



ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS AND INTERAGENCY COLLABORATIVE DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN NAIROBI CITY COUNTY, KENYA

Zakayo, C. N.

ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS AND INTERAGENCY COLLABORATIVE DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN NAIROBI CITY COUNTY, KENYA

Zakayo, C. N.

Tutorial Fellow, Department of Security and Correction Science, Kenyatta University

Accepted: July 21, 2022

ABSTRACT

The increasing frequency and severity of disasters is a global security concern which has led to adoption of new disaster management tools embracing interagency collaboration approach. However, to achieve effective collaborations during disaster management, there is need to understand how organizational dynamics influence collaborative arrangements. The study assessed the influence of OD on the effectiveness of interagency collaboration during disaster management in Nairobi City County (NCC), Kenya. The study was anchored on resource dependence theory, it employed both cross sectional survey and phenomenological research designs. Target population was 3045 persons working with disaster management agencies in NCC and a sample size of 317 purposively and stratified randomly picked from the various strata of target population. Data collection instruments used in the study were questionnaires and key informant interview guide. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistical procedures and inferential analysis specifically linear regression. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically. Findings of the study revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between OD and IAC where a correlation coefficient (R) of =0.203; P= 0.001 was established, this implied that OD contribute 20.3% of the outcome of IAC. Coefficient of determination (R^2) was $R^2= 0.106$; P= 0.00, this implied that 10.6% of variability in IAC during disaster management is explained by OD. The study concluded that managing diversities as a result of inevitable differences in agency cultures, policies, structures, procedures, beliefs, values and philosophies is key. The study recommended the development of policy to guide IAC operations, creating opportunities for regular interaction between the various disaster management agencies through joint training, workshops and meetings, this will provide a platform for such agencies to learn each other's cultures, values, philosophies, missions and understanding of others mandates, operations and also expanding IAC network.

Key words: Interagency Collaboration (IAC), Disaster Management (DM), Organizational Dynamics (OD) Disaster Management Agency (DMA) Collaborative Disaster Management (CDM) and Interagency (IA)

CITATION: Zakayo, C. N. (2022). Organizational dynamics and interagency collaborative disaster management in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 9 (3), 197-217.

INTRODUCTION

Disaster management according to UNISDR (2012) involves coordinating and integrating all activities necessary in building, sustaining and improving the capabilities for preparing, protecting, responding and recovering from disasters. Recent global events have highlighted that countries previously deemed not disaster prone are now experiencing an increased intensity and frequency of disasters (Yassin, 2015; Sulaiman, Teo, Fernando, Shiau, Roslan & Abdul, 2019). The global rise in disasters is shocking and alarming and calls for effective management strategies (Sapir, 2019a), hence the adoption of Interagency collaborative approach since it engages all sectors of the society in a decentralized manner rather than the traditional disaster management tools (WHO, 2017). Traditional disaster management tools have proved to be ineffective in managing disasters (Kapucu & Garayev, 2011), in this regard, collaborative decentralized systems of disaster management are increasingly being instituted to manage disasters (Hileman & Bodin, 2019). Global disaster frameworks like Hyogo framework for action (UNISDR 2005) and its successor the Sendai Framework support disasters to be managed in a networked collaborative manner.

IAC improves collective actions, sharing of resources (Christensen & Ma, 2020), promotes innovation (Hartley & Rashman, 2018), and provides opportunities for organizations to learn (Provan, Kenis and Human, 2015). Despite the increase in the development of IAC tools to manage disaster, various studies and practitioners of the concept have noted that interagency collaborative process is highly dynamic and complex, thereby difficult to achieve (Tang, Shao, Zhou & Hu, 2021). The complexities are brought about by diversities in organizational cultures, structures and procedures of the various disaster management agencies which have different interests and goals. According to Nowel, Steelman, Velezo & Yang (2018) there is lack of understanding of the impact of organizational dynamics on the outcomes of IAC, hence need to

examine how the dynamics influence effectiveness of IAC during DM.

OD revolves around the manner in which collaborative process is managed and they influence the ability or willingness of stakeholders to participate in collaborative process, they shape the development and implementation process of collaborative arrangement. The implication of this is that OD should be taken into considerations at the onset of any collaborative work since they are key in determining the ability or willingness of stakeholders to engage in collaborative process. OD includes agency polices, cultures, structures, agency values, beliefs and philosophies, agency principles, priorities, goals and missions. Diversities in organizational procedures, policies and structures according to Eide, Haugstveit, Halvorsrud, Skjetne, & Stiso (2012) results in complexities among people involved in collaborative process during DM. Despite the knowledge that differences in agencies cultures, procedures, policies and structures results to complexities among people, there has been little that has been done to address the challenges and harnessing the opportunities as a result of such differences, this is evident from the continuing failures in IAC. It is also important to note that differences in agency structures, policies and procedures must not always result to complexities, as such diversities may also be a source of innovations which may go along in improving IAC. According to Palttala, Boano, Lund & Vos (2012) agencies have tendencies to pursue their own goals, missions procedures and mandates during IAC rather than the combined goals and missions. Disasters in Nairobi City County are managed collaboratively where various disaster management agencies including the police, the kenya defence forces, the national youth service, national and county disaster coordinative agencies and various nongovernmental organizations work collaboratively with each other. However, management of past disaster scenarios in the county have demonstrated difficulties in such interagency arrangements since the various

agencies have got different organizational characteristics which usually presents difficulties and complexities. Therefore, this study sought to examine the influence of the various organizational dynamics on the effectiveness of interagency collaborative arrangement in NCC, Kenya

Statement of the Problem

Despite the increasing development and adoption of interagency collaborative approach in management of disaster in Nairobi City County, Kenya, past experiences in management of various disaster scenarios including the Westgate gate mall attack have shown that there are complexities and difficulties in how such agencies involved work collaboratively. This is due to the diversities in the organizational characteristics of the agencies involved and lack of understanding on how the specific aspects of organizational dynamics influence interagency collaborative disaster management. Previous studies have looked at the concept of collaborations in general, emphasizing on benefits with very scarce literature on how the various organizational dynamics characteristics interact and influence interagency collaborative management. Examining how different aspects of organizational dynamics influences interagency collaborative disaster management is key in understanding IAC networks and can help to achieve and sustain successful IAC in management of disasters in the city.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

Resource Dependency Theory

Resource Dependence Theory (RDT) was proposed by Pfeffer and Salancik in 1978, who argued against the notion of self-sufficiency of an organization and that organizations depend on others to provide necessary resources for successful operation and survival (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Resource exchange among organizations is the fundamental emphasis of RDT and that dynamic interactions among organizations as they build inter-organizational relations facilitate beneficial

management of their resource dependencies. According to Hillman, Whither, & Collins (2009) the central idea of the theory is that an organization cannot survive unless it is able to effectively manoeuvre the external environment to access essential resources. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) also pointed out at inter-organizational dependence as a key factor in the successful operations of an organization. Interdependencies and connections are maintained through institutional tools, procedures, rules, legal regulations, and professional associations (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). The tenets of RDT are often illustrated in disaster response networks in which organizations of different levels and sectors within and outside the government depend on one another to overcome constraints of their individual incapacities (Casciaro and Piskorski, 2005). For instance, DM in Kenya is a function of both forms of government, the devolved and national government, however devolved governments depend on the national government to handle bigger challenges and provide relief in the face of disasters which are beyond their capacity. Similarly, national governments often look up to international organizations to assist in responding to situations which are beyond their capacity.

