Leadership Conflict, Communication Strategy, and Resolution Effectiveness in the Structure of Polycentricity in Crisis Situations

by Chun-Yuan Wang
Central Police University,

Jyun-Wei Hong
Central Police University

Leadership Conflict, Communication Strategy, and Resolution Effectiveness in the Structure of Polycentricity in Crisis Situations

Chun-Yuan Wang[*], Jyun-Wei Hong[**]

Abstract

Proper leadership often plays an essential role in crisis management. Crisis leaders need to set priorities, integrate different agendas, and reduce the impact of crisis events in conditions of high uncertainty and urgency. Effective crisis leadership can quickly mitigate the impact of a crisis and bring members of the organization or the public back to their daily routines. With the increasingly frequent occurrence of large-scale crisis events, collaboration has become a crucial core competency for crisis leaders. In a collaborative crisis network, the power of policymaking roles will be temporarily replaced by mobilizing the resources of all parties more quickly. These changes present a dynamic, multi-level, and polycentric model. However, polycentric collaborative governance doesn't always work smoothly. Take COVID-19 as an example. Since the outbreak of the pandemic in December 2019, Americans have often complained about the inefficiency of the government's response. Governor Cuomo of New York State not only publicly criticized the Trump administration's inaction in controlling the pandemic at a press conference, but also disagreed on widespread screening policies with New York Mayor Bill de Blasio. In Taiwan, there have also been many cases where local chiefs and central pandemic prevention have not acted in harmony in the past two years. How to cooperate effectively at this time becomes the main purpose of this research when leaders who should set priorities have conflicts in a crisis. Given the importance of crisis communication, this research is driven by two main research questions: 1.What are the relationships among conflict management in a polycentric leadership model, crisis communication strategy, and communication effectiveness in a crisis? 2.Taking Taiwan's COVID-19 prevention policy and ractopamine pork import policy cases as examples, what are the relationships among crisis leadership, crisis communication strategies, and effectiveness? How to conduct a systematic analysis? Based on this analytical framework, this study intends to conduct in-depth interviews with officials of relevant ministries and councils of the Central Taiwan Committee and local heads to collect qualitative data, hoping to answer the above questions effectively, advance the

---

[*] Professor and Director of the General Education Center, Department of Police Administration, Central Police University. E-mail: g885422@seed.net.tw
[**] Ph. D. Student, Graduate Institute of Police Policy, Central Police University.
E-mail: pa776094@gmail.com (corresponding author).

research agenda in theory, and provide relevant suggestions for practice.

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 global pandemic clearly required multi-level interactions to help prevent and control it. However, in such a polycentric network structure, there were frequent conflicts of crisis leadership. For example, when the pandemic spread, the American people complained about the inefficiency of the government, the governors of the states rose up against the policies of the federal government, of which New York State Governor Cuomo was a representative. Cuomo was the first state official in North America to hold a press conference to expose the outbreak. He contradicted the policy of New York City's mayor, Bill de Blasio, of not adopting the full-scale screening that New York City had adopted. When the number of confirmed cases in New York State reached double digits, Cuomo took the lead in spending a $40 million outbreak control budget with the support of the state legislature. Later, he continued to criticize the Trump administration's laissez-faire attitude towards pandemic control as absurd at a press conference. Compared with Trump's attitude of shirking responsibility when he was asked about the shortage of testing reagents and insufficient quarantine in the United States at a press conference. As de Blasio ordered extending the closure of New York City until June, Cuomo took the opposite judgment: they had not yet reached the level of reopening. Cuomo argued that New York State had seen a downward trend in hospital admissions over the past month, thanks to a two-month lockdown of schools and non-essential businesses, and that the hospital system had not collapsed, so it could follow in the footsteps of southern states and "move over the hill to reopen economic activity".

