real or perceived threat to central social values, (2) high time pressure on decision-makers, and (3) high levels of uncertainty concerning the appropriate response (Rosenthal et al. 1989; Boin et al. 2018). In any major crisis, there is a discernible risk associated with the organization that fails to manage the crisis effectively, and to alleviate its societal consequences. For instance, research examining the pre- and post-crisis management associated with Hurricane Katrina (US southeast coast, 2005) showed negative implications for the perceived legitimacy of the offices and public leaders in

charge of the response (U.S. House of Representatives 2006). In this sense, a study on President Bush's crisis management concluded: "One of the chief claims legitimizing incumbent leaders and governments is that they protect public order, health and safety. The onset of crisis breaches this claim" (Boin et al. 2010: 707).

Findings in the crisis literature indicate that existing social inequalities intensify during times of crisis (Kaniasty & Norris 1995), when networks of social cohesion can fall apart (Kaniasty & Norris 1993; Norris et al. 2002). For instance, ineffective crisis management by national and international actors after the devastating earthquake in Haiti in 2010 catalysed and amplified pre-existing social tensions (Kolbe et al. 2010). This resulted in a loss of social capital, and increased the risk of renewed societal crises, because the basis of societal resilience was eroded in the absence of social competencies (Norris et al. 2008). It is likely that this *circulus vitiosus* works also the other way around: Establishing social capital in a preventive manner should mitigate the societal consequences of crises which, again, improves societal resilience. The key question then is whether crisis management by the state, in particular local level administrative agencies that bear the main burden of crisis management, can have a moderating effect on social capital and societal resilience in times of crisis. So far, there have been only few attempts to study the ability of public administrations to generate social capital in times of crisis and/or harness it for the purpose of managing the crisis and its societal effects (Prior & Eriksen 2013).[1]

Theoretically, we expect that effective crisis management by local administrative agencies affects societal resilience when the actions of the state, as crisis manager, are perceived as legitimate by the crisis-affected population. Thereby, legitimacy is understood as "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate" (Suchman, 1995, p. 574). Easton (1956) and Scharpf (1999) differentiate two legitimacy enhancing mechanisms: Input legitimacy (rule by the people) and output legitimacy (rule for the people). Whereas the former emphasizes that legitimate state authority can be generated on the basis of an act of collective self-determination, such as elections, the latter

[1] Measuring societal cohesion is possible when following the conceptualization suggested by Arant et al. (2016) and Dragolov et al. (2014). Societal resilience then consists of the three dimensions (and indicators), (1) social relationships (embeddedness in societal networks, trust in other human beings and acceptance of diversity), (2) connectedness (identification with the community, trust in institutions, perception of equity), and (3) orientation to the common good (solidarity and helpfulness, acceptance of social rules and societal participation).

dimension holds that social acceptability emerges if the ends of state action are conceived desirable and the means selected to achieve these ends are viewed proper (rule for the people).

We argue that local administrations in crisis management can influence these two legitimacy enhancing mechanisms a) if they create conditions for the participation of organized forms of civic engagement and b) if they manage the crisis effectively. Firstly, the expanded opportunities for civic engagement are one an alternative to generate input legitimacy, other than through elections. In addition, visible participation by parts of the society in the crisis management response should improve the acceptance among *all parts* of the society regarding the burdens generated by the consequences of crises and the associated political decisions. Secondly, output legitimacy refers to such actions by the state and its institutions that are perceived by the society as effective. In crisis management, traditional modes of bureaucratic action, such as uncompromising enforcement of the law in individual cases, are no longer appropriate. Instead, crisis management requires disproportionate use of resources, bending of official rules, and violation to informal norms. In short, effective crisis management requires that local agencies must switch from a mode of strict rule application to a flexible working style. Both flexible administrative action and cooperation with civilian stakeholders ought to improve the performance of crisis management. Such conditions should then lead to enhanced social acceptance of crisis management and its possible societal burdens.

The key question we focus on next are the conditions under which local administrative agencies are capable of acting flexible and enabling societal participation. In order to understand and systematize the interplay of the different entities that interact under the pressures of a crisis, we use the concept of "hybrid organizations" (Seibel 2015a). Such a perspective acknowledges that crisis management typically involves a broad array of actors from different branches and levels of the political system, as well as outside actors such as private businesses, non-governmental organizations and individual citizens.