Review of Related Literature

Organizational Dynamics and Interagency Collaborative Disaster Management

According to Schein (2010) organizational cultures refers to an organization's tacit assumptions, espoused values, and artifacts, where artifacts are described as the visible items such as languages, behaviours, and dress while espoused values describes statements that are written in form of mission and philosophy of an organizations. Such statements are also found in internal communication, mission statements, and practice literature. Tacit assumptions are described as the values guiding those statements. Organizational culture serves as a tool of social cohesion (Schein, 2010) and is heavily influenced by ideologies and policies. To Schneider, Enhart and Maley (2013), organizational culture includes those norms that

members of an organization experience and describe as their work settings, it is important to note that the behaviours of the members in the organization are shaped by these norms. Simoneaux & Stroud (2014) concluded that the way members of an organization behave constitute their organizational culture, while according to Amadeo (2013) cultural diversity is when differences in race, ethnicity, language, nationality, religion and sexual orientation are represented within a community. The implication of this is that cultural diversity which is a key characteristic of collaborative processes influences the outcome of IAC by either resulting to unhealthy conflicts or even innovations which are useful during the collaborations.

A study by Petcha (2013) on the effect of organizational cultures on inter-organizational collaboration during crises response in the USA involving the police, fire department, Nonprofit organizations and private security companies noted organizational cultures to influence effectiveness of IAC during crisis response. Differences in organizational cultures of participating agencies during collaborations do not automatically result to disagreements, where differences result to conflicts, this frustrates attainment of common goals, affects how members interact within the collaboration and impedes sharing of information among the participating agencies. This implies that there is need for collaborating agencies to identify opportunities as a result of differences in organizational cultures to help in maximizing benefits of IAC. Also, ways of mitigating conflicts as result of conflicting agency cultures was not addressed by the study, therefore, the study sought to investigate ways through which such conflicts can be managed while maintaining cultural identity of the various agencies.

Study by Guver and Motsching (2017) on effects of diversity in teams and workgroups in Australia found that there was no single commonly accepted effect of diversities in organizational cultures on performance of teams and that members reactions in IA to diversities in organizational cultures vary

and that no straight forward association between diversity and IA performance. Despite there being no straight forward relationship between diversities in organizational differences and IA team performance, the study noted that diversities in organizational cultures had negative impact on cohesion, communication, integration and potential to increase conflicts, all which influenced collaborations negatively. However, the study concluded by observing that organizational differences to a certain limit tends to improve decision making and problem-solving process through encouraging creativity and innovation

Observations by Guver and Motsching (2017) on the effects of organizational diversities in cultures on effectiveness of CDM appears to be into twofold, where diversities in organizational cultures are seen to impact some aspects of IAC negatively and others positively. For instance according to the study diversities in organizational cultures negatively impacts on group cohesion, impacts communication and has potential to cause conflicts. On the other hand diversities in organizational cultures improve decision making and problem solving by encouraging creativity and innovation. Therefore there is need to examine the influence of organizational cultures in CDM in NCC, Kenya.

Fleming, McCarthy and Steelman (2015) in their study on conflict and collaboration in wildfire management in the USA comprising of Forest service, land management agencies, local agencies and federal representatives noted that diversities in organizational mission and goals were not inherently harmful or undesirable, however, the study noted that if not well managed, the diversities can result to tensions in the IAC. This contradicted the findings of a study by Kapucu & Garayev (2013) on designing, managing and sustaining functionally collaborative emergency management networks which noted that differences in organizational goals, missions and mandates influences effectiveness of collaborative arrangements. Even though Fleming, McCarthy and Steelman (2015) noted diversities in organizational mission and goals

not inherently harmful as long as they are managed well, how such diversities in organizational goals and missions can be managed was not addressed by the study, hence the study sought to examine how diversities in organizational goals and missions can be managed. However study by Clampitt & Dekoch (2011) had noted differences in agency goals and missions to make communication during collaborations challenging. This contrasting views by different studies and scholars on the interaction of organizational goals and missions with other OD and on the influence of their diversities on effectiveness of IAC led to this study to investigate how organizational goals and missions interacted with other dynamics of collaboration and how differences in goals and missions of the various DMA influenced effectiveness of IAC in NCC, Kenya.

However, a study by Kapucu & Garayev (2013) on diversities in organizational goals and missions indicated that diversities influence the effectiveness of collaborative arrangements negatively, yet how to mitigate negative influence was not provided for by the study, therefore this study investigated whether there were such conflicts during CDM in NCC, Kenya and if they were present, how were such conflicts as a result of differences in organizational goals and missions mitigated to ensure effectiveness of IAC in NCC, Kenya. An inductive case study of the Columbia space shuttle response effort by Beck and Plowman (2014) noted that differences in organizational goals, missions and structures were influencing the collaborative response negatively at the early stages of the response operations when there was no any authority figure or coordinative agency. This implies that having an authority figure or a coordinating agency during collaborative disaster management is key to ensure success. However how such an authority figure or coordinating agencies are selected was not explained by the study, therefore there is need to investigate how collaborative coordinating agencies during CDM are selected amongst the various responding agencies.

Study by McLachin and Larson (2011) in Canada on barriers to IA collaboration in crises management involving various NGOs, Aid and advocacy groups, UN representatives, Canadian Military and private sector noted that compatibility in organizational structures, processes and procedures influences positively effectiveness of collaborative disaster arrangements by creating a sense of mutuality and symmetry between partners. However, organizational structures, policies, procedures and processes of DMA are in most cases not compatible, for instance state agencies mainly the military and police uses top down structures characterized by organizational bureaucracy which are different from those of non state actors.

Organizational structures of majority of non state actors involved in disaster management such as humanitarian aid agencies, international relief agencies and local NGOs mainly have decentralized structures. Therefore study by Study by McLachin and Larson (2011) didn't take into account that collaborative disaster management environment is highly characterized by incompatible agency structures, processes and procedures. Therefore the study sought to examine whether differences in agency structures, procedures and polices influences IAC negatively and how such differences can be managed if they negatively influence effectiveness of IAC. Another study in India by Prasanna (2018) on relationship between organizational culture and humanitarian collaborations indicated that congruence on organizational cultures resulted to better collaborations. The study didn't take into account that during disaster scenarios, there are very many responding organizations participating in collaborative arrangements local and international, governmental and nongovernmental. There are very few instances that similarity in organizational goals occurs amongst the responding agencies, also the study did not provide foe mitigation measures in case of lack of congruence on organizational cultures neither did it explained what happens whenever there is dissimilarity in organizational

cultures. Therefore, there is need to investigate the influence of OD on IAC effectiveness as a result of lack of congruence in organizational cultures, and if it affects IAC effectiveness negatively, what are the mitigation measures to ensures success of collaborative arrangements in disaster management.