In the past two years, Taiwan's pandemic prevention achievements have attracted international attention. However, after the China Airlines pilot incident and the Wanhua community infection in Taipei City in May 2021 led to a large-scale outbreak of the pandemic in Taiwan, the public gradually doubted the government's ability to prevent the pandemic, and the local policies promulgated by many local leaders were also inconsistent with the policies issued by the Central Epidemic Command Center. In addition, the government's announcement to officially open the importation of ractopamine-containing U.S. pork in January 2021 also raised local questions and has

even led to street protests. Part of the strength of social systems lies in how managers prevent serious conflicts and, when they do occur, how they resolve them to maintain the integrity of the system and the well-being of its members. Organizations adapt to changes in their environment by confronting major conflicts, resolving them, and reorganizing the need to deal with them. Conflict management is the practice of identifying and managing conflicts in an intelligent, fair, and effective manner. Conflict management requires skills such as effective communication, problem solving, and interest-based negotiation (Saeed et al., 2014).

It is clear from both theory and practice that true leadership is not easy, especially in certain situations and environments that are more challenging and demanding than others. The most demanding are those situations and circumstances where leaders and their areas of responsibility are faced with acute or potentially acute forms of risks, threats, hazards, and other related forms of physical, psychological, or material damage or trauma, and where the challenge of effectively resolving conflicts and overcoming extreme circumstances is even more noteworthy (Stern, 2017)。

LEADERSHIP CONFLICT IN CRSIS SITUATIONS WITH POLYCENTRIC STRUCTURES

Bowers et al. (2017) argued that all leaders have unique styles that give character to their approach to leading organizations. Leadership styles are categorized in a variety of ways and show that specific styles are more effective in specific situations. The transformational leader is described as assertive, adaptable, and logical. He will seek consensus after discussions with the deployment. This type of leader thinks strategically, is detail-oriented, sees the big picture, and can apply the logic of cause and effect to connect the dots from past experiences. However, such a leader needs time to build consensus and may not be the best fit in situations where there is a high degree of time pressure. The transactional leader is considered to be a leader who is meticulous in what he does. This type of leader focuses on the smallest details of the individual, is smart, follows rules, and gets the job done. Transactional leaders are bound by rules and regulations, which also keep them on their toes when it comes to managing the unexpected in most emergency crisis situations. Cognitive leaders are visionary and

imaginative. Their personality traits include leadership knowledge, expertise in a specific area, a big-picture perspective, strategic thinking, and a participatory approach to decision-making. However, Petriglieri (2020) also warned that a leader's leadership is incomplete when his charisma is based on vision alone; the limits of this visionary leadership can be clearly seen in crisis, uncertainty, and radical change.

The definition of crisis leadership that this study seeks to examine is the combination of situational factors specific to the situation coupled with internal and external pressures on the leader and the constraints and influences that crisis professionals are subjected to by these factors. The potential combination of multiple factors in a crisis situation increases the high-risk nature of decision making. Recent literature cites factors that affect crisis leaders as including extreme insecurity, vulnerability, high costs (including loss of life and the possibility of armed conflict and victims), greater unknowns and changing outcomes, enemies, media, transparency, politics, stakes, and prejudice (including the possibility of conflict). Relationships and Bias (Oroszi, 2018).

In these situations, crisis leaders need to think about three important issues: What are the core values at stake in this situation? What are the major uncertainties associated with the situation? And how can these uncertainties be reduced? And how much time is available to deal with the situation (Stern, 2017)? As a result, there is often a degree of uncertainty in crisis situations that leads to fear and stress in the community. Kapucu and Van Wart (2006) also noted that "catastrophic disasters are considered to be unanticipated or unusual in scale, interrupting the ability of the communication and emergency response system itself to make decisions, and are the beginning of disruptions in communication and collaborative cooperation" (p. 280).

