

**Addressing Challenges in the Middle East: Assessing the
Organisational Soundness of International Research
Collaborations**

Izaz Khattak

Ms Department of Mgt Kohat University of Science and
Technology

Abstract

International collaboration in unstable circumstances within the scholarly community is prone to increased instability, concerns associated to guilt, and inadequate support. In order for these coalitions to remain politically and financially sustainable in the long term, it is imperative to engage stakeholders at many levels, both locally and globally. This holds true irrespective of the scale of the coalitions under consideration. This study investigates the role of complicated stakeholder arrangements in a worldwide academic health science network in promoting peace initiatives in the Middle East. The organisational structures involved in this partnership are being adjusted to more effectively align with the structural, intellectual, and political needs of various international support organisations. However, the credibility of international research and its contribution to peacebuilding has not been undermined. This study investigates the methods of reconciliation employed by cooperative health researchers to mitigate organisational instability, address imbalances in resources, and consistently establish and repair connections across different stakeholder groups.

Keywords: International cooperation Boundary management. organizational authority . T Academic Health Science Center.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of utilising stakeholders to oversee resources across many levels of financial and intellectual transactions (local, national, regional, and global) is increasing in the realm of international

research. The levels encompass the local, national, regional, and international domains. Reich (2002), Anderson and Steneck (2011), Gulati and Singh (1998), and other researchers argue that when complex societal problems are not effectively dealt with using one-sided methods, collaborations involving several stakeholders often become the only feasible answer. It is important to remember that the resource configurations of nations, which make them appropriate for international study, vary significantly. Differences in the availability of intangible resources, such as government assistance, a cooperative atmosphere, and the durability of promises, are some of the inconsistencies mentioned by Stein et al. (2001) and Reich (2002). Both internal and external stakeholders may experience cognitive dissonance when it comes to many issues, such as desired results, stakeholder responsibilities, problem recognition, and the identification of root causes (Reich, 2002; McCoy et al., 2008). This has the potential to endanger research collaborations because of the cognitive dissonance that could lead to their dissolution (Reich, 2002). The participation of academic health science institutes from nations afflicted by violence in worldwide research collaborations has highlighted the seriousness of the issue. According to Stein et al. (2001) and Skinner et al. (2005), connecting the professional and social aspects helps to speed up problem-solving and enables the integration of knowledge acquisition among many parties. One of the main reasons for supporting interdisciplinary research centres is their inherent diversity. Healthcare personnel not only have the capacity to quickly carry out life-saving measures, but they may also engage in global discussions. Political and socioethnic tensions are widely recognised as factors that contribute to violent conflicts and exacerbate considerable public health risks (Pedersen, 2002; Noyke et al., 2005). Specific conversations have the capacity to significantly alleviate these conflicts, therefore potentially enhancing the well-being of the overall population. Academic mediation helps people reconsider the nature of conflicts, approach ongoing discussions with a more rational mindset,

and understand what is considered normal in the midst of violent events. This is one of the main reasons why it is advantageous for processing traumatic experiences (Gangrade and Misra, 1990; Oweini, 1998; Abu-Saba, 1999; Gluncic et al., 2001; Skinner et al., 2005). Evangelista (1999) and Dechaine (2002) argue that the long-lasting impacts of global initiatives like Pugwash and Doctors Without Borders highlight the significant benefits that come from combining scientific, humanitarian, and peace-building efforts to address global emergencies. Academic institutions situated in peaceful and stable regions have valid worries about the genuineness of their involvement in locations where hostage situations, bodily injury, or employee deaths are likely to occur. These queries relate to whether people are behaving really while in dangerous circumstances. Likewise, educational institutions, political groups, and academic families may question the wisdom of the selfless objectives they have set. Furthermore, it is crucial to consider that the idea of intervention may encounter resistance from different domestic stakeholder groups and groups impacted by violence in partner nations (Dajani and Carel, 2002; Ghani and Lockhart, 2008). This tendency is more likely to occur in situations where solutions or answers are not easily noticeable or evident (Zwi, 2004). The risk of a misalignment between the competing claims and interests of commercial companies and the public's priorities on health, education, and peace might have a negative impact on resource allocation and partnership equilibrium. Furthermore, this mismatch may adversely affect the credibility and viability of joint ventures that were first established with admirable objectives (Kirk, Grunin, and Stern, 1999; Kaul, Grunin, and Stern, 1999). Stern, Grunin, and Kaul conducted the investigations for these cases. In academic health science institutions, there is a situation where conflicting opinions on the roles and duties of internal administrators can exacerbate the challenges caused by the involvement of external entities. The year 2005. As stated by Kirchet al
The academic medical enterprise is an institution that prioritises both