A study by Altay and Labonte (2014) in Haiti noted that rigid organizational structures and cultural differences amongst participating agencies results to difficulties in information sharing, this made shared decision making and consensus on shared organizational goals extremely difficult. However, how to mitigate the problem of lack of shared understanding to problems and lack of consensus on shared organizational goals as a result of rigid organizational structures and cultural differences was not provided for by the study. Therefore, there is need to examine if there are opportunities for maximizing effectiveness of IAC as a result of differences in organizational cultures of the participating agencies. Also to investigate how problems as a result of rigid organizational structures can be mitigated.

Study by Al-Jenaibi (2011) on the impacts of cultural diversities in organizational teams in United Arab Emirates (UAE) found that members belonging to different cultures usually have different ways of thinking and thus analyzes a matter at hand from a variety of perspectives. According to the study, the differences in experiences can be beneficial by providing the organization with a sound and vast knowledge base. The implication is that there are opportunities for ensuring success of IAC that comes with differences in organizational cultures, as such differences provides a rich knowledge base for the collaborative arrangement. However, how to overcome problems as a result of the cultural differences was not articulated for by the study, therefore, there is need to investigate how such problems can be mitigated.

Another study by Martin (2014) on the effects of cultural diversities when working within teams noted that cultural diversities can have both

positive and negative impacts, where the unfavorable impacts according to the study includes dysfunctional conflicts, difficulties in achieving harmony in the IA team settings while favourable impacts include strong knowledge base which is created by a variety of cultural experiences. The study concluded by noting that the effects of cultural diversities depend upon how well they are managed by the organizational leadership, where proper management and with good leadership, the positive impacts of organizational diversities can be enhanced while the negative effects of diversities in cultures be reduced leading to effectiveness in IAC.

The study by Martin (2014) noted that cultural diversities during IAC can have both positive and negative impacts to the effectiveness of IAC , where positive impacts are dependent upon organizational leadership and proper management. However, the study did not articulate the attributes required for collaborative organizational leaders and what constitute proper management. Also the study noted the unfavourable consequences as a result of cultural diversity, however, how to mitigate such unfavourable consequences was not articulated by the study. Therefore, this study sought to examine how the unfavorable consequences as a result of cultural diversity can be mitigated bearing in mind that IAC during DM is highly characterized by cultural diversity. According to Galbraith (2002) agencies are oriented towards achieving their own goals and objectives according to their interests and responsibilities. This goal directed behaviour according to Galbraith (2002) affects the common problem space between the collaborating actors, thus affecting other organization sometimes dramatically, which results to under performance of collaborative arrangements. In noting that individual organization goal directed behaviours affects how collaboration networks define and understand common problem space, Galbraith (2002) didn't provide for ways in which such goal directed behaviours can be minimized or the conflicts which they bring can be solved, hence this study sought to and proposed how such goal

directed behaviours can be minimized in a IAC arrangements.

It is also important to note that there exists different and contrasting views on the influence of differences in organizational goals, missions, mandates and philosophies on performance of CDM, for instance, Rodriquez, Petrez and Pardodei (2003) noted that when goals and mandates of organizations differ, they affect the effectiveness of the collaborative arrangements by increasing difficulties in how such agencies interact, while Guimera et al (2005) argued that differences in goals, mandates and philosophies emanating from various agencies participating in a CDM are essential in that they offer valuable experience by exposing agencies to diverse methods of doing things, values and cultures, which eventually enlarge their skills of collaborating. This contrasting view implies that there need to investigate the influence of differences in organizational goals, mandates, policies and missions of the different DMA in NCC, Kenya. In noting the negative impacts of differences in organizational goals, structures and missions, the study by Rodriquez et al., (2003) did not articulate for ways of mitigating such negative impacts. Therefore this study sought to investigate how the negative impacts of differences in organizational goals, missions and mandates can be mitigated.

The study by Beck and Plowman (2014) concluded that such diversities influence collaborations negatively, while Flemming et al., (2015) argued that the differences are not inherently undesirable to the success of IAC in disaster management. Due to these contrasting views on the influence of differences in organizational goals and mandates on performance of collaborative arrangement, the study sought to and assessed how differences in agency goals, missions, mandates, philosophies and priorities affects CDM in NCC, Kenya. The bureaucratic nature of security agencies for instance may hamper efforts to establish working relationships across agency boundaries further affecting IA efforts. How to solve the differences

emanating from diverse agency structures is what McGuire & Silvia (2010) didn't articulate, hence this study sought to and proposed what can be done to ensure that collaborative efforts are successful and effective in managing disasters despite the diversities in agency structures. During collaborative response to the 9/11 World Trade Center attacks in the USA, rigid hierarchy and inflexible agency structures were noted by Comfort & Kapucu (2006) to have impendent team work, where they noted that rigid agency structures affect adaptability of agencies.

According to Hocevar, Jansen and Thomas (2011), structural flexibility is identified as a dimension of interagency collaboration capacity and as a factor that allows partners in a collaboration to adapt as requirement changes, enables partners during collaboration to demonstrate willingness to adjust procedures which further facilitate collaboration and also allows partners to respond to requirements of other organizations within the collaboration. Even though Hocevar et al (2011) talked of structural flexibility as a factor and dimension of interagency collaboration capacity, what enables agencies to have flexible structures was not explained, therefore the study sought to establish factors that enable organizations to have flexible or inflexible structures. Agency policies and procedures just like structures also differ from agency to agency and can impede development of collaboration. For instance, the policy of security agencies on personnel transfers and deployment where the officers are from time to time expected to work in different places across the country may adversely affect collaborative partnerships and continuity in case of a situation where officers with past experience in collaborative capacity are replaced with officers without past experience in IA work.

Since differences in organizational polices has been noted to impede collaborative efforts in management of disasters, it was of importance for the study to look into the ways through which such differences in organizational policies can be

managed to ensure effective collaborations in the management of disasters. A study by M'muthuiba (2013) on sharing of information among humanitarian organization in Kenya observed that organizational cultures were instrumental in determining sharing of information during collaborations. A view shared by Egli (2011) and Vuori & Okkonen (2012) who observed the crucial need of understanding organizational cultures since they affect the willingness and attitude of organizations to share information during collaborations. Observations by M'muthuiba (2013) and Vuori & Okkonen (2012) implied the need for the study to examine whether organizational cultures determine information sharing during CDM in NCC, Kenya. Therefore, this study is timely in that the findings of the study influence the development of necessary policy and legislations to guide collaborations in disaster management.

METHODOLOGY

This research employed both cross sectional survey and phenomenological research designs to enable investigations into the subject under study. Phenomenological research design was useful in finding out human experiences of the people involved (Maypole & Davies 2001), i.e., lived experiences of disaster management personnel who had been involved in IAC. Cross sectional survey design was employed since the study comprised of different agencies involved in management of disaster.

The study site for this research was Nairobi City County, NCC was a suitable study site because the county had in the past experienced some of the most devastating disasters in the country. Also, the site is highly populated and also the capital of Kenya and majority of disaster management agencies have their headquarters here. Target population was

3045 persons working with disaster management agencies in NCC including the National Police Service officers, the Kenya defence forces (Disaster Response Battalion), The National Youth Service, National Disaster Management Unit, National Disaster Operations Center, The Kenya Red Cross Nairobi Branch and The Nairobi City County Fire and Rescue Service. Sample size for the study was 317 officers purposively and stratified randomly picked from the various strata of target population. Data collection instruments used in the study were questionnaires and key informant interview guide. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistical procedures and inferential analysis specifically linear regression. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The objective of the study was to assess organizational dynamics influence on the implementation of interagency collaborative disaster management arrangement in Nairobi City County, Kenya. Therefore, analysis of how various organizational dynamics including agency cultures, agency values, beliefs and philosophies, agency goals, missions and mandates, agency structures, policies and procedures influence interagency collaborative disaster management arrangement was the focus.