Many studies have found that crisis operations are multi-organizational, cross-jurisdictional, multi-centered networks. They require horizontal coordination rather than top-down command and control. It is generally accepted that the decision-making process must be centrally directed in crisis response ('t Hart, Rosenthal, & Kouzmin, 1993). The term "polycentricity" implies a number of formally independent decision centers. Whether they are truly independent or constitute an interdependent system of

relationships is an empirical question in a given situation. If they consider each other in competitive relationships, entering into various contracts and cooperative commitments or resorting to central mechanisms to resolve conflicts, the various political jurisdictions in a metropolitan area can operate in a coherent and predictable pattern of interactive behavior. To some extent, they can be described as a "system" (V. Ostrom, Tiebout, & Warren, 1961, pp. 831-32). The structure of polycentric governance systems depends on the strength of formal institutions, the organizational capacity of individual policy participants, the level of centralized power granted to government participants, and the nature of the environmental collective action problem created by the ecosystem (Berardo & Lubell, 2016, p. 748).

However, multi-center collaborative governance is not always so smooth. Saeed et al. (2014) argued that conflict is a pervasive phenomenon, both in social and professional interactions. Landau et al. (2001) agreed that conflict exists in all interpersonal relationships: it is always there and always will be there. According to Rahim (1983), conflict is "an interactive process that manifests itself as incompatibility, inconsistency, or disharmony within or between social entities (individuals, groups, organizations, etc.)". Marquis and Huston (1996) define conflict as "internal disharmony caused by differences in ideas, values, or feelings between two or more people". Scholars from different disciplines have proposed definitions that look at conflict from different perspectives. However, the common theme that dominates all these definitions is the aspect of different needs, goals, or interests and the perceived or real interference of one party with the other. Conflict is often avoided and suppressed because of its negative consequences, and seeks to maintain consistency, stability, and harmony within the organization. This situation requires empirical research on conflict, focusing on its appearance, causes, consequences, emotional, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral aspects (Nadler & Tushman, 1999; Nauta & Kluwer, 2004).

CRISIS LEADERSHIP CONFLICT, COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND RESOLUTION EFFECTIVENESS

Take the example of Hurricane Katrina in 2005: when leaders fail to cooperate with each other, the negative effects are obvious (Boin et al., 2013; Roberts & Veil, 2016). In contrast to the traditional bureaucratic model, successful collaborative partnerships under collaborative governance expect effective communication and consensus building among cross-departmental actors. Since public sector culture somewhat hampers the possibility of administrators designing mechanisms to increase citizen engagement, it is necessary to adjust communication patterns, especially to strengthen the interpersonal communication and organization skills of public administrators. In particular, there is a need to strengthen the interpersonal communication and discourse skills of public administrators rather than to stick to their traditional roles.

Communication is a dynamic process that serves a dual purpose of facilitating learning, positive change, and empowerment. It is a process of continuous coding, decoding and interpretation, a way of sharing goals, attitudes, knowledge, information and opinions. It occurs in a social context where people play the role of both source and receiver (Abarquez & Murshed, 2004). Another requirement for effective communication is to disseminate information in a timely, reliable, and targeted manner. Therefore, three basic frameworks for communication are proposed: the use of an information clearinghouse for risk collection, assessment, and dissemination; the design of a communication system that continuously disseminates events of system negligence to increase the reliability of the system; and the use of innovative communication technologies to enable the effective integration and dissemination of information (Abkowitz, 2002). A strategy is a series of systematic and well-planned actions that combines different methods, techniques, and tools to achieve a desired change or goal within a specific timeframe and using available resources. A communication strategy is a series of organized actions designed to achieve a specific goal by implementing a combination of communication methods, techniques, and approaches. When designing a communication strategy for disaster mitigation and

preparedness, it should address and solve community-level problems through the use of research results, communication methods, technologies, and media (Okada & Matsuda, 2005).