3. *Conceptualizing public administrations in crisis management as "hybrid organizations"*

Despite the traditional and well-established types of cooperation between governmental agencies and either private businesses or civil society organizations, the phenomenon of institutional hybridity remains both under-researched and undertheorized. In general, organizational hybridity is a common pattern of institutional arrangements in developed

democracies and rule-of-law based public administration. Typical examples are construction and maintenance of infrastructure, requiring the cooperation of governmental agencies and private contractors, or the provision of social welfare and services where public administrations cooperate with non-profit organizations in the form of charities or welfare associations. In the ideal case, hybrid organizations are able to combine the relative strengths of each of the relevant cooperation partners. In the case of cooperation between governmental agencies and civil society organizations it is the strength of government and public administration to provide robust and calculable organizational frameworks and funding, while it is the strength of civil society organizations to mobilize volunteerism and social capital in the form of community life and social networks.

However, in their institutional "DNA", hybrid organizations carry several tensions that can undermine their effectiveness and stability (Denis et al. 2015). On the one hand, concessions to competing logics of action are indispensable for the sake of, again, stability and effectiveness of the hybrid arrangement as such. Governmental agencies have to accept, for instance, protracted processes of participatory decision-making and grass roots democracy when cooperating with civil society organizations. Conversely, civil society organizations have to accept the logic of rule-of-law based hierarchy and financial accountability when cooperating with governmental agencies. Obviously, any attempt to impose one's own logic on a partner in a hybrid arrangement will render the latter unsustainable. However, over-adapting to the actions of one's counterpart would undermine the logic of complementary strengths on which the arrangement is built in the first place. Recognizing both the potentially contrasting, but mutually complementary, strengths and identities to strike a balance between concessions and adaptation on the one hand, and maintenance of identity and relative strength on the other hand, is what accomplished leaders within hybrid arrangements seek to ensure (cf. Hildebrand 2008 and Shields 2003 on the necessity of pragmatism in public administration).

This kind of managerial effort inevitably requires learning at an appropriate level and with sufficient speed. The management of hybrid arrangements requires an instinctive or conscious awareness of the respective strength and identity of the very organizational components forming the hybrid arrangement in question. It is obvious that this kind of learning must be more expeditious under the condition of crisis management than under the condition of regular 'run-of-the-mill' operations. The speed and appropriateness of learning is therefore a key-variable when it comes to the emergence and maintenance of stability and effectiveness of hybrid arrangements (Seibel 2015b).

The conventional approach to address the phenomenon of institutional hybridity was sector-centered (Seibel 2015a) in the sense that descriptive analyses of the phenomenon referred to the very interface between the public, the private and the civil society sectors where forms of hybrid arrangements typically occur. Public enterprises at the interface between the market and the state, or private foundations in the realm of higher education, or research and welfare associations running hospitals, or social services, serve as examples of hybridity in this kind of phenomenological perspective.

The recent relevant literature identifies more differentiated analytical approaches to the phenomenon of institutional hybridity. Seibel (2015a) contrasts the merely sector-centered perspective with what he calls a mechanism-centered perspective focusing on latent, rather than manifest, hybridity. He points to the fact that what is widely acknowledged as a dominant governance mechanism – e.g., competition in market-driven businesses, hierarchy and related accountability in public administration, participation and grass roots democracy in civil society organizations – does in reality overlap, thus creating informal hybridity in each sector. There is, for instance, competition and rivalry in the realm of public administration and there is hierarchy, authority or even coercion in the realm of civil society organizations as well as participation and grass roots involvement in the competitive environment of private businesses (e.g., 'cooperate citizenship' or consumerism).

According to Seibel there is, however, good sense in acknowledging the dominance and a related legitimization pressure of particular mechanisms, depending on the specific sector and the individual organizations they entail. The existence of competition and rivalry among bureaucracies does not affect the ultimately binding force of the rule-of-law and hierarchical accountability. However, once inter-organizational rivalry among public administration units affects performance or binding rules, it is considered illegitimate. Likewise, the notion of corporate citizenship or participatory leadership in private business does not suspend the validity and rigidity of corporate survival in a market-driven competition. Nor does the inevitable hierarchy or accountability standards within civil society organizations alter the fact that the mobilization of civil society volunteerism is a matter of participation and grass roots democracy, which are indispensable identity-building elements.