Respondents using a 5-point Likert scale of responses ranging from SA-Strongly Agree, A-Agree, U-undecided, D-Disagree and SD-Strongly Disagree were asked to assess this influence based on the indicators contained in the questionnaires administered to them. The table below provides a summary of descriptive statics results for organizational dynamics influence on IAC disaster management.

Table 1: Descriptive Results Summary for OD Influence on IAC Disaster Management

Statement	SA %	A %	U %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std Dev
Differences in agency cultures influence CDM effectiveness	24.8	68.0	3.0	3.4	0.80	4.13	0.68
Differences in agency cultures during CDM are unhealthy	15.8	75.2	3.8	4.9	0.4	4.01	0.65
Differences in Beliefs, values and philosophies influences CDM	15.8	75.6	4.5	4.5	0.4	4.05	0.55
Agency Beliefs, values and philosophies influences how agencies perceive others	18.3	70.3	6	5	0.44.	4.11	0.57
Differences in agency goals and Missions influences CDM	20.9	70.4	3.8	2.5	1.4	4.16	0.55
There is need for missions and goals alignment during CDM	30.5	58.9	6	2.8	1.8	4.32	0.59
Agency structures and policies influences CDM	20.3	60.3	2.1	9.8	7	4.25	0.54
There is need for a policy to guide agencies during CDM	60.9	20.5	7.5	9	2	4.65	0.51

Source: Field Data (2021).

Agency Cultures : Values, beliefs and philosophies

Respondents were asked whether differences in agency cultures influences effectiveness of IAC during disaster management operations, study findings indicated that majority (68%) of the respondents agree that differences in agency cultures influences effectiveness of interagency collaborative operations, 24.8 percent strongly agree, with 3 percent undecided. About .4 percent disagrees while 0.8 percent strongly disagrees. Differences in agency cultures as a factor influencing IAC effectiveness had a mean of 4.13 and SD of 0.68, implying that differences in agency cultures influences effectiveness of IAC arrangements. Culture can be explained as organizational tacit values, beliefs, values, artifacts such as language and behaviours (Schein, 2010). Traditions, habits and particular way of life or preferred methods of operating that are more of less specific to a particular community also constitute culture. From the definition of culture, the differences in cultures implies that different individuals participating in IAC form different DMA will have different preferred ways of doing things, thinking, exhibit different behaviours, uphold

different values, beliefs and philosophies which may be contradictory. It is such different ways of thinking and the held values, philosophies and beliefs that result to conflicts during IA which influences its effectiveness. However, it is not always automatic that when there are differences in cultures, conflicts will arise, the different ways of doing things and thinking can be a source of innovation or lead to crosspollination of ideas, this will positively influence IA effectiveness. This implies that, agencies during CDM should not shun differences in how they approach DM, rather they should take advantage and make use of such differences positively, though this has not been the case in most of IAC arrangements, where individuals have stuck to their ways adversely impacting on IAC arrangements.

Study finding on the influence of cultural differences on IAC during disaster management corroborate findings by Akhtar, Marr & Garnevska (2012) who in their study found that differences in organizational cultures greatly influenced collaborative response negatively following the 2005 South Asian earthquake in India, however a

study by Stahl, Makela, Zander and Mazneuski (2010) contradicts these finding by noting that cultural diversities bring creativity to IA teams by bringing creative inputs into the process and allowing formation of creative processes, positively influencing IAC. Another study by Martin (2014) concluded that cultural diversities had both positive and negative impacts, unfavourable impacts being dysfunctional conflicts, difficulties in achieving harmony while favourable impacts included strong knowledge base as a result of variety of cultural experiences. The absence of agreement into the specific influence of cultural differences on IAC also implies that actual situation on the ground during emergency response together with the IAC leadership may also determines whether the diversities will influence positively or negatively, this is because in most cases, disaster scenarios do not give room for people to form new creative processes at the onset, but upon interaction under guidance of an effective leader, the agencies through their representatives can take some time to reflect on the progress as they seek new ways of tackling the matter at hand. This means that during the onset of the collaborations, the differences are likely to influence IAC negatively, but as time goes by and the most pressing needs are addressed, then the diversities can be negotiated to bring out new and innovative ways.

During interview with one of the key informant KIR12, the following was noted concerning agency cultures;

Differences in agency cultures have been a thorny issue during interagency collaborations for a long time, we could meet in a disaster scenario and fail to achieve a common goal because agencies could insist on their own ways of doing things. But nowadays and especially after the Westgate Mall terrorist attack on 21st September 2013, we have had improvements, we have leant to accommodate each other's different ways of working, this is because we cannot all think and work in the same manner. Also, we have leant to use the differences and

come up with innovative ways as a result of the divergent views, though its time consuming, but at the end we all come up with one good idea which helps us in attaining our goal, even though it does not work all the times (Respondent KIR 12).

From the qualitative interview, differences in agency cultures appears to have been a key determinant of collaborative success, where difficulties during IA operations have been as a result of failing to accommodate divergent views and lack of consensus on which way to operate. According to the respondent, the adverse effects of conflicts as a result of cultural diversities during IAC can be mitigated by increasing opportunities of agency interaction through series of meetings, workshops and joint trainings. From the study findings, majority (75.2%) of respondents agree that during IAC, conflicting agency cultures are unhealthy and impedes innovation, 15.8 percent of the respondents strongly agree that conflicting cultures of participating agencies during IAC are unhealthy and do impede innovation. 3.8 percent of the respondents were undecided whether conflicting cultures of different agencies during IAC are unhealthy and impedes innovation, respondents who disagree were 4.9 percent while 0.4 percent of the respondents strongly disagree that conflicting cultures of participating agencies are unhealthy and impede innovation during IA operations. By having 75.2 percent of respondents indicating to agree that differences in agency cultures are unhealthy, this means that if agencies participating in a collaborative DM arrangement do not agree on which way to operate and as a result stick to their ways of operating. This behaviour by agencies of sticking to their ways of doing things and not adopting new ways of operating is harmful and impedes innovation during IA. The study finding support Petcha (2013) findings that conflicting agency cultures results to frustrations in attaining common goals during IA where as a result of lack of consensus on what ways to adopt, each agency pursues their own goals. From the interview with

KIR7 on whether conflicting agency cultures during IAC are unhealthy and impedes innovation, the following response was obtained.

When we have our agency cultures conflicts during IAC, we have problems in agreeing on common ways of working together, this is because each agency wants to do things in their own ways. As a result, it becomes difficulty to attain common goals and even sometimes we start competing amongst ourselves. (Respondent KIR 7).