There are three main frameworks for leaders to communicate in crisis management: image repair theory, situational crisis communication theory (SCCT), and discourse of renewal theory (DRT) (Liu et al., 2020). In terms of image restoration theory, it is important to observe how to restore the image and reputation of an organization through the use of response strategies in crisis communication. The purpose of communication is not only to convey a message to the receiver and make them understand it, but also to maintain a good and popular image of oneself in the receiver's mind. Benoit (1997) proposed five image restoration strategies: denial, evasion of responsibility, reduction of offensiveness, corrective action, and mortification. Coombs, a well-known crisis communication scholar, proposed the Situational Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT), which uses attribution theory to develop a system for evaluating organizational reputation threats. Different situational factors such as crisis type and crisis history are used to evaluate the threat of the current crisis to the organization, and crisis managers select crisis communication strategies based on reputation threats; the more reputation threats, the more accommodating strategies are chosen (Coombs & Holladay, 2007). SCCT believes that there are two important components of crisis communication, namely, "what to say" and "how to say it". The "what to say" refers to the "crisis response content" and consists of two major strategies: primary and complementary response content. The "basic strategies" include three types: 1. deny, 2. diminish, and 3. rebuild. "Supplementary strategies" are mainly support strategies, which include reminding people of the organization's good performance in the past, praising people's support for the organization in the past, or telling people that they are also victims (Coombs, 2007). As for the crisis response format (how to speak), Coombs (2015) also points out several important principles: quickly, speaking with one voice, consistency, and openness (p.130). Finally, Seeger and Ulmer (2002:127, 129) argue that discourse of renewal theory is an alternative position to apologetics and image repair theory in that it allows crisis communicators to construct crisis as a dynamic, natural, and

potentially positive organizing process, which may help to imagine a post-crisis future, liberate resources, and stimulate efforts to reconstruct and emphasize the potentially positive aspects of a crisis. DRT argues that organizations that recover quickly from crises communicate in a spontaneous, optimistic, ethical, forward-looking, and leader- and community-based manner.

The importance of multicenter collaborative governance is self-evident, as the close interconnectedness of people and things and the change in the operation of individual actors in the original system are sometimes not a panacea for problems, and can sometimes even be dangerous in crisis situations. Effective collaborative governance depends on the establishment of "linkage mechanisms" that influence the possibilities of collaborative formation. A pluralist actor or legitimate convener can facilitate synergy with credible leaders across boundaries in multiple areas related to the issue, and can bring together initial stakeholders. Linkage mechanisms are initial agreements that define the problem and can help clarify the risks or benefits to the organization in solving the social problem and how much help the organization needs to solve the problem, such as discovering that self-interest and interdependence are prerequisites for collaboration (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006). Shetach (2012, p. 26) argues that conflicts are frequent and are neither positive nor negative in nature. Since people have their basic differences, including: (1). There are various possible interpersonal differences, such as age, gender, race, feelings, culture, etc.; (2). People have contradictory or opposing interests due to their culture, location, role, department, hierarchy, and other factors. Therefore, people need to have constant communication. In such a situation, if there is weak structure, poor control, or other leadership issues, there is a tendency to have severe organizational dysfunction or loss of direction (Pratt et al., 2019).

Furthermore, the effectiveness of crisis communication can be discussed in terms of the relevance of crisis managers' communication dissemination in crisis events to the self-assessment of the "organization-public relationship" (Gruning & Huang, 2000), which includes: 1. the degree of mutuality of control (this characteristic reflects the inevitable power imbalance between the organization and its public. 2. trust is the level

of confidence and support that one party has in opening up to the other party. 3. relational satisfaction is "the degree to which one party has a preference for the other party because positive relationship expectations are reinforced". 4. commitment is "the degree to which one party believes and feels that the relationship is worth the effort" (Huang, 2001, p. 67). Commitment is "the extent to which one partner believes and feels that the relationship is worth the effort" (Huang, 2001, p. 67). In summary, one of the main functions of organizational leadership is to resolve conflicts. However, under the governance structure of a polycentric collaborative network, multiple leaders often become the main source of crisis leadership conflicts due to their different positions, perceptions, roles, or interests.