Seibel therefore advocates for what he calls a theory of the middle ground when it comes to the definition of institutional hybridity. On the one hand, hybridity occurs in many forms and types including latent hybridity of various governance mechanisms in one and the same institutional type. On the other hand, the classic "sectors" – public, private, and civil society –

remain formal and manifest institutional arrangements precisely because they entail dominant and defining mechanisms as a yardstick against which organizational behavior is ultimately being justified and legitimized. Seibel's distinction between manifest and latent hybridity provides for a more fine-grained analysis of the actual interaction of various institutional logics of hybrid arrangements relative to the conventional sector-centered perspective.

4. *Mapping hybrid organizations in crisis management*

To assess the performance of local hybrid organizations during crisis management, we first need to analyse aspects of manifest hybridity. To this end, a systematic mapping of administrative behaviour should be sufficient to reveal the actual variation between organizations in crisis management, permitting the identification of ideal types. To classify coping strategies, two dimensions have been identified as relevant: flexibility and participation (see above). In line with this, Oechsler (2008), referring to New Public Management, notes that the changing social environment triggered worldwide public administration reforms as response to a rising request for flexibility and participation. Thus, in addition to traditional normative orientations such as legal standards, which follow an institutional or organizational logic, the importance of flexibility and participation rises. Other than legal standards, flexibility and participation reflect hybrid elements within the administrative process and therefore account for the logic of hybrid organizations (Seibel 2015a).

The first dimension, flexibility, captures the ability of local public administrations to find solutions to overcome a crisis. At the county level, uncompromising enforcement of the law in individual cases does not seem adequate, requires a disproportionate use of resources, violates informal norms of moral justice, or triggers undesirable side effects threatening local peace to lead. In such cases, flexible solutions might become important, resulting in the avoidance of certain formal norms, or in informal arrangements and negotiations with involved external actors. In general, flexible and interactive enforcement processes have the disadvantage that they often create uncertainty as to whether they are in accordance with the law (Geser 1998). Participation, the second relevant dimension of the study, reflects the incorporation of civil society engagement in crisis management processes and structures. On a local or county level, efficiency issues cannot be discussed without also considering issues of democracy and participation, as even the most concrete administrative measures can suddenly turn into controversial political topics that trigger public engagement or disengagement.

Starting from the two basic dimensions of participation and flexibility, we may expect four basic types of administrative styles (see Lipsky 1980; Matland, 1995): 1) routine administrative governance, where neither participation nor flexibility play a role in administrative behaviour, 2) consultative administration, where channels for participation exist, but where mechanisms to adopt management tools in a flexible way are missing, 3) leadership-based administration with a higher level of flexibility, but few participatory elements, and 4) 'Street-level' bureaucracy, which ranks high on both dimensions.[2]

		Participation	
		Strong	Weak
Flexibility	Strong	'Street-level bureaucracy'	*Leadership*-based administration
	Weak	Consultative administration	Classic-bureaucratic administration

In what follows, we use the "migration crisis" of 2015/16 in Germany as an interesting case to study the performance of crisis management, organized mainly by local public administrations in collaboration with civil society actors, and the effects of this performance on social cohesion and resilience.

5. *Civic engagement and administrative performance during the 2015/16 "migration crisis" in Germany*

The German "migration crisis" between 2015 and 2016 constitutes a typical crisis situation. We propose using it to study the performance of crisis management, organized mainly by local public administrations in collaboration with civil society actors, and the effects of this performance on social cohesion and resilience.

At first glance, the fast influx of asylum seekers into Germany during that time posed significant challenges for the country's governmental and administrative systems. While on the national level, political efforts mainly focused on reaching coordinated policies with other

[2] In a future version of this paper, we will formulate distinctive hypothesis for each of these administrative styles.