patient care and research endeavours with equal significance. The tactics employed by scientific institutions, research facilities, and laboratories in the medical field are shaped by the profession's epistemic standards, organisational cultures, and accountability frameworks. Cooper et al. (2007) and Macfarlane et al. (2008) suggest that the impacts being discussed may differ from those observed in other areas of work. Partnerships with public health care institutions are essential for academic health research institutes to efficiently meet the needs of local taxpayers and patients. This deviates from the prior focus, which was limited to efforts targeted at resolving global concerns. The growing geopolitical significance of academic outreach and the intricate administration of research internationalisation add to the challenges of maintaining positive stakeholder relationships and achieving institutional consistency (Marginson and Rhoades 2002; Beerkens and Ende 2007; Jongbloed, Enders, and Salerno 2008; Jones and Oleksiyenko 2011). These characteristics make it more challenging to build and maintain institutional coherence. There is a lack of research on the legitimization of international cooperation in complicated multi-stakeholder scenarios, even while academic literature acknowledges the increasing involvement of stakeholders in academic organisations. This remains true even if there is a lack of evidence on the validity of multinational collaboration. Academics involved in cross-border initiatives face specific challenges when different stakeholders provide different levels of assistance. Academics face the challenge of legitimacy when collaborative projects become essential research tools in their disciplines but may not be as important to the larger institution, its members, or the overall company. Academic professionals face a challenging dilemma as a result of this intrinsic contradiction. The scholarly community is actively studying the issue of legitimacy problems in inter-organizational contexts during periods of escalating political unrest or crises. When faced with many risks, the issue of successfully addressing the concerns of various stakeholders arises. Despite

extensive research on organisational legitimacy, these questions remain unanswered. Universities face growing pressure to meet the standards set by national and international organisations regarding their level of social participation. References were made to Tierney (2010), Khan et al. (2011), and Khan et al. (2009), among other sources. This study seeks to fill the current gaps in knowledge by investigating the strategies used to legitimise the involvement of multiple stakeholders in an international partnership (Isralowitz et al., 2001; Moore and Aweiss, 2008; Noyek et al., 2005; occasionally referred to as Isralowitz et al., 2001). This will be achieved by examining the legitimization tactics utilised by various stakeholders. Specifically, it aims to address gaps in understanding the dynamics of Canadian medical scholars' engagements with the Middle East, particularly in terms of negotiating the political, cultural, and religious disparities between these two locations. This study utilises an analytical method, building on earlier investigations concerning organisational legitimacy. This study highlights the growing allocation of university mandates to various local, national, and international obligations (Marginson and Rhoades, 2002; Jones and Oleksiyenko, 2011). The methodology used in this investigation was inspired by the previously described study. The following section will offer a clear explanation of the topic, together with a brief summary of the main findings and a description of the research methods. The concluding section of the research highlights the significant consequences of the findings for global collaboration, especially in relation to the overall strategic objective of the legitimization process.