DATA AND METHODS

Case summaries

COVID-19 pandemic prevention policy

In May 2021, a large-scale outbreak of the epidemic occurred in Taiwan, and the first national three-level alert in history was implemented. The public gradually questioned the government's ability to prevent the epidemic, which led many local leaders to promulgate local policies that differed from those issued by the central epidemic command center, creating a phenomenon known as "counter-clockwise". For example, as the epidemic continued to rise and the number of confirmed cases gradually increased, the outlying islands of Kinmen, Penghu, and Matsu announced mandatory rapid screening of people arriving at the airport, a move that contradicted the central government's policy and was eventually deemed illegal. In Taipei City and New Taipei City, where the epidemic was the most serious in Taiwan, it was decided shortly after the outbreak that schools below the high school level would be closed in advance, but the central government considered that students' right to education and care should be taken into account; finally, Taipei City Mayor Ko Wen-je repeatedly and publicly questioned the vaccine policy that was crucial to the safety of the nation's life, saying that foreign vaccines had passed international certification and had clear prices and could be procured immediately, but the central government had signed a contract to

purchase a domestic vaccine that had not yet completed the experimental process. The epidemic tested not only the government's ability to respond to crises, but also the need for leaders to try to find solutions to problems under uncertain and unpredictable circumstances and to lead horizontal collaboration among professional groups, organizations, and departments through communication skills.

Ractopamine pork import policy

The Taiwan government announced without warning on August 28, 2020 that it would open the import of American pork containing clenbuterol (Ractopamine) from January 2021. It was only four months from the announcement to the end of the administrative procedure. The criticism from the outside world was that it was a surprise opening, and the communication is obviously insufficient, which once triggered Taiwanese pig farmers and the public to take to the streets to protest. Although the central government constantly emphasized the need to abide by international trade norms, and Taiwan's local pork has quality advantages, it should not overreact. However, imports of pork with lysine residues below 0.01ppm were allowed, but domestic pig farmers were prohibited from using lysine. This caused the public to question the political interests behind the government's decision, creating a crisis of trust. Therefore, after the announcement by the central government, local governments of counties and cities formed local self-government regulations one after another, stipulating that imported pork must be "zero-detected" or restricted from using lean pork. Some local governments even appealed to the judge for an interpretation of the constitution, hoping to clarify the division of powers and responsibilities between the central and local governments in setting food residue pesticide or animal drug safety tolerance standards.

Methods

The two main research questions of this study include: 1. What is the relationship between the conflict management mode and communication effectiveness of polycentric structures in crisis situations? 2. How does the case of Taiwan's COVID-19 epidemic prevention and the opening of imported pork work as an example to make

a systematic analysis? Under the multi-governance structure, the question facing organizations is no longer whether a crisis will happen, but when will it happen. How will the crisis play out? What type of disaster? This kind of thinking seems to be too negative, but in the face of rapid changes in the surrounding environment, the best way for an organization is to be prepared to deal with it. Unlike quantitative research, which focuses on explaining or predicting social phenomena, qualitative in-depth interviews focus on exploring and describing social issues. In this case, we want to explore the participation willingness and operational effectiveness of different actors in collaborative disaster management. Since it is exploratory frontier research, this research will define important related concepts through interpretation. A total of 9 interviewees have been selected for this study, and the interviewees are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3. List of in-depth interviewees

Workplace	Coding	Date of Interview	Gender
Changhua County	A1	2022/10/21	female
Changhua County	A2	2022/10/21	male
New Taipei City	A3	2022/10/25	male
Taichung City	A4	2022/10/31	male
Kaohsiung City	A5	2022/12/02	male
Taichung City	A6	2023/01/10	male
Taichung City	A7	2023/02/09	male
Miaoli County	A8	2023/02/15	male
Taipei City	A9	2023/03/08	male

Discussion

Multi-centered leadership conflict and conflict management model

Reasons for Polycentric Leadership Conflict

The contemporary organizational environment has increasingly emphasized complex adaptive systems, and under the concept of complex environment, multi-centers are composed of many actors and agents, which are sensitive to the environment and various situations in their initial state, adjust their behavior to the environment in

an unpredictable way, and oscillate between stability and instability. The complex system is dynamic and nonlinear as the multiple actors take emergency actions when they encounter an imbalance (Plowman et al., 2007). (Respondents A2, A5).