European countries, on the local level the main challenges were more operational in nature. Especially during the "hot phase" from fall 2015 to early 2016, the provision of food, shelter and medical care were the largest concerns (Roth, 2017). In many instances, local authorities were overwhelmed by the often insufficiently coordinated arrival of large numbers of migrants in their jurisdictions. Consequently, they were partially unable to meet the basic needs of asylum seekers, as laid out, for example, in international humanitarian standards and prescribed by law (Speth and Becker, 2016: 10).[3]

Recent research on the "migration crisis" in Germany shows that civil society actors played a central role in mitigating the crisis and fostering a steady return to normalcy. In other words, without the engagement of social associations, aid agencies, newly founded refugee initiatives, faith-based charities, sport clubs, informal help networks, contributions from individual citizens, and many other forms of public engagement, the crisis would have been much worse. On the other side, however, research also points to significant differences in the adaptive capabilities of local authorities to develop and implement appropriate solutions together with civil society groups. While in some places, effective mitigation was hampered by maintaining rigid pre-existing structures and work divisions, in other contexts it was possible to develop flexible and effective local solutions (Bogumil et al. 2016; Hahlen and Kühn 2016). So far, however, it remains largely unclear which factors have influenced the emergence of such adaptive and innovative strategies.

The existing literature has tended to focus on anecdotal evidence on either success stories of civic engagement and capable local administrators, or experiences of administrative shortcomings that were partially absorbed by volunteers. In one of the few systematic analyses on the topic, Speth and Becker (2016) identify five groups of actors involved throughout Germany: the federal state, municipalities, established civil society organisations, spontaneous supporters, and finally, the concerned migrants themselves. Studying a diverse set of cases (Berlin, Mannheim, and Starnberg), they concluded that between 2015 and 2016, the relationship between these actors has generally shifted in the direction of more deeply anchored civil involvement, which was highly valued by local authorities. Although the challenges encountered in this critical period appeared to be similar to a large extent, they find that the

[3] For this reason, we contend that the situation has to be described as a crisis, even though we are aware that the term "migration crisis" may be misinterpreted in a sense as if the migrants caused the crisis, while in reality the (publicly perceived) inability to provide elementary state functions for the migrants represented the actual crisis. Images of overburdened authorities were quickly exploited as a political issue to question the legitimacy of the German governmental (Wallis, 2017: 2).

observable coping strategies have differed widely. Among other factors, the cooperation between actors has been organized with considerable variation. In general, they showed that more participation and cooperation have led to better results[4].

Similarly, Gesemann and Roth (2017) find that overall, German districts and municipalities have mastered related challenges rather well, which may also have improved social cohesion on the ground. As key factors for such successes, they name local governmental performance, openness and a high degree of voluntary commitment from the population, as well as good information exchange and networking of the relevant actors in the communities. Beck (2016) goes even further in interpreting the observable impulse as a "renaissance of civil society" and the beginning of a new division of responsibilities between the state, economic and private actors. He sees successful cooperation in such situations as a milestone on the path towards local democracy, which can prevent downright state failure. According to him, the crisis itself had a catalytic effect: the sudden visibility of overtaxed and inflexible administrative routines on the local level created a need for the development of further societal resources that required innovative cooperation models (ibid.: 104). Taking a more critical stance, Wallis (2017) claims that local civil society initiatives play an ambiguous role because their engagement reinforced the perception of an overburdened government. According to her, volunteers may also have been frustrated as a result of a lack of cooperation and transparency by an underfinanced, understaffed, overly bureaucratic, and sometimes repressive administration (ibid.: 4-5). Such perceptions, in turn, might also have contributed to societal polarization.

6. *Flexibility and participation in managing the "migration crisis" in Germany*

Given the partially contradictory insights offered by existing literature, further empirical research is needed that could also indicate where hybrid organizations might develop structures that proved to be effective. Such research could identify where administrations faced tensions between routine behaviour and the necessity of flexibility and where the potential for participation was unusually low or high. These tensions are expected to become apparent not only with regard to the behaviour of the public administration, but also in direct interactions

[4] In a later study, Speth and Bojarra-Becker (2017) confirm and extend these findings based on a different set of case studies (Gelsenkirchen, Bocholt, Landkreis Starnberg, Bamberg, Gransee, and Forst). Their findings suggest that a 'fluid culture of cooperation' and mutual trust are key for successful and sustainable crisis management.

with other stakeholders. Thus, the mechanisms for overcoming the scepticism, which was initially present between the public administration and civil stakeholders, and hence the nature of hybridity in the crisis response, are crucial for cooperation in an interaction that could be prone to friction.