The Organizational Legitimacy of a "Glonacal" Agency

Over the past few decades, there has been a significant rise in the movement of people, goods, and ideas across borders. Furthermore, it has generated both prospects and obstacles, apart from its contribution to scientific inquiry. According to Cooper et al. (2007), improved epidemiology and surveillance systems, along with increased opportunities for national governments to work together on faster,

more practical, and cost-effective solutions, can decrease the complexity and spread of infectious diseases related to mobility. There has been a change in the way academic science is governed, leading to more responsibility and more efficient planning and execution of projects for those involved (Jones and Oleksiyenko 2011). The effectiveness of joint initiatives carried out by academic health research institutions is assessed by other key participants, including international agencies, supporting organisations, and end-users. Moses, Theien, and Matheson (2005) argue that medical institutions, research centres, initiatives, and programmes seek recognition and prestige from powerful persons and within their own social circles. Fujisaki, Frost, and Reich published a paper in 2004. In order to effectively handle emerging scientific subjects and international projects, it is imperative for many groups to engage in collaboration (Oleksiyenko and Sa'2010). These organisations, as stated by Ryan and Walsh (2004) and Jongbloed, Enders, and Salerno (2008), create policies, allocate resources, and assign responsibilities. Previous studies have identified legitimacy indicators, including value congruency, organisational survival (Zald and Denton, 1963; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978/2003), and the flow of financial, informational, and intellectual resources (Terreberry, 1968). Stakeholder agreement on specific ideas and activities being "desirable, proper, or appropriate within a socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" is increasingly affecting the legitimacy of organisations (Suchman 1995:574). The process of legitimization is challenging since there is a potential for conflicting parties to hold contrasting perspectives on what is considered right and wrong. The maturity, complexity, and interconnectedness of an organisation affect its ability to identify and address threats to its legitimacy. Managing power becomes increasingly challenging as circumstances rapidly change and conflicts arise between local, national, and international commitments and interests. The collective ambitions of the three partner planes are denoted as "globanacalagency" (Marginson and Rhodes, 2002).

Although it has been tested, this interaction with many layers may worsen when in the presence of other people. Decisions are made by experts, the government, and citizens both within the United States and beyond. Most decisions are typically backed by neighbouring social organisations, referred to as "social worlds," whose standards and values are in line with those of the decision-makers. As the movement of people, goods, talents, and technology expands, regional "social worlds" tend to adopt political and cultural trends from other locations. Organisations that involve stakeholders at several levels are more vulnerable to environmental instability due to the interaction of local and global factors. The instability is exacerbated by internal differences within the organisation and the need for groups to adapt to the changing beliefs and goals of its followers, who are also involved in global interests and commitments. Clark (1983) presents a comprehensive overview of the hierarchical organisation of higher education, including its overarching framework, internal organisation, and foundational elements. These tiers represent the manner in which internal and external stakeholders engage in negotiations regarding funding, policies, initiatives, and duties. Cooperative attitudes and interpretations are enhanced by coherence, but structural levels decrease. According to Jones and Oleksiyenko (2011), partner support layers are incapable of functioning and providing mutual aid without lyde. Academics and departments are against transnational law because "academic tribes and territories" (Becher and Trowler 2001) have different objectives. Collaboration is facilitated by the existence of a range of organisational practices, resources, and knowledge within departments of higher education, as well as various networks and engaged stakeholders. Bunton and Mallon (2007) and Ramsey and Miller (2009) examine the responsibilities and commitment of professors within different performance and tenure frameworks. Mallon (2006) argues that research organisations are facing pressure due to competition for limited internal resources. Confusion and opposition are likely to arise during the implementation phase since