Because leaders have different backgrounds and positions, they have different perspectives on decision-making. In particular, the information gap is a major cause of conflict (Respondents A7, A9). The institutional collective action framework proposed by Kim et al. (2022) attempted to explain the complex synergies under government departments, describing how participants use these mechanisms to cope with collaborative risks and achieve collective action. In this framework, it is important to understand the nature of the conflicts faced (Respondent A3, A6).

Another concern is what is the authority of the actors in the established system? That is, why do we need to collaborate? And do the expected benefits of collaboration meet the expectations (Respondents A3, A2). Sometimes network collaboration is formed through the legal system. For example, according to Article 88 of the Medical Law, the central authority may divide medical regions, establish a hierarchical medical system, and formulate a medical network plan in order to promote the balanced development of medical resources and to coordinate the planning of existing public and private medical institutions and the reasonable distribution of manpower.

In addition, according to Article 5 of Taiwan's Infectious Disease Prevention and Control Act, the central Ministry of Health and Welfare is responsible for setting policies and related plans for infectious disease prevention and control, while local governments draw up implementation plans according to the prevention and control policies and plans set by the central government and the special epidemic prevention needs of their areas (Respondent A3). In such a dynamic relationship structure, when there is conflict between the leaders of the polycentric group in a crisis situation, they may be subverted and impacted by the uncertainty and conflicts that exist in a short period of time, and the established policy settings, policy goals, and institutional arrangements for policy development are under pressure, which may jeopardize the legitimacy of the leaders and challenge the institutionalization of governance (Boin &

t'Hart, 2003; 'Hart, 2003) (Respondents A4, A7). In addition, the benefits and costs considered by both parties in the communication and coordination process are key factors that affect the effectiveness of communication.Kim et al. (2022) further emphasized that there are risks involved in collaboration, even though it may benefit all parties involved (Respondents A1, A3).

Conflict management model

According to Article 16 of the Prevention and Control of Infectious Diseases Act, the central competent authority may when necessary invite relevant authorities to convene a coordination meeting on epidemic management and coordinate personnel, resources, and equipment of relevant authorities (agencies) at all levels of government, and supervise and assist local competent authorities in implementing preventive and control measures. Although government departments have developed formal systems to avoid or reduce the likelihood of conflict, it is worth noting that their effectiveness remains to be seen (Respondent A3). A compromise approach by leaders in dealing with conflicts may help to reach a consensus (Respondent A1).

As for how to avoid conflicts, Respondent A6 thought that returning to professionalism was the best way, but also emphasized that political involvement might complicate the situation (Respondent A6). Regarding the reasons for political involvement, Respondent A9 said that the conflicts come from too many political calculations (Respondent A9). Finally, it is worth noting that although avoidance style is considered inappropriate and ineffective in the communication process, if used strategically, it seems to be helpful in conflict management in certain situations (Respondent A2).

Crisis communication strategy and solution effectiveness

Application of crisis communication strategies

In contrast to traditional bureaucratic models of operation, successful collaborative partnerships in public administrations often expect effective communication and consensus building among cross-departmental actors. However, in practice, it is not

always possible to reach an agreement right from the start, and the process highlights the importance of communication strategies (Respondent A1). In addition, effective crisis communication needs to meet the needs of the stakeholders according to the type of crisis. Crisis requires different levels of response for different levels of the organization, and the leaders of the organization should assess the crisis and match the strategy to their needs (Respondents A7, A2).

When the existing system is in conflict or becomes an area of political wrestling, the timely use of informal communication channels can facilitate policy agreement and implementation (Respondent A9). 2021 saw the outbreak of an incident in which the Taipei City government failed to comply with vaccination regulations, which led to a crisis of public trust in the city government. The Taipei City government admitted to apparent lapses in vaccine control and launched an internal investigation team to try to rebuild the government's credibility and image (Interviewee A9).