From the key informant, failing to reach consensus on common ways of working results to tendencies by agencies to doing things their way. If agencies results to this, it means that there will be lack of common understanding to the situation at hand, there will be lack of joint decision making and also this will impacts on knowledge and information sharing, hence results to distraction and negatively influences IAC. However, where the diversities in cultures are managed well, then this is a source of strength due to the rich base in ideas from different sectors hence resulting to innovation. Study findings indicate that majority (75.6%) of the respondents were of the opinion that differences in agency beliefs, values and philosophies influences IAC, 15.8 percent of the respondents strongly agree while 4.5 percent were undecided whether the differences in agency beliefs, values and philosophies influences IAC. 0.4 percent of the respondents strongly disagree while 4.5 percent disagree. Agency beliefs, values and philosophies as a variable had a mean of 4.05 and a SD of 0.55. Beliefs can be explained as what individuals hold as true, it expresses thoughts formed by human beings (Pehkonen & Pletila, 2003). This implies that the subjective judgments concerning some aspect of self or the environment around us. Values are internalized cognitive structures that guide choices individuals make, motivate people to act in one way or another, act as guide for human behaviours while organizational philosophies describes how organizations operate and are organized to meet goals, that is, organizational philosophies help

individuals within such organizations to understand the goals and values they are working towards.

Therefore, differences in beliefs, values and philosophies between the various agencies participating in IAC arrangement would imply that individuals will have different perspectives of what the problem is, depict different behaviors, judge issues or situations differently and understand goals differently based on their organizations or agencies they came from. Holding different values, beliefs and philosophies may result to individuals during collaborations being suspicious of others, set stage for frictions, lack of order, resistant to change and also lack of consensual harmony during IA interactions. Resistant to change implies lack of innovations as individuals are not ready to change their way of doing things, lack of consensus implies absence of shared understanding to problems, suspicions during IA interactions results to lack of trust. Hence the reason for having 75.6 percent of respondents indicating to agree that differences in organizational beliefs, values and philosophies influences effectiveness of IA collaborations. However, diversity in agencies values, philosophies and beliefs may be managed to broaden collaborative groups' perspectives which according to Ozbilgin & Tatli (2008) improves performance of the multidisciplinary teams. Also, as members became more familiar with each other's perspectives and develop transactive memories, this can help in creating abilities by individuals to embrace inclusiveness. Reducing prejudices, avoiding use of stereotypes and recognizing that diversity exists and learning to value and respect differences is a good way of mitigating such differences for effectiveness of IAC arrangements. According to Sanne (2012), the tendency by individuals to strongly stick to their organizations beliefs, values and philosophies even causes them to miss some important experiences and lessons from disaster events which eventually results to DM leaders to repeat same errors resulting in future vulnerabilities. Rigidity of core beliefs and values means that DMA leaders tend to absorb those

pieces of information that fit in their own beliefs and disregard information that does not, and stick to actions that uphold their belief systems.

In responding to how having differences in agency values, beliefs and philosophies influences CDM effectiveness, KIR15 had this to say;

The values, beliefs and philosophies we have strongly put us together as an agency, they influence the way we behave and portray ourselves, this influences collaborations in a big way as in most time we strive to maintain that all throughout the collaboration process. Remember we are the image of our agencies (Respondent KIR15).

From KIR 15 interview, agencies values, beliefs and philosophies create a sense of oneness or strong bond and cohesion in an agency or amongst members of a specific agency. Values, beliefs and philosophies individuals from different agencies hold determines how such individuals will behave and portray themselves during the collaborations. During the interview, it also came out that individual while collaborating strives to maintain their identity by sticking to their values, beliefs and philosophies throughout the collaboration. This lack in readiness to compromise agencies values, beliefs and philosophies during IAC implies limited innovations in how the IA groups approach situations. The strong bond created by agencies values, beliefs and philosophies resulting to oneness within an agency may imply limited interactions between the agencies, as members reduced affinity to associate with members from different agencies. Reduced interaction by members from different agencies means limited sharing of information, knowledge, low levels of trust between different agencies. This influences CDM effectiveness by affecting the attainment of the goals. This finding from the key informant corroborates the study finding, and support observations by Torlak (2004) and Sanne (2012). Even though the study finding largely indicate the influence to be negative, it is important It is important to that the differences in agency beliefs,

values and philosophies by themselves may not be harmful, rather the rigidity or tendency by different agencies to stick to them and fail to adopt news of doing things so as to maintain the status quo.

On whether agency beliefs, values and philosophies influence how individuals perceives others during IAC, findings indicated that majority (73.3%) of respondents agree that beliefs, values and philosophies held by agencies influences how individuals perceived others during CDM, with 20.3 percent of respondents strongly agree. Only a small number (5%) of respondents indicated that agency beliefs, values and philosophies do not influence how individuals perceive others during IAC. Approximately 6 percent were undecided while 0.4 strongly disagreed. Agency beliefs, values and philosophies determines what individuals from the agencies hold to be true or real, the thoughts they form, how they make judgments alongside guiding how such individuals operate. This has got implications on how individuals during collaborative arrangements perceive others, this is because how individuals see the world around them is dependent upon sensory inputs, which are affected by values and beliefs. Beliefs and values shape the way people perceive their self and others, therefore agencies beliefs, values and philosophies determines greatly how individuals during IAC perceive others, hence the reason for having the majority of respondents (73.3%) indicating to agree.

The finding corroborates observations noted by Sanne (2012) that organizations beliefs and values heavily determines how individuals from such organizations perceive others and even influence the way they interpret situations. KIR9 while making contribution on the influence of agency values, beliefs and philosophies on IAC had this to say;

Agency values, beliefs and philosophies has a lot of influence in the way we think and act, this also influences how we see and perceive those whom we are working with during the collaborations (Respondent KIR9).

From the interview with KIR9, agency beliefs, values and philosophies are key in determining how individuals collectively think and act during CDM, this is because individuals are predisposed to adopt values from immediate environment. By determining how individuals think and act, it affects their judgment over others, hence influencing how they perceive others during collaborations. Even though the finding from the key informant corroborates study finding by supporting that agency beliefs, values and philosophies determine how individuals perceive others, it is important to note that there are other factors that can determine how individuals perceive others during IAC, for instance past history of success in working collaboratively will influence individual perception towards others.

Agency Policies: Structures, procedures, Goals, Missions and Mandates

Respondents were asked whether agency Policies, structures and procedures of participating agencies influences IAC, findings indicated that majority (67.3%) of the respondents agree that policies, procedures and structures of participating agencies influences IAC, 29.3 percent of the respondents strongly agree policies influences IAC while 2.1 percent of respondents were undecided whether agency policies of participating agencies have any influence on IAC. Only 9.8 percent of the respondents disagreed that policies of agencies participating in IAC influences the performance of such arrangement while 7 percent strongly disagreed. A policy is a predetermined course of action established by agencies to guide towards strategies, objectives and goals, structures, procedures and decision making (Manghani, 2011). This implies binding rules and regulations followed by individuals within an organization to achieve smooth running, to ingrain values and norms that contribute to the culture of the organization, form boundaries for acceptable behaviour within the workplace. By having majority of respondents (67.3%) agreeing while 29.3 percent strongly agreeing that agency policies influence CDM implies

that if an agency has a policy supporting collaborations during DM, such policy defines strategies, structures and procedures to put in place towards attaining successful collaborations.