As flexibility and participation are concepts too vague to be measured directly, they require subdivision into several more accessible concepts, so-called concepts-by-intuition (Saris & Gallhofer, 2014). For flexibility, these concepts-by-intuition will account for behaviour that deviates from standard procedure, such as rule disregarding, rule changing, or modifications in the organizational procedures (e.g. working hours). For measuring participation, concepts-by-intuition are identified that comprise the capacity to activate the general public and civil society organizations, in both implementation and decision-making. The manifestation of flexibility and participation in the following concrete administrative acts may be particularly worth studying in the three following domains: (1) registration of the asylum seekers; (2) establishment of reception centres; and (3) provision of medical care. During these administrative acts, the administration's capacities of cooperation with civil actors, and adaptation of hybrid governance mechanisms can be assessed. Furthermore, communication strategies and strategies of generating massive resource influxes during a short time can be examined.

An example for concrete flexible behaviour of the administration during the "migration crisis" is the regulation of construction. As accommodations for asylum seekers were required very quickly and without bureaucratic barriers, it was necessary to withdraw conflicting building regulations. In November 2014 the first exceptional regulation was created by the Building Code (BGBl. I S. 1748), which was extended by Article 6 of the Asylum Procedure Acceleration Act (*Asylverfahrensbeschleunigungsgesetz*), to a wide-ranging special regulation that allowed the administration to meet the pressing requirements for a flexible response. This offered far-reaching possibilities to deviate from the provisions of the Building Code and the regulations issued under the Building Code for urgently needed accommodation of asylum seekers. Furthermore, the Asylum Procedure Acceleration Act facilitated the installation of renewable energy technologies, for reception facilities, and for shared accommodation. This relieved pressure on authorities with respect to the conversion of existing public buildings into accommodation facilities for asylum seekers (BMUB, 2018). Another example of flexible administrative behaviour was the integration of civil actors, a participatory response that was established particularly in the context of coordinating donations (clothes, toys, etc.). However,

not all administrative bodies were able to integrate this kind of participation. Perhaps surprisingly, particularly the smaller, more loosely composed help networks faced difficulties with the integration of civil society actors and were unable to overcome the barrier of bureaucracy (e.g. due to a lack of permits). Common and local needs-based problem-solving processes that involve welfare organizations in the decision-making process are only partially developing (Kühn, 2015).

This proposed model of analysis can be applied to the mapping process during which a questionnaire-based survey is conducted among the most important state and civil actors. To analyse the differences in administrative behaviour, the county level (including the so-called "Kreisfreie Städte"/ independent cities) seems to be the most appropriate sub-national entity. On government side, the respective persons are the ones responsible within the corresponding asylum agency, or the asylum coordinator in office. Within the other group of stakeholders, the coordinators of the leading welfare organizations or locally active civil helping networks are of particular interest. However, administrative behaviour can create the impression of reacting flexible and participatory, while in reality not living up to these ideals. Consequently, the empirical implications of the impact of public relations is considerable. Yet, as the questions have to be asked in retrospective, this research runs danger of measuring the effect of administrative behaviour after the consequences have already become visible and thus, might influence the evaluation of the crisis response. In order to control for this problem, items should not only comprise facts and the actual course of the crisis management in 2015, but ask about the (current) assessment of how flexible and participatory administrative behaviour has been. Furthermore, a set of hypothetical items has to be included, assessing administrative behaviour in hypothetical situations.

In addition to this quantitative approach, qualitative analysis appears as a second, complementary way, especially to study latent forms of organizational hybridity. As discussed above, hybridity not only exists within boundary-spanning organizations, but also within sectors. These forms of hybridity probably escape any attempt to analyse them with the methods discussed before. To capture latent hybridity, in-depth observations of institutional mechanisms, values and ideologies are required, involving thick descriptions of organizational processes, based on interviews, document analysis and other related methods. Most interesting cases to study could be identified drawing directly on the mapping of the performance of manifest hybrid organizations discussed above. Together, these two perspectives could provide a comprehensive picture of hybridity in local crisis management.

7. *Conclusion*

This paper offers a first conceptual step towards measuring what effect variation of administrative action in crisis management can have on social capital and societal resilience. Building on previous work, we see the ability of administrations to moderate the (perceived) legitimacy of their actions in crisis management as the main mechanism for such an effect. Local administrations can enhance legitimacy a) if they create conditions for the participation of organized forms of civic engagement in crisis management, and b) if they manage the crisis effectively. The concept of "organizational hybridity" has been introduced in order to theoretically derive four possible styles of administrative crisis management: 'Street-level bureaucracy'; leadership-based administration; consultative administration; and classic-bureaucratic administration.

As demonstrated, systematic research on organizational hybridity in crisis management does not exist, neither on the case of Germany, nor more generally. Applying the present theory and concept to the case of the German "migration crisis" of 2015/16 thus provides an opportunity to gain a more nuanced understanding of the interaction effects between administrative crisis management and societal resilience.

8. *Literature*

Arant, R., Larsen, M. & Boehnke, K. (2016). *Sozialer Zusammenhalt in Bremen*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Beck, S. (2016). 'Die Flüchtlingskrise als Renaissance der Bürgergesellschaft', *Forschungsjournal Soziale Bewegungen*, 4: 101-105.

Bogumil, J., Hafner, J. & Kuhlmann, S. (2016). 'Verwaltungshandeln in der Flüchtlingskrise', *Verwaltung & Management,* 22(3): 115-125.

Boin, A., 't Hart, P., McConnell, A., & Preston, T. (2010). 'Leadership style, crisis response and blame management: The case of Hurricane Katrina', *Public Administration*, 88(3): 706-723.

Boin, A., ‘t Hart, P. & Kuipers, S. (2018). ‘The Crisis Approach’, in: Havidán Rodríguez, William Donner, Joseph E. Trainor (eds.) *The Handbook of Disaster Research*, Springer: 23-38.

Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit, BMUB (2018). *Häufig gestellte Fragen im Zusammenhang mit der Bereitstellung von Flüchtlingsunterkünften*. Retrieved from: http://www.bmub.bund.de/themen/stadt-wohnen/staedtebaurecht/baugesetzbuch/fluechtlingsunterbringung/faq-fluechtlingsunterbringung/ (accessed: 26.2.2018).

Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. New York: John Wiley.

Dekens, J. (2007). *Local knowledge for disaster preparedness: A literature review*. International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD).

Denis, J.-L., Ferlie, E. & van Gestel, N. (2015). ‘Understanding Hybridity in Public Organizations’, *Public Administration,* 93: 273-289.

Dragolov, G., Ignácz, Z., Lorenz, J., Delhey, J. & Boehnke, K. (2014). *Radar gesellschaftlicher Zusammenhalt: Messen was verbindet. Gesellschaftlicher Zusammenhalt in Deutschland*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Gesemann, F., & Roth, R. (2017). *Erfolgsfaktoren der kommunalen Integration von Geflüchteten*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Geser, H. (1998). ‘Demokratie oder Effizienz? Regeltreue oder Bürgernähe? Die kommunale Verwaltung im Spannungsfeld widersprüchlicher Zielorientierungen’, *GESIS Working Paper*. Zürich. Retrieved from: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-356372 (accessed: 26.2.2018).

Hahlen, J. & Kühn, H. (2016). ‘Die Flüchtlingskrise als Verwaltungskrise – Beobachtungen zur Agilität des deutschen Verwaltungssystems’, *Verwaltung & Management,* 22(3): 157-167.

Hildebrand, D. L. (2008). ‘Public Administration as Pragmatic, Democratic and Objective’, *Public Administration Review,* 68: 222-229.

Kaniasty, K. & Norris, F. H. (1995). ‘In search of altruistic community: Patterns of social support mobilization following Hurricane Hugo’, *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 23(4): 447-477.

Kolbe, A. R., Hutson, R. A., Shannon, H., Trzcinski, E., Miles, B., Levitz, N., Puccio, M., James, L., Noel, J. R. & Muggah, R. (2010). ‘Mortality, crime and access to basic needs

before and after the Haiti earthquake: a random survey of Port-au-Prince households', *Medicine, conflict and survival*, 26(4): 281-297.

Kühn, O. (2015). 'Wo und wie Bürger Flüchtlingen in Düsseldorf helfen können' *Neue Ruhr Zeitung Online*. Retrieved from: https://www.nrz.de/staedte/duesseldorf/wo-und-wie-buerger-fluechtlingen-in-duesseldorf-helfen-koennen-id10933084.html (accessed: 26.2.2018).

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Matland, R. E. (1995). 'Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 5(2): 145-174.

Norris, F. H., Friedman, M. J. & Watson, P. J. (2002). '60,000 disaster victims speak: Part II. Summary and implications of the disaster mental health research', *Psychiatry* 65(3): 240-260.

Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F. & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). 'Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness', *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 41(1-2): 127-150.

Oechsler, W. A. (2008). 'Anwendung von betriebswirtschaftlichen Verfahren in der öffentlichen Verwaltung — Gefahren, Risiken und Nebenwirkungen am Beispiel der neuen Steuerungsinstrumente Baden-Württemberg', in: Rudolf Fisch, Andrea Müller und Dieter Beck (eds.): *Veränderungen in Organisationen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: 53–63.

Prior, T., & Eriksen, C. (2013). 'Wildfire preparedness, community cohesion and social–ecological systems', *Global Environmental Change*, 23(6): 1575-1586.

Roth, F. (2017). 'Herausforderungen und langfristige Implikationen der Flüchtlingskrise 2015/16. Bericht zum D-A-CH-Expertenworkshop, 27.-28.10.2016, Zürich', *Risk and Resilience Report*, 7. Center for Security Studies (CSS), ETH Zürich. Retrieved from: http://www.css.ethz.ch/publikationen/suche-und-bestellung/details.html?id=/h/e/r/a/herausforderungen_und_langfristige_impli (accessed: 26.1.2018).

Rosenthal, U., Charles, M. T. & 't Hart, P. (1989). *Coping with crises: The management of disasters, riots, and terrorism.* Springfield: Charles C Thomas.

Saris, W. E., & Gallhofer, I. N. (2014). *Design, Evaluation, and Analysis of Questionnaires for Survey Research* (Second edition). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Scharpf, F. W. (1999). *Regieren in Europa: effektiv und demokratisch*? Frankfurt/Main: Campus-Verlag.

Schmidt-Aßmann, E. (1998). *Das allgemeine Verwaltungsrecht als Ordnungsidee*. Berlin,: Springer.

Schorr, C., Biergert A., Weber, T., Max, M. & Schulze, M. (2014). *Die Rolle der ungebundenen HelferInnen bei der Bewältigung von Schadensereignissen*, Teil 1. Berlin: Deutsches Rotes Kreuz.

Seibel, W. (2015a). 'Studying hybrids: Sectors and mechanisms', *Organization Studies,* 36(6): 697-712.

Seibel, W. (2015b). 'Welfare mixes and hybridity: Analytical and managerial implications', *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations,* 26(5): 1759-1768.

Shields, P. M. (2003). 'The Community of Inquiry: Classical Pragmatism and Public Administration', *Administration & Society,* 35: 510-538.

Speth, R. & Becker, E. (2016). 'Zivilgesellschaftliche Akteure und die Betreuung geflüchteter Menschen in deutschen Kommunen', *Opusculum,* 92. Berlin: Maecenata Institut.

Speth, R., & Bojarra-Becker, E. (2017). 'Zivilgesellschaft und Kommunen: Lerneffekte aus dem Zuzug Geflüchteter für das Engagement in Krisen', *Observatorium,* 18. Berlin: Maecenata Institut.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). 'Managing Legitimacy - Strategic and Institutional Approaches', *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 571-610.

U.S. House of Representatives (2006). *A Failure of Initiative. Final Report of the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina*, Report 109-377. Retrieved from: http://katrina.house.gov/ (accessed: 26.2.2018).

Wallis, M. (2017). '„Dorn im Fleisch der Verwaltung"? Was Willkommensinitiativen mit der Krise sozialer Infrastruktur zu tun haben', *LuXemburg,* Online. Retrieved from: https://www.zeitschrift-luxemburg.de/dorn-im-fleisch-der-verwaltung-was-willkommensinitiativen-mit-der-krise-sozialer-infrastruktur-zu-tun-haben/ (accessed: 26.2.2018).