Solution Completeness

The effectiveness of communication strategies is often enhanced when the proposed solution is consistent with the organization's goals and in the best interests of the organization (Respondent A6). However, it was noted that many leaders did not have experience in working together before the crisis, which may be an important factor in the effectiveness of communication (Respondent A2). In addition, Respondents A2 and A7 also mentioned the influence of political factors on the effectiveness of communication, in addition to Respondents A6 and A9, who believed that the involvement of political forces was a factor in the occurrence of conflict. Finally, the use of clearinghouses for risk collection, assessment, and dissemination, the design of communication systems to disseminate continuously events of system negligence work to increase the reliability of the system, as well as the use of innovative communication technologies to effectively combine and disseminate information (Abkowitz, 2002; Respondent A1).

Relational satisfaction

When there is an unequal power relationship in the communication process, and the communication strategy adopted is authoritative, even if the two parties finally resolve the conflict, it is not necessarily beneficial to the improvement of relationship satisfaction (Respondent A2). On the other hand, when professional knowledge is used as the starting point of communication strategy, it can create a relatively positive relationship with the other party in the communication and increase mutual trust between the two parties (Respondents A1, A8). In addition to using professional knowledge as the basis for communication, Interviewee A9 believes that establishing an open and transparent system is also the key to increasing trust.

Commitment

The implementation of the solution must be feasible, within the range acceptable to all stakeholders, and only when the promise is realized and regarded as effective communication (Respondents A1, A8). Finally, in order to resolve conflicts effectively, only through mutual communication and understanding can a good solution be achieved and become a driving force for policy progress (Respondent A8).

CONCLUSION

One of the purposes of crisis leadership communication is to influence the behavioral intentions of stakeholders—that is, the potential support level of stakeholders to the organization. However, many factors may affect the effectiveness of conflict resolution. The preliminary findings of this study are as follows: 1. Institutions can help establish collaborative relationships, but they can also create leadership conflicts within networks. The authority granted by the system and the costs of cooperation considered by the stakeholders are important factors that influence the formation of these relationships. In the public sector, the risk of being held responsible may be a critical factor in deciding whether or not to cooperate. 2. Leaders' perceptions of the conflict and challenges to authority, whether intentional or unintentional, can lead to conflicts among leadership networks. Therefore, appropriate communication strategies can help shape the solution and enhance the effectiveness of conflict

resolution in the process of finding a solution. 3. Strategically using avoidance techniques can help reduce the escalation of conflict situations and enhance the overall effectiveness of conflict resolution. 4. Political factors may exacerbate the complexity of leadership conflicts in polycentric networks and may affect the effectiveness of communication. 5. Establishing an open and transparent system and using professional knowledge as the basis for communication strategies can effectively enhance positive relationships between relevant stakeholders. This in turn facilitates the formation of the next cooperative relationship. The authors will continue to search for appropriate interviewees as the basis for data analysis in this study, to explore the research questions further, and to propose specific suggestions and directions for possible future reform.

REFERENCES

Berardo, R., & Lubell, M. (2016). Understanding what shapes a polycentric governance system. *Public Administration Review*, *76*(5), 738-751.

Bloisi, W., Cook, C. W., & Hunsaker, P. L. (2003). *Management and organisational behaviour*. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill.

Boin, A., & t'Hart, P. T. (2003). Public leadership in times of crisis: Mission impossible? *Public Administration Review*, *63*(5), 544-553.

Bowers, M. R., Hall, J. R., & Srinivasan, M. M. (2017). Organizational culture and leadership style: The missing combination for selecting the right leader for effective crisis management. *Business Horizons*, *60*(4), 551-563.

Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2006). Unpacking the halo effect: Reputation and crisis management. *Journal of Communication Management*, 10(2), 123-137.

Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2007). The negative communication dynamic: Exploring the impact of stakeholder effect on behavioral intentions. *Journal of Communication Management*, 11(4), 300-312.

Drummond, H. (2000). *Organizational behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Farazmand, A. (2007). Learning from the Katrina crisis: A global and international perspective with implications for future crisis management. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 149–160.

Grunig, J. E., & Huang, Y. H. (2000). From organizational effectiveness to relationship indicators: Antecedents of relationships, public relations strategies, and relationship outcomes. In J. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 23–53). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Huang, Y. H. (2001). OPRA: A cross-cultural, multiple-item scale for measuring organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13(1): 61–91.

Kapucu, N., Arslan, T., & Collins, M. L. (2010). Examining intergovernmental and

interorganizational response to catastrophic disasters: Toward a network-centered approach. *Administration & Society*, *42*(2), 222-247.

Kapucu, N., Arslan, T., & Demiroz, F. (2010). Collaborative emergency management and national emergency management network. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, 19(4), 452-468.

Kapucu, N., & Ustun, Y. (2018). Collaborative crisis management and leadership in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *41*(7), 548-561.

Kapucu, N., Yuldashev, F., & Feldheim, M. A. (2018). Nonprofit organizations in disaster response and management: A network analysis. *Journal of Economics and Financial Analysis*, *2*(1), 69-98.

Landau, S., Landau, B., & Landau, D. (2001). *From conflict to creativity: How resolving workplace disagreements can inspire innovation and productivity*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Liu, B. F., Iles, I. A., & Herovic, E. (2020). Leadership under fire: How governments manage crisis communication. *Communication Studies*, *71*(1), 128-147.

Marquis, B. K., & Huston, C. J. (1996). *Leadership roles and managers function in nursing*, 2nd ed., Lippincott, Philadelphia, PA.

McNamara, M. W. (2015). Unraveling the characteristics of mandated collaboration. In **J. C.** Morris & K. Miller-Stevens (Eds.). *Advancing collaboration theory: Models, typologies, and evidence*. NY: Routledge.

Morgeson, F. P. (2005). The external leadership of self-managing teams: Intervening in the context of novel and disruptive events. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(3)*, 497–508.

Murphy, P., & Dunn, P. (2012). Senior leadership in times of crisis. *Noetic Notes*, *3*(1).

Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1999). The organization of the future: Strategic imperative and core competencies for the 21st century. *Organizational Dynamics*, *28*(1), 16-45.

Nauta, A., & Kluwer, E. (2004). The use of questionnaires in conflict research. *International Negotiation*, *9*(3), 457-470.

Noran, O. (2014). Collaborative disaster management: An interdisciplinary approach. *Computers in Industry*, *65*(6), 1032-1040.

Olsson, P., Folke C., & Berkes, F. (2004). Adaptive co-management for building resilience in social-ecological systems. *Environmental Management, 34*(1), 75-90.

O'Toole Jr., L. J. (1997). Treating networks seriously: Practical and research-based agendas in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, *57*(1), 45-52.

Oroszi, T. (2018). A preliminary analysis of high-stakes decision-making for crisis leadership. *Journal of Business Continuity & Emergency Planning*, *11*(4), 335-359.

Our World in Data (2021/12/26). Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19) – the Data. Website: https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus-data. Visited on 2021/12/26.

Perrow, C. (1999). *Normal Accidents: Living with high-risk technologies*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Petriglieri, G. (2020). The psychology behind effective crisis leadership. *Harvard Business Review*. https://www.nonprofitjourney.org/uploads/8/4/4/9/8449980/the_psychology_behind_effective_crisis_leadership_petriglieri_spring_2020.pdf.

Pratt, T. J., Smollan, R. K., & Pio, E. (2019). Transitional leadership to resolve conflict, facilitate change and restore wellbeing. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2018-1419.

Saeed, T., Almas, S., Anis-ul-Haq, M., & Niazi, G. S. K. (2014). Leadership styles-relationship with conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *25*(3), 214-225.

Shetach, A. (2012). Conflict leadership: Navigating toward effective and efficient team outcomes. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, *35*(2), 25-30.

Stern, E. K. (2017). Crisis, leadership, and extreme contexts. In M. Holenweger, M. K. Jager, & F. Kernic (eds.), *Leadership in extreme situations* (pp. 41-59). Springer, Cham.

Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, membership and organization. *Psychological Bulletin*, *47*(1) 1-14.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ:

Prentice-Hall.

Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. (2002). The interface of leadership and team processes.

Group and Organization Management, 27, 4–13.