The agency policy will help set and defines the agencies boundaries for acceptable practices, guide how such collaborations will be undertaken and above all facilitate successful delivery of required results, thereby influencing IAC effectiveness positively. Absence of a policy by an agency on collaborations implies that such an agency will approach collaborations without a blueprint, characterized by absence of predetermined structures or procedures on how it will achieve collaborations during CDM. This will result to confusions and conflicts between the participating agencies, thereby influencing CDM effectiveness negatively. The study finding on policies is consistent with study finding from Molenveld, Voorberg, VanBurren & Hagen (2021) which noted policies to have influence on collaborations success. It is also important to note that presence of an agency policy on collaborations may not automatically imply positive influence on effectiveness of CDM. This is because the agency may be collaborating with other agencies which do not have policies to guide them or with agencies having incompatible policies. While contributing on the influence of agency policies, structures and procedures on CDM, one of the key informant KIR16 narrated the following;

Having a policy on collaborations as an agency is very important because such will define how you will relate with other agencies during collaboration and define your roles while collaborating. The challenges comes because of differences in agency structures and procedures, for instance where our mode of operandis are in most cases different with how majority of responding agencies operate, we are structured to be self sustaining whenever called upon in an operation in terms of our welfare, this has seen us take the bulk of most work and

responsibilities of taking care of others during CDM. (Respondent KIR 16).

From the qualitative data above, the implication is that agency policies are good management tools which influence CDM by defining how the agencies will engage other participants, guide on the strategies towards obtaining results. If agencies have proper working procedures and good policies in place, this positively influences IAC, while lack of proper working structures and procedures will result to overburdening one or a few of the DMA which greatly affects CDM negatively. On whether there is need for a overall policy to guide interagency collaborative disaster management activities, findings indicated that 60.9 percent strongly agree that there is need to have a policy to guide IAC, 20.5 percent of the respondents agree that there is need for development of policy to guide how agencies should collaborate during DM, while 7.5 percent of the respondents were undecided on whether there is need to have a policy in place to guide CDM. The need to have a overall policy to guide IAC variable had a mean of 4.65 and SD of 0.51. By having majority of respondents (60.9%) indicating to strongly agree that there is need to have overall policy to guide collaborations implies that existence of a policy to guide collaborations is key in determining success of IAC. Having a policy on how collaborations in the country will be managed means clear defined roles for DMA, clarity on how such collaborations are initiated, developed, governed and sustained to achieve results. The study finding is consistent with a study by Ndar (2019) on critical analysis of Kenya's DRM Strategy which concluded that there is need for proper policy to guide DM mechanisms in the country.

The study finding is further consistent with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 priority number two on strengthening disaster risk which advocates for coherence of national and local frameworks of laws, regulations and public policies to guide public and private sectors in taking action to address DM at the

national and local level. On the need to have a policy to guide CDM in the country, key informant KIR5 narrated the following;

I strongly believe that having a policy to guide disaster collaborations in the country is the right decision, because, the current policy framework only advocates for collaborations between agencies but does not provide for how such should be arrived at and managed. Therefore, having one with provisions on how CDM is to be managed will help bring uniformity, order and centrality in how collaborations during disaster response are managed. Also, this will help in domesticating the Incident Command System (ICS) which is a foreign concept and eventually improve interoperability. In fact, the National Disaster Management Authority Bill is almost ready and has all these provisions and is all we have been waiting for to bring such much awaited order in disaster collaborations (Respondent KIR5).

From the qualitative data above, it implies that there has been a policy framework in place regarding DM which advocates for IAC in management of disasters in the country. However, it came out clear that such policy framework has not been effective in guiding collaborations in the country; this is because it merely advocates for collaborations but not conclusive on how such should be established, governed and sustained. Further, the respondent (KIR5) noted that the National Disaster Management Authority Bill is almost ready and has all the provisions to bring order in the way collaborations should be managed in the country. From the study finding, there has been existence of policy framework advocating for disaster collaborations, but what has been lacking is a proper one articulating how disaster collaborations is to be achieved and managed.

Respondents were asked whether differences in goals, missions and mandates of their agencies influences collaborations during DM, the study findings indicated that majority (70.4%) of the respondents agree that differences in agency goals,

missions and mandates influences IAC while 20.9 percent strongly agree. Those who were undecided whether differences in agency goals, missions and mandates influences IAC were 3.8 percent, only a few respondents (2.5%) disagree that differences in goals, missions and mandates of agencies involved in DM influences IAC while 1.4 strongly disagreed. Differences in agency goals, missions and mandates as variable had a mean of 4.16 and SD of 0.55. By having 70.4 percent indicating to agree with the statement that agency differences influences IA effectiveness during DM, it implies that there is need to take into considerations differences in agencies goals and missions as they influences IAC. This is because if the participating agencies approach collaborations with different goals and missions to achieve, this will adversely affect the effectiveness of IAC. For instance, if during collaborative disaster response for flooding in a coastal town as a result of hurricane involving state agencies whose mission is to relocate such populations while the non state actors in such collaborations have the missions to rebuild new structures for the affected populations. In such collaborations characterized with differences in missions and goals, IAC effectiveness will be adversely impacted. The study finding collaborate observations by Beck and Plowman (2014) who noted that differences in organizational goals and missions' influences negatively collaborative response to disasters.

The study finding is also in line with observations by Casey, McCartha and Steelman (2015) who noted that diversities in organizational missions and goals create tensions during IA relationships, such tensions as a result of differences in agency goals and missions affect common problem space, joint decision making and also lead to agency goal directed which greatly influences IAC. However, it is not in all cases that diversities in agency goals, missions and mandates results to negative influence towards IAC success. Diversities in organizational goals, missions and mandates during IAC implies different resources and expertise which are key in

achieving IAC. For instance during collaborative response in case of a collapsed building, presence of paramedics, police officers, the military, NYS, private disaster response all having different goals and mandates means that the military will embark on evacuating casualties paramedics will specialize in taking them to hospital, the police provide security as they secure the scene. Therefore diversities in goals and missions is not inherently harmful during IAC. During interaction with key respondent KIR14 on diversities on goals, missions and mandates during CDM, the following observation was made;

Agency goals, missions and mandates influence IAC a lot, for instance, if we have differences as a result of our agency goals, missions and mandates, this affects how we interact and also teamwork among the different agencies. As a result, if the differences are not managed properly, agencies start working towards achieving their own goals, competition come in, supremacy battles and even conflict emerge. This greatly affects IAC negatively. A good example is during slums fires where we respond with relief aid to the victims and mobilize for them to have new buildings or structures, but the goal of the national government in most cases is to have such people relocated which in most cases contradicts the goal of most NGO's of resettling the victims in their inhabitants (Respondent KIR14).

From the key informant interview, having differences in goals, missions and mandates from the participating agencies influences IAC effectiveness, where such differences leads to conflicts of interests. Differences in agency goals and missions mean that the agencies will have differences in approaches, differences in perspectives and different ways of understanding the situation. If participating agencies as a result of differences in goals and missions do not agree on approaches and strategies, lack common understanding to the problem. This affects joint decision making, leads to the agencies competing to

outshine each other and also power asymmetries where each agency work towards goal directed behavior and justifying their course, thus making attainment of collaborative goals difficult.