individuals will need to sacrifice their personal interests in order to achieve the common good (Finet, 1993). The level of collaboration between universities and stakeholder networks for research support was diverse. These divisions result in the formation of both internal and external hierarchies. Academic: University administrators have the authority to choose faculty members based on factors such as location, individual interests, or their connection to the institution. Furthermore, they may also pursue financial and political support. The power of institutional leaders is limited due to disagreements over knowledge and unfair financial support, which determines the order of importance given to local, national, and global objectives (Oleksiyenko and Sa'2010). Academic health sciences institutions offer their knowledge and skills on a global level, both inside their own country and internationally. Medical researchers necessitate worldwide networks to foster innovation and get novel discoveries. The health facilities are influenced by the demands of their local clientele, who may not be aware of the ways in which local and global interdependencies impact their health. While academicians may desire to do so, health professionals are not authorised to modify the research plan. Instead, the management of the center's funds is entrusted to local clients and taxpayers. Globalisation may impede cross-border interactions between academic health partners. According to Sa' and Oleksiyenko (2011), academic leaders cannot undertake worldwide efforts in the health sciences without external finance, despite the growing international recognition of social and technological capabilities in this field. Discrepancies at the higher level of organisational structure, differences between the public and commercial sectors, the involvement of new participants, and differing understandings of accountability norms hinder international collaboration. To achieve significant, pertinent, and morally upright scientific advancement worldwide, it is crucial for a wide range of participants from various academic disciplines, departments, and cultural backgrounds to work together. Researchers have a responsibility to participate in

conversations with others who have an interest in their work, both within and outside of academia, in order to obtain financial and political support at various levels of decision-making. As the focus on profitability increases, organisational structures that rely on data analysis and calculations are gradually eroding academic collaborations. The individuals responsible for this piece of literature are Salerno, Enders, and Jungbloed. The purpose of partnership planners is to reduce differences in organisational cultures and missions so that professional and governmental stakeholders can have a more positive view of common objectives and strategies.

CONCLUSION

CISEPO's global collaborations have earned organisational legitimacy in part due to the great diversity of intellectual, cultural, and structural resources accessible at all levels of the cooperating organisation. It was conceivable for the organisation to gain this legitimacy. CISEPO was able to accomplish its core goals despite its modest size and its auxiliary function in the greater international attempt to address the crisis in the Middle East. The declared aims encompassed increasing constructive communication and collaboration, as well as eliminating hatred, discord, and hostility among the many professional sectors forming the medical profession in the Middle East. A variety of cross-jurisdictional aspects in the governance matrix and techniques for integrating regional, national, and international entities were discovered by the study (refer to Table 1). Consequently, the interconnections among the medical community's endeavours to settle disagreements, establish common aims, foster confidence, and preserve their dedication to promote peace in the violent region became more apparent. By establishing the authenticity of international collaboration in the Middle East to promote health and peace, analytical matrices can be of great service in discovering the interrelationships among different levels of government. This research elucidates the integration of social, political, and cultural aspects by a cooperative agency and highlights the crucial function of boundary

spanners as indispensable intermediates in bridging the differences that form throughout the process of settling conflicts. The fundamental focus of this work is the method in which a combined agency incorporates social, political, and cultural concerns. The quadrants that are part of the matrix also help to highlight the relationship that exists between institutional standards and organisational norms. Furthermore, it simplifies the process of finding conflicts and intersections at various levels, which in turn simplifies the process of building cross-border components that have the ability to elevate stakeholder involvement in critical areas. CISEPO, according to Marginson and Rhoades (2002), perceives itself as an exemplification of a "global agency" that transcends intellectual circles, markets, and nation-states. They imply directly that CISEPO considers itself a prototypical "global agency." These entities' capacities will be significantly reduced if they go on working in isolation, making it hard for them to cope with current problems. The research objectives of the academic health science institutions that host CISEPO are closely linked to the strategy it employs to establish a multilayered organisational legitimacy. The fact that these institutions host CISEPO makes this relationship conceivable. Smaller departments, along with their networks and spin-offs, become the go-betweens to ensure continued academic engagement and commitment when the academic community feels more nervous about liability risks or when an entire medical faculty finds it difficult to advance the internationalisation of its fields (Jones and Oleksiyenko, 2011). The research unit, knowledge network, and non-profit status of CISEPO are crucial components in the organization's development of a multi-stakeholder approach. CISEPO used one of the several information sources at its disposal.

REFERENCES

Agichtein, E., Castillo, C., Donato, D., Gionis, A. and Mishne, G. 2008, 'Finding high-quality content in social media', in Proceedings of the

International Conference on Web Search and Web Data Mining (WSDM'08), ACM New York, NY, pp. 183–194.

Ardévol, E. 2012, 'Virtual/Visual Ethnography: Methodological Crossroads at the Intersection of Visual and Internet Research', in S. Pink (ed.), *Advances in Visual Methodology*, Sage, London.

Atkinson, P., Delamont, S., Coffey, A., Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. 2007, *Handbook of Ethnography*, Sage, London.

Baym, N. and Markham, A. 2009, 'Introduction: Making Smart Choices on Shifting Ground', in A. Markham and N. Baym (eds.), *Internet Inquiry*, Sage, London.

Beaulieu, A. 2004, 'Mediating ethnography: objectivity and the makings of ethnographies on the Internet', *Social Epistemology*, 18, 139–164.

Beaulieu, A. and Simakova, E. 2006, 'Textured connectivity: an ethnographic approach to understanding the timescape of hyperlinks', *Cybermetrics*, 10(1).

Boellstorff, T. 2008, *Coming of Age in Second Life: An Anthropologist Explores the Virtually Human*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Burrell, J. 2009, 'The Field Site as a Network: A Strategy for Locating Ethnographic Research', *Field Methods*, 21, 2, 181–199.

Cox, A., Clough, P. and Marlow, J. 2008, 'Flickr: A First Look at User Behaviour in the Context of Photography as Serious Leisure', *Information Research*, 13, 1, paper 336. <http://InformationR.net/ir/13-1/paper336.html>.

Cresswell, T. 2002, 'Introduction: Theorizing Place', in G. Verstraete and T. Cresswell (eds.), *Mobilizing Place, Placing Mobility : The Politics of Representation in a Globalized World*, *Thamyris/Intersecting*, 9, 11-32.

de Kerckhove, D. 2010, *The Augmented Mind*. 40k books. @galapita and @hibai, 2011, *Maig del seixanta-tweet*, *Enfocant*, 21 June 2011, <http://enfocant.net/noticia/maig-del-seixanta-tweet>.

Gilbert, E. and Karahalios, K. 2009, 'Predicting Tie Strength with Social Media', *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 211-220.

Granovetter, M.S. 1973, 'The Strength of Weak Ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 6, 1360–1380.

Hine, C. 2000, *Virtual Ethnography*, Sage, London. Hine, C. 2008, 'Overview: Virtual ethnography: modes, varieties, affordances', in N. G. Fielding, R.M. Lee and G. Blank (eds.) *Handbook of Online Research Methods*, Sage, London.

Hine, C. 2009, 'Question One: How can Internet Researchers Define the Boundaries of Their Project', in N. Baym and A. Markham (eds.), *Internet Inquiry*, Sage, London.

Hobart, M. 2010, 'What do we mean by "media practices"?', in B. Bräuchler and J. Postill (eds.), *Theorising Media and Practice*, Berghahn, Oxford and New York. Honeycutt, C. and Herring, S. 2009, 'Beyond Microblogging: Conversation and Collaboration via Twitter', *Proceedings of 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 42, pp. 1-10. Humphreys, L. 2007, 'Mobile Social Networks and Social Practice: A Case Study of Dodgeball', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 1, article 17. <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/humphreys.html>

Java, A., Song, X., Finin, T. and Tseng, B. 2007, 'Why we Twitter: Understanding Microblogging Usage and Communities', *Proceedings of the Ninth WEBKDD and First SNA–KDD Workshop on Web Mining and Social*

Network Analysis, pp. 56–65. Jean-Klein, I. 2003, 'Into Committees, Out of the House? Familiar Forms in the Organization of Palestinian Committee Activism during the First Intifada', *American Ethnologist*, 30, 4, 556–577. Juris, J. 2012, 'Reflections on #Occupy Everywhere: Social Media, Public Space, and Emerging Logics of Aggregation', *American Ethnologist*, 39, 2, 259-279. Ingold, T. 2008. 'Bindings against boundaries: entanglements of life in an open world' in *Environment and Planning A*, 40, 1796-1810. Kelty, C. 2008, *Two Bits: The Cultural Significance of Free Software*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Komito, L. 2011, 'Social Media and Migration: Virtual Community 2.0', *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62, 6, 10751086.

Kozinets, R. 2010, *Netnography*, Sage, London. Kwak, H., Lee, C., Park, H. and Moon, S. 2010, 'What is Twitter, a Social Network or a News Media?' *The 19th World-Wide Web (WWW) Conference*, Raleigh, North Carolina. Lang, G. and Benbunan-Fich, R. 2010, 'The Use of Social Media in Disaster Situations: Framework and Cases', *International Journal of Information Systems for Crisis Response and Management*, 2, 1, 11-23. Law, J. 2004, *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, Routledge, London. Madianou, M. and Miller, D. 2011, *Migration and New Media: Transnational Families and Polymedia*, Routledge, London. Marwick, A. and Boyd, D. 2011, 'To See and Be Seen: Celebrity Practice on Twitter', *Convergence*, 17, 2, 139-158. Massey, D. 2005, *For Space*, Sage, London. Miller, D. 2000, 'The Fame of Trinis: Websites as Traps', *Journal of Material Culture*, 5, 1, 5-24. Miller, D. 2011, *Tales from Facebook*, Polity Press, Cambridge. Miller, V. 2008, 'New Media, Networking, and Phatic Culture', *Convergence*, 14, 4, 387-400. Naughton, J. 2011, 'Twitter's Five-

year Evolution from Ridicule to Dissidents' Tool', *The Observer*, 13 February 2011. O'Reilly, K. 2005, *Ethnographic Methods*, Routledge, London. Oulasvirta, A., Lehtonen, E., Kurvinen, E. and Raento, M. 2010, 'Making the Ordinary Visible in Microblogs', *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 14, 237-249. Pink, S. 2008, 'Re-thinking Contemporary Activism: From Community to Emplaced Sociality', *Ethnos*, 73, 2. Pink, S. 2009, *Doing Sensory Ethnography*, Sage, London. Pink S. 2012, 'Visuality, Virtuality and the Spatial Turn', in S. Pink (ed.), *Advances in Visual Methodology*, Sage, London. Platt, P. 2010, 'Five Strategies for a Captivating Social Media Conversation', <http://www.imediaconnection.com/content/27431.asp> Postill, J. 2008, 'Localising the Internet beyond Communities and Networks', *New Media and Society*, 10, 3, 413-431. Postill, J. 2010a, 'Researching the Internet', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 16, 3, 646–650. Postill, J. 2010b, 'Introduction: Theorising Media and Practice', in B. Bräuchler and J. Postill (eds.), *Theorising Media and Practice*, Berghahn, Oxford and New York. Postill, J. 2011, *Localizing the Internet: An Anthropological Account*, Berghahn, Oxford and New York. Postill, J. forthcoming, 'Democracy in an Age of Viral Reality: A Media Epidemiography of Spain's Indignados Movement', *Ethnography*. Potatoskins, 2011, Comment on J. Postill's blog post 'From fieldnotes to fieldtags', 4 June 2011. <http://johnpostill.com/2011/05/13/from-fieldnotes-to-fieldtags/>. Prieur, C., Cardon, D., Beuscart, J., Pissard, N. and Pons, P. 2009, 'The strength of weak cooperation: A case study on Flickr', <http://arxiv.org/abs/0802.2317>. Rapport, N. and Amit, V. 2002, *The Trouble with Community*, Pluto, London.

Solis, B. 2011, 'The hashtag economy', 16 June 2011, <http://www.briansolis.com/2011/06/hashtag-this-the-culture-of-social-mediais/>. Wesch, M. 2009, 'YouTube and You: Experiences of Self-awareness in the Context of the Collapse of the Recording Webcam', *Explorations in Media Ecology*, 8, 2, 19-34, <http://krex.k-state.edu/dspace/handle/2097/6302>. Wittel, A. 2001, 'Toward a network sociality', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18, 6, 5176.