From the qualitative data, there is need to manage goals and missions differences during IAC by ensuring that agencies participating in such collaborative arrangements pursues same goals or by taking advantage of the differences in allocation of roles and responsibilities. This will to timely response, increased interaction, common understanding to the problem and joint decision making, thus influencing IAC positively. However, the study finding is not consistent with Guimera et al., 2005 who noted that goal differences are essential in that they provide valuable ways of dealing with problems. According to Flemming et al 2015, agencies goal differences are not inherently undesirable. According to observations by Guimera et al. (2005) and Flemming et al. (2015), having differences in goals and missions during IAC is not a problem, rather how such differences are handled. If collaborative leadership considers diversities in goals and missions as important source of resources and ideas into achieving goals and objectives, then this will positively impact on the effectiveness of CDM.

The respondent's level of agreement was sought on the need for agencies to align their agency missions and goals during AIC, and the study finding indicated that majority (58.9%) of the respondents agree that there is need to for agencies participating in IAC to align their missions and goals while 30.5 percent of the respondents strongly agree that there is need for mission and goal alignment. Only a few (1.8%) of the respondents strongly disagree on the need for agencies to align their missions and goals during IAC, 6 percent undecided while 2.8 disagreed. Need to align missions and goals for different agencies during IAC as a variable had a mean of 4.32 and SD of 0.59. Mission alignment means placing each agencies missions into proper position or a state of agreement among different agencies with a

common cause enabling shared common values. Mission alignment during IAC enables agencies to act on one vision or goal. Having majority (58.9 %) agreeing and 30.5 percent strongly agreeing on the need for mission and goals alignment during IAC implies the crucial role mission alignment plays in collaborative success. By enabling sharing and adoption of similar values, this means having a shared way of approaching and understanding of problems, implies agencies will allocate more resources and there will be fewer incompatibilities throughout the relationships, hence need for missions and goals alignment. However, alignment of goals and missions during collaborations is only possible when participating partners share much in terms of culture, views, mindsets and even professional languages and practices. If the agencies tend to share less, then such alignment may not be possible and will imply poor stakeholder engagements during the collaborations.

The study finding is supported by a study by Provan & Kenis (2007) who noted that mission and goal alignment sustain collaborative practices, and another study by Provan & Lemaire (2012) who also noted that by aligning their goals and missions, agencies are more likely to arrive at consensus characterized by common understanding of the problems, that greatly influences IAC positively. The study findings by Kapucu, Garayev & Wang (2013) noted that alignment of mission and goals by DMA help sustain collaboration networks for longer by ensuring that there are few incompatibilities, shared values which mean adoption of similar ways of doing things, resulting to more stable and effective IAC arrangements. Gray and Purdy (2018) in their study attributed difficulties in collaborations to lack of goal alignment among partners. The study finding and corroborating literature indicates that there is need to align agencies missions and goals, but the urgency of demand for disaster response may not allow for such as a priority at the onset of the disaster, and also disaster response agencies do not get to a disaster scene at the same time. Thus, goal and mission alignment should be an ongoing

improvement process which should be undertaken when the initial collaborations have already started to improve and sustain collaborative processes. The importance of aligning goal, missions and mandates was also revealed during interaction with key informant KIR6 who narrated the following;

To avoid a situation where each agency wants to work towards achieving their own goals, we have realized that it is important when we meet during disaster scenarios to spare some times and set joint goals to pursue as a team, essentially this is the work of the in-charge incident command post or the overall leader of the collaborative arrangement. Failing to do this in most cases as has always taken us into circles

of competition amongst ourselves (Respondent KIR6).

From the key informant, goal and mission alignment is a critical element of success of IAC arrangements as it prevent agencies goal directed behaviours, and it is dependent upon the overall leadership to convene such an opportunity with agency representatives at the incident command post to align the missions and goals, while the response work is still ongoing. However, opportunities for discussing and aligning goals and missions are scarce especially during the response phase where time is of essence, other phases of DM like mitigation and preparedness may allow for participating agencies to align their missions and goals.

Inferential Analysis

Table 2: Correlations Summary

			OD
CDM	Bivariate Correlation	1	.203**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	266	266
Org_Dynamics	Bivariate Correlation	.203**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	266	266

Table 3: Regression Analysis Model for OD on IAC DM

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Std Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.533	.371		6.820	.000
	Org_Dynamics1	0.109	.063	.107	1.717	.001

a. Dependent Variable: IAC DM1

Source: Field Data, 2021).

From the correlations summary above, the correlation coefficient (r) = 0.203, p value 0.001, meaning that there is a significant relationship between OD and IAC, with a strength level of 23.3 percent. From the linear regression model above, it is clear that OD influence on CDM is significant where the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.109$, $\beta = 0.107$, $P = 0.001$) meaning that contribution of OD to the overall influence of IAC is 10.9 percent. The

implication is that there are other dynamics that also influences IAC arrangements effectiveness like human dynamics and process or implementation dynamics. The relationship between OD and IAC can also be concluded to be significant, since P -value was 0.000 which is less than 0.05, also for every 1 standard deviation unit increase in OD would result to 0.107 standard deviation unit increase on CDM, therefore, OD is a significant variable of CDM.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An understanding of how various organizational dynamics interacts and influences IAC performance is key to help in improving the establishment, sustenance and management of effective IAC disaster management arrangements. From research question, how do OD influence performance of IAC arrangement within NCC, Kenya, the study concludes that the various indicators of OD influence CDM differently, but they mutually work together to influence CDM effectiveness and that there are other dynamics other than OD that influences IAC effectiveness. It is imperative to note that having a policy in place to guide how IAC should be established, sustained and managed for

effective management of disasters is important. In addition, managing diversities resulting from differences in agency cultures, agency structures and procedures, agency values, beliefs and philosophies, agency mission, goals and mandates of the various agencies involved in the collaborations is key since such differences are inevitable and if not well managed, they compromise on the effectiveness of IAC. In light of this information, opportunities for agencies to interact regularly is critical since it provides a platform for such agencies to learn each other's culture, values, beliefs, strengths and weaknesses, this will go along in creating agencies knowledge of the other which is very vital during CDM operations.

REFERENCES

- Akhtar, P., Marr, N. E., & Garnevska, E. V. (2012). Coordination in humanitarian relief chains: chain coordinators. *Journal of humanitarian logistics and supply chain management*, 2(1), 85-103
- Al-Jenaibi, B. (2011). The scope and impact of diversity in the United Arab Emirates on initial study. *Journal for communication and culture* 1(2), 49-81
- Altay, N., & Labonte, M. (2014). Challenges in humanitarian information management and exchange: evidence from Haiti. *Disasters forthcoming*, 38(s1), S50-S72.
- Amadeo, K. (2013). Cultural diversity in organizational theory and practice, *Journal of Intercultural Management*, 2(2), 5-15
- Beck, T. E., & Plowman, D. A. (2014). Temporary, emergent interorganizational collaboration in unexpected circumstances: A study of the Columbia space shuttle response effort. *Organization science*, 25(4), 1234-1252
- Casciaro, T., & Piskorski, M. J. (2005). Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative science quarterly*, 50(2), 167-199.
- Casey, J., McCartha B and Steelman, A. (2015). Conflict and collaboration in wildfire. The Role of mission alignment: *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 75, No. 3 PP, 445-454
- Christensen, T., & Ma, L. (2020). Coordination structures and mechanisms for crisis management in China: challenges of complexity. *Public Organization Review*, 20(1), 19-36
- Clampitt, P. G., & DeKoch, R. J. (2010). *Transforming leaders into progress makers: leadership for the 21st century*. Sage Publications.
- Comfort, L. K., & Kapucu, N. (2006). Inter-organizational coordination in extreme events: The World Trade Center attacks, September 11, 2001. *Natural hazards*, 39(2), 309-327.
- Egli, V. L. (2011). *Impact of organizational culture on information sharing*. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLL FORT LEAVENWORTH KS SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES.

- Fleming, C. J., McCartha, E. B., & Steelman, T. A. (2015). Conflict and collaboration in wildfire management: the role of mission alignment. *Public Administration Review*, 75(3), 445-454.
- Gailbraith, J. (2002). *Designing Organizations*. Jossey-Bass Publishers San-Francisco, CA
- Gray, B., & Purdy, J. (2018). *Collaborating for our future: Multistakeholder partnerships for solving complex problems*. Oxford University Press.
- Guimera, R., Uzzi, B., Spiro, J., & Amaral, N. (2005). Team assembly mechanisms determine collaboration network structure and team performance. *Science*, 308(5722), 697-702.
- Güver, S., & Motschnig, R. (2017). Effects of Diversity in Teams and Workgroups: A Qualitative Systematic Review. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*. Vol. 7, No 2, June 2017
- Hartley, J., & Rashman, L. (2018). Innovation and inter-organizational learning in the context of public service reform. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 84(2), 231-248.
- Hileman, J., & Bodin, Ö. (2019). Balancing costs and benefits of collaboration in an ecology of games. *Policy Studies Journal*, 47(1), 138-158. doi:10.1111/psj.12292
- Hillman, A.J., Withers, M.C., & Collins, B.J. (2009) Resource Dependence Theory: A Review. *Journal of Management*, 35(6) 1404 – 1427.
- Hocevar, P; Jansen, E; Thomas, G. (2011). "Inter-organizational Collaboration: Addressing The Challenge." *Homeland Security Affairs*. 10 years after: The 9/11 Essays
- Kapucu, N., & Garayev, V. (2013). Designing, managing, and sustaining functionally collaborative emergency management networks. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 43(3), 312-330.
- Kapucu, N., & Garayev, V. (2011). Collaborative decision –making in emergency and disaster management. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 34(6), 366-375
- M'muthuiba, A. G. (2013). *Information sharing among humanitarian organizations in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Manghani, K. (2011). Quality assurance: Importance of systems and standard operating procedures. *Perspect Clin Res*, 2(1), 34-37.
- Martin, G. C. (2014). The effects of cultural diversity in the workplace. *Journal of diversity management (JDM)*, 9(2), 89-92.
- Maypole, J., & Davies, T. G. (2001). Students' perceptions of constructivist learning in a community college American history 11 survey course. *Community College Review*, 29(2), 54-79.
- McGuire, M., & Silvia, C. (2010). The effect of problem severity, managerial and organizational capacity, and agency structure on intergovernmental collaboration: Evidence from local emergency management. *Public Administration Review*, 70(2), 279-288.
- McLachlin, R., & Larson, P. D. (2011). Building humanitarian supply chain relationships: lessons from leading practitioners. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management. Journal of Humanitarian logistics and supply chain management* 1 (1), 32-49
- Molenveld, A., Voorberg, W., Van Buuren, A., & Hagen, L. (2021). A qualitative comparative analysis of collaborative governance structures as applied in urban gardens. *Public Management Review*, 23(11), 1683-1704. doi:10.1080/14719037.2021.1879912

- Ndar, A. (2019). *A Critical Analysis Of Kenya's Disaster Management strategy* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Nowell, B. (2010). Out of sync and unaware? Exploring the effects of problem frame alignment and discordance in community collaborative. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(1), 91-116.
- Ozbilgin, M., & Tatli, A. (2008). *Global diversity management: An evidence-based approach*. London, England: Palgrave
- Palttala, P., Boano, C., Lund, R., & Vos, M. (2012). Communication gaps in disaster management: Perceptions by experts from governmental and non-governmental organizations. *Journal of contingencies and crisis management*, 20(1), 2-12.
- Pechta, L. E. (2013). *A study of the effect of organizational communication cultures on interorganizational collaboration of crisis response*. Wayne State University.
- Pehkonen, E., & Pletila, G. (2003). Mathematical beliefs and different aspects of their meaning. *Zentralblatt für Didaktik der Mathematik (ZDM)*, 28(4), 101-108.
- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G.R. (1978). *External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row
- Pfeiffer, J. and Salancik, G.R. (2003) *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Business Books.
- Prasanna S. R. (2018). *The Relationship between Organisational Culture and Humanitarian Supply Chain Collaboration in Long-Term Aid*. Hanken University Dissertation. Helsinki Finland
- Provan, K. G., & Lemaire, R. H. (2012). Core concepts and key ideas for understanding public sector organizational networks: Using research to inform scholarship and practice. *Public Administration Review*, 72(5), 638-648.
- Provan, K. G., Kenis, P. N., & Human, S. E. (2015). Legitimacy building in organizational networks. In L. B. Bingham & R. O'Leary (Eds.), *Big ideas in collaborative public management* (pp. 121-137). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Provan, K., & Kenis, P. (2007). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18, 229-252.
- Rodriguez, S., Petrez, J., & Pardodei, M. (2003). *An Empirical Study About the Effect of Cultural Problematic on Organizational Learning in Alliances*. The Learning Organization
- Sanne, J. M. (2012). Learning from adverse events in the nuclear power industry: Organizational learning, policy making and normalization. *Technology in Society*, 34(3), 239-250.
- Sapir, G. (2019a). EM-DAT: *The Emergency Events Database-Universite Catholique de Louvain* (UCL) Retrieved from https://www.emdat.be/emdat_db/
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual review of psychology*, 64, 361-388.

- Simoneaux, S., & Stroud, C. (2014). A strong corporate culture is key to success. *Journal of Pension Benefits*, 22(1), 51-53.
- Stahl, G., Makela, K., Zander, L & Maznevski, M. (2010). A look at the bright side of Multicultural team diversity, *Scandinavian journal of management* 26(4), 439-447
- Sulaiman, H., Teo, S., Fernando, T., Shiau, C., Roslan, A., & Abdul, K. (2019). Multi Agency Collaboration in Flood Disaster Management in Sarawak Malaysia. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (IJITEE)* ISSN: 2278-3075, Volume-8 Issue-8S, June 2019
- Tang, P., Shao, S., Zhou, D., & Hu, H. (2021). Understanding the collaborative process and its effects on perceived outcomes during emergency response in China: From perspectives of local government sectors. *Sustainability*, 13(14), 7605.
- Torlak, G. (2004). Learning organizations. *Journal of Economic and Social Research*, 6(2), 87-116.
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, (2012). *How to Make Cities More Resilient. A Hand book for Local Government Leaders*. Geneva,
- Vuori, V., & Okkonen, J. (2012). Knowledge Sharing Motivational Factors in using intra organizational social media platform. *Journal of Knowledge Management* 16(4).
- World Health Organization, (2017). *A strategic framework for emergency management*. Geneva: WHO 2017
- Yassin, M. (2015, March 15). Official Statement of Malaysia Government in the third United Nations Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction