MANAGING CONTRADICTION AND SUSTAINING SUSTAINABILITY IN INTER ORGANIZATIONAL NETWORKS THROUGH LEADERSHIP: A CASE STUDY

Neman Muradli[1], Fariz Ahmadov[2]

[1,2] *International Graduate and Doctorate Center, Azerbaijan State University of Economics, Baku, AZ1007, Azerbaijan*

E-mails:[1] muradlineman@gmail.com ; [2] ahmadovfs@hotmail.com

Abstract. The broadly-based literature on organizational studies has concentrated mainly on resolving organizational issues through acquisition of resources, decreasing transaction costs and incentives. In other words, scholars commonly examine the organization itself, at the expense of inter-organizational relations. However, with the emergence of "network governance" organizations are no longer to be considered as isolated but rather as actors that actively seek to maintain themselves in a given situation by collaborating with other actors, forming organizational networks. This study utilizes a network perspective to examine the influence of leadership on management of unity/diversity contradiction in educational program implementation. A deductive approach is used to generate propositions by analyzing implementation efforts in respect of educational program in Azerbaijan: "State Program on education of Azerbaijan youth abroad in the years 2007-2015". The analysis examined a research question: How do leadership activities affect to manage unity/diversity contradiction in network? This question was addressed using qualitative method. In education program, unity and diversity were found to exert an important influence on success of network. At the implementation level, understanding of unity and diversity concept helps network managers to attract diverse actors to the network and unite them around network's goal. The coordinating units of network manage the unity/diversity contradiction by activating member organizations, facilitating interaction, framing the structure and mobilizing network members. Thus, effective management of contradiction increases the network's capacity to access information, financial resources and experiences.

Keywords: inter-organizational network; contradiction; sustainability; leadership

1. Introduction

Educational programs play a significant role in the creation of high level human resources; in the last fifteen to twenty years, most such programs have been implemented through inter-organizational networks (Hjern & Porter, 1981; O'Toole & Montjoy, 1984; Kickert et al., 1997; Hall & O'Toole, 2000; Monni et al., 2018). This may be

due to the growth of social and economic complexity or problems nowadays known as "wicked" (Rittel & Webber, 1973; Borisov et al., 2018), challenging the capacity of government to respond.

Increasing complexity requires government to introduce new forms of organizational management in order to produce complex solutions. For this reason, governments look to solve major social and educational problems by implementing large-scale programs under a multi-organizational arrangement or network. Scholars have shown that multi-organizational or network-based management is a more adequate way of resolving issues (Thurmaier & Wood, 2002; McGuire, 2006; Le Roux, Kelly, Sanjay, & Pandey, 2010, Mura et al., 2017).

Kettl (2002) noted that many complex modern problems do not fit within organizational boundaries and that multi-organizational arrangements are needed to address such problems. Network-type program implementation involves configuration of governmental, non-governmental, and private organizations, and of formal structures and institutionalized rules and norms. One important factor in network-based implementation of programs is collaboration among organizations, which creates opportunities for pooling of limited resources (Huxam &Vangen, 2005). Management mechanisms in such networks are designed to solve problems by collective action, and collaboration in networks therefore enables organizations to solve problems that cannot be solved by a single organization alone (McGuire & Agranoff, 2010); this view is especially strong in program implementation. However, collaboration in networks is not an easy task, and more than 50% of organizational alliances fail (Kelly & Schaan, 2002; Park & Ungson, 2001).

Scholars suggest that failures and difficulties in network collaboration arise from complexity in the network (Park & Ungson, 2001) and from the dynamic and ambiguous nature of collaborations (Huxham, 2003). One of the main reasons for complexity in network is inherent contradiction between unity and diversity. Network need to be formed from diverse members in order to successfully reach its goal and yet need to be united. The unity and diversity contradiction represents a paradox of belonging—when individuals or organizations naturally strive for both self-expression and collective partnership. Scholars identified the contradictory view of unity and diversity in leadership, "how people request autonomy (diversity) while demanding control of anything dependent on them (unity)" (Carranza, 2008). On the one hand, high unification of similar organizations in network fails to achieve coalition. On the other hand, high diversity slows progress to achieve network's goals, since generation of familiarity and trust take time.

Overcoming the challenges of contradiction in network requires effective management and leadership. There are several cross-sectoral approaches to leadership (e.g., power-influence, traits-skills, situational, and reciprocal). However, the present study examines leadership within the boundaries of inter-organizational networks. Here, leadership refers to "network leadership"—the activities network managers engage in while directing and coordinating the work of group, such as structuring work relationships (Bass, 2008), and in particular, the capacity to bring parties to the table by using four distinct categories of leadership activities; activation, facilitation, framing, and mobilization.

The purpose of this study is to understand the challenges and opportunities faced by network managers in trying to manage diverse relationships with participating organizations and unite them. This research will examine inter-organizational arrangements on "State Program on education of Azerbaijan youth abroad in the years 2007-2015", which extensively engaged in capacity building of youth, improving socio – economical condition in Azerbaijan. By analyzing existence of unity/diversity contradiction the aim is to uncover the role of leadership on management of this contradiction as a program implementation strategy. One specific question guide this research: How do leadership activities affect to manage unity/diversity contradiction in network?

In examining the research question, this study aims to explain how new concepts of "leadership" influence on contradiction management and how leaders activate, facilitate, frame, and mobilize network members. Therefore,

the research question aims to test how four leadership activities—activation, facilitation, framing, and mobilization—separately influence unity/diversity contradiction in networks.

2. Definition of Network

Any study of networks must clearly begin from a definition of the term "network." In general, there is no unique definition of a network, which has been characterized from divergent perspectives. Grandori and Soda (1995) explained the term from an economic perspective, placing networks at the core of organization theory. They described inter-organizational networks in terms of the wide variety of possible relationships among organizations, such as joint ventures, strategic alliances, and consortia. More specifically, the inter-organizational network has been explained as an "institutional form of coordinating, governing and economic exchange relations among actors" (Ebers, 1997). The main notion here is that there is no common ownership in a network, and organizations make their own decisions.

Agranoff and McGuire (2001) characterized networks as "multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be achieved, or achieved easily, by a single organization." At its simplest, this definition approaches networks from a public management perspective. Similarly, Bryson et al., (2006) defined networks as "cross-sectoral collaboration…the linking or sharing of information, resources, activities and capabilities by organizations in two or more sectors to achieve an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately". Provan, Fish, and Sydow (2007) and Weber and Khademian (2008) defined networks from the perspective of relationships. According to Weber and Khademian, networks are established by organizations, individuals, and groups for exchange of relations (Weber & Khademian, 2008).

From a collaboration perspective, Liebeskind, Oliver, Zucker, and Brewer (1996) considered trust and mutual interests as the main components of networks understood as a long-term interchange based on trust and mutual interests. Kreiner and Schultz (1993) and Dubini and Aldrich (1991) defined networks in terms of "collaboration among individuals and organizations." Gray and Wood suggested that collaboration occurs "when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain" (Gray and Wood, 1991).

Organizations are linked together in different ways and for different purposes. Each such arrangement has its own targets, and the relevant definition of a network may differ accordingly. Despite differences across the various literatures, these definitions share several common characteristics. Almost all definitions note freedom of decision-making in participating organizations, repetitive interactions among actors, and primary reliance on collaboration. In this light and for present purposes, the term "network" is used exclusively here to refer to "*a number of interdependent organizations are gathered for special purposes, which negotiate to each other and share information, resources and activities"*. The present study defines networks from a public perspective, where the targets of participating organizations were to extensively engage in capacity building of youth, improving socio – economical condition in Azerbaijan. The above definition captures how these organizations come together and how they act in pursuit of their goals.

3. Unity and diversity contradiction in network

Whether within the public or private sectors, managing inter-organizational networks is an inherently difficult task. According to Brass et al, (2004) in inter-organizational network, members build long-term cooperative relationship by retaining control over its own resources as well as decide how to use it. Collaborative relationship among members have also been studied under inter-organizational relationship, coalitions, partnership, collaborative agreements (Provan, Fish, and Sydow, 2007). One of the specific types of inter-organizational network called as "goal-directed network", which encompasses "groups of three or more legally autonomous

organizations that work together to achieve not only their own goals but also a collective goal'' (Provan and Kenis, 2008). In order to govern members of network effectively this type of network forge a special governing body, which called as ''network administrative organization'' (NAO) (Provan and Kenis, 2008). Within network, NAO functioning as leader and it is responsibility of NAO's staff to manage tension generated by the simultaneous demands to sustain unity (bringing organizations together to function in accord) and diversity (drawing out unique contributions based on members differences).

The concept of unity in inter-organizational networks refers to the state of being in accord, without deviation. Some network researchers explain unity based on self-interest paradigm. They assume that, in inter-organizational network, organizations are eager to unite in order to maximize their preferences and desires. Emerson (1972) examined unity perspective based on power dependence theory. He argued that groups in inter-organizational network unite because of to exchange valued resources. Marwell & Oliver (1993), explain unity in network as "mutual interests and the possibility of benefits from coordinated action". Samuelson (1954), developed public goods theory, which assume that individual or groups unite not because to maximize self-interest, instead, the motivation to forge unity is to maximize collective ability of group to leverage resources and mobilize for collective action.

Unlike concept of unity, diversity refers to ''the demographic and cultural characteristics of an organization's labor force, customers, competitors, or population at large'' (Post, 2007). In other words, diversity is a structural and institutional traits within and across organizations. There are different approaches to diversity in organizational and inter-organizational levels. According to Van Knippenberg et al., (2004); Williams & O'Reilly, (1998), heterogeneous groups have the potential to produce better solutions than homogeneous groups. In a diverse group relationships among people with different sets of contacts, information and resources generate creative problem solving, decision-making and idea creation. Homogeneous groups have limited recourses and perspectives compare to heterogeneous groups thus it makes barrier for their performance.

Moreover, theories such as social identification, social categorization, and similarity attraction concentrate on negative sites of diversity. The main argument of these theories is that similarity of values and attributes on demographic variables improve attraction, therefore, people prefer to work with those similar to themselves. Basic argument underlying in social categorization theory is that people differentiate themselves with others based on social categories such as, age, gender and they are more interested to interact with in-group members than out-group members. Furthermore, similarity-attraction theory implies that interpersonal similarity such as values and attitudes are important determinant of interpersonal attraction. According to this perspective, there is higher performance in a group, which members belong to the same social category than a group members who belong to various social categories (Van Knippenberg & Shippers, 2007).

In network literature based on several theories such as group behavior (Smith and Berg, 1987), collaborative behavior (Huxham 2003; Wood & Gray 1991), organizational behavior (Cyert & March 1963; Lawrence & Lorsch 1967), scholars identified some important contradictions such as, internal versus external legitimacy, flexibility versus stability and efficiency versus inclusiveness (Provan & Kenis, 2008). Although this study recognize abovementioned contradictions, it was another contradiction—that of unity versus diversity— is a driving force in NAO's efforts to ensure collective action. Therefore, this study focus on a specific contradiction that the NAO must address to effectively govern the network: the unity-diversity contradiction.

Organizational and network literatures suggest that unity and diversity contradiction in network is characteristic of any organized effort, in small group collaboration as well as in inter-organizational relationships (Mintzberg, 1983; Poole & Van den Ven, 1989). Inter-organizational network management implies fragmentation and dependence at the same time. The central idea of fragmentation put importance on collaborative advantage of each partner to bring different resources to the network. Diversity, however, reveals tensions about collaboration

because of organizational differences (Huxham and Beech, 2003). Some scholars claim that diversity is reducing network performance (Sampson, 2007). However, in an effective inter-organizational network both unity and diversity are similarly important. Unity-diversity contradiction in networks mirrors the integration-differentiation duality managers of individual organizations face and must address strategically (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967).

In network level, Provan and Kenis (2008) make correlation between unity-diversity and efficiency-inclusiveness tension. They link unity with efficiency and diversity with inclusiveness. In NAO if manager's priority is efficiency he/she would promote unity over diversity and inclusiveness. However, if a manager interested primarily with diversity, he/she would promote inclusiveness over efficiency. According to Mizrahi and Rosenthal (1993), unity-diversity tension may occur along with age, gender or ideological dimensions as well as along with power dimension, "where unity generates power for network but may be difficult to achieve due to power differences among members of network.

To sum up, based on reviewed literature this article claim that unity-diversity contradiction is a distinct contradiction in network governance not researched well by scholars. Therefore, this is a rare study to concentrate unity-diversity contradiction in case of "State Program on education of Azerbaijan youth abroad in the years 2007-2015".

4. Leadership in inter-organizational networks

Traditionally, the perceived characteristics of leaders include education, skills, intelligence, and personality, all of which are seen to contribute to making them leaders. Such approaches imply a hierarchical structure, but network leadership has other requirements. The main purpose of this section is to review the literature on leadership in network management in a collaborative context and to explore network leadership activities. This review will not encompass the entire field of leadership but will focus on those dimensions of management that are of specific relevance in achieving effective collaboration and efficient program implementation within a network.

According to McGuire and Silvia (2009), "leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating of individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives". They distinguish leadership in organizational and network contexts, positing that these two are quite different; while organizational leadership is more task-oriented, network leadership is seen to be more people-oriented (Mc Guire &Silvia, 2009).

Some scholars (e.g., Bennis&Nanus, 1997; Northouse, 2007) have viewed leadership and management as different constructs. Bennis and Nanus (1997) stated that management is "doing things right" whereas leadership is "doing the right things." Similarly, Northouse (2007) described management as accomplishment of activities whereas leadership involves the ability to "influence others and create vision for change." From this perspective, Northouse (2007) defined network leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal." According to Novak (2008), possible approaches to leadership in networks include distributed, relational, and transformational approaches. Under the distributed approach, Pearce and Conger (2003) defined leadership as "shared leadership," involving "influence and leadership broadly distributed among a set of individuals" (Pearce &Conger, 2003). Houghton, Neck, and Manz (2003) proposed that the main factors for shared leadership are selection of appropriate team members, establishing group norms that support the new concept, empowering team members, and improvement of leadership skills. The relational approach defines leadership as a set of multilevel interdependencies and relations among individuals; more specifically, "leadership occurs in and through relationship and network of influence" (Flether & Kaufer, 2003). Unlike the distributed and relational approaches, the transformational view of leadership emphasizes individual qualities such as the personality and values of the leader and assumes that leadership occurs in a leader-follower context (Bono&Anderson, 2005). Lipman-Blumen's (1996) concept of "connective leadership "focused on leaders' connections with others, both internally and externally.

It is also important to highlight that leadership is pivotal for successful collaboration. Bryson, Crosby, and Stone (2006) proposed two leadership positions: formal and informal, arguing that in order to become an effective leader, formal leaders-coordinators, co-chairs-need skills, commitment, personality and etc. Additionally, they categorize leaders as "sponsors" or "champions"; while sponsors are not closely involved in day-to-day work and are not active participants in collaboration, champions are actively involved in both (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006).

For this study, the core theoretical frameworks explaining leadership activities are those of McGuire and Agranoff (2010) and Huxham and Vangen (2005). Although the typology of activities differs, the functions are broadly similar. According to Agranoff and McGuire (2001), Vangen and Huxham (2004) networks entail four main leadership activities: activating, facilitating, framing, and mobilizing. The main purpose of activation is to achieve program goals through identification and incorporation of persons and resources (Hunter & Agranoff, 2008). In other words, selection of the "right players with right resources" for an effective network (McGuire & Agranoff, 2001), as echoed by McGuire and Silvia (2009). On this view, during selection of network members, managers must assess and tap potential members: "…activation is critical component of leadership because resources such as money, information, and expertise can be integrating mechanisms of networks" (McGuire & Silvia, 2009).

Facilitating refers to the enhancement of participation and managing inequalities in networks (Vangen & Huxham, 2004). Bartunek et al., (2000) distinguished two categories of leadership action: initiating (chosen mainly by traditional authoritative leaders) and facilitating (mostly preferred by participative or collaborative leaders). They emphasized the need for facilitating actions in highly complex situations to create favorable conditions for network members and to ensure strong interaction among participants. Successful facilitation ensures high collaboration among members, minimizing "informational blockages to cooperation" (McGuire & Silvia, 2009).

Framing aims to "…establish and influence the operative rules of network, influencing its prevailing values and norms and altering the perception of network participants" (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001). More specifically, this activity helps to establish a network identity and culture (Hunter & Agranoff, 2008). The main feature of this function is to create value in the network and then to communicate this value among network actors. By creating value, network leaders can strengthen mutual endeavor and processes of interaction and negotiation among participants. Without effective framing, there can be no value creation, and ultimately, no mutual understanding. By effective framing, leaders influence each participant, creating an effective working structure and a collective vision for the network, helping participants to understand its unique characteristics.

Finally, mobilizing aims to secure commitment and support network purposes (Agranoff & McGuire, 2001). By mobilizing organizations, "…leaders develop support for network processes from network participants and external stakeholders" (McGuire & Silvia, 2009). The main behaviors for this activity include maintaining network legitimacy and incentive-based motivation.

It is further argued that in each type of network, managers use different kinds of leadership activity—for instance, in voluntary networks, managers need to focus more on activation and framing activities than on facilitation and mobilizing. Applying these management functions and other behaviors, this study will seek to establish describe which activity (or activities) was more important in managing "State Program on education of Azerbaijan youth abroad in the years 2007-2015".

5. Method

Given the complex, innovative, and under-researched character of this research topic and the nature of contradiction and leadership, an in-depth qualitative study yielding rich data is the most appropriate research methodology. Primary data for this study were collected by conducting questionnaire-based interviews. Data collection was shaped by the formal structures of Program; the coordinating unit and participating governmental, non-governmental, and private organizations were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Other data sources included scholarly works published in academic journals, books written by experts, official publications produced by government, NGOs and media sources of all types produced anywhere.

Interviews represent the main source of data for this study. In total, 20 interviews were conducted with 25 interviewees, including 5 managers, 12 organizational members, and 8 staff from the network coordination unit. Informants were interviewed in 5 group interviews and 5 individual interviews. Informants were selected from two groups: the coordination unit and member organizations.

Managers of the coordination unit provided broad information about leadership activities in the network. Coordination unit managers review the opinions and decisions of other members, making them important informants for present purposes. Staff members also provided important data about leadership and collaboration. By comparison with unit managers and staff, organizational members provided less information but some useful insights.

All group meetings were conducted in person. Interviews with coordination unit managers were also face-to-face. Because of confidentiality and complex problem solving responsibilities, all interviews with managers were face-to-face, which provided more informative responses to the questionnaire. Most organizational members' main concern was confidentiality (in relation to law and professional ethics) and after receiving those assurances, they provided broad and useful data about both networks.

Group interviews were conducted on the networks side. The first group interview involved six participants; after that, it was decided to limit group interviews to a maximum of three people as the first group interview was not time-efficient and interviewees were unable to maintain focus. One of the benefits of group interview was that group dynamics could be exploited as participants reflected on each other's inputs (Frey and Fontana, 1991).

Most of the interview questions in this study were open-ended, providing an opportunity to seek explanations beyond the initial responses. At the same time, it was important to avoid leading questions, which suggest a particular answer (Herman & Bentley, 1993). By avoiding use of closed and leading questions, it was possible to keep the conversation focused on the topic while allowing participants room to shape the content of the discussion.

The interviews were divided equally in two parts, each containing core questions. This structure facilitated in-depth and detailed answers. The first part was introductory, including greetings and opening questions to obtain general information about the interviewee's work, position, and responsibilities. The second part of the questionnaire concerned internal management of the network. In this section, to obtain detailed information, more time was spent with coordination unit managers than with the other two groups (members and staff). The second part of the questionnaire analyzed possible relationships between unity/diversity contradiction and leadership in education program.

All of the main interview questions were correlates of the research questions, and all provided broad information about the manager's leadership role in the network and its possible effects on collaboration. Most coordination unit managers had participated in previous government program networks, which enabled comparison of the government's current and previous networks.

5.1. Participant observation and documentation

The second method of data collection used in this study was observation and documentation. The main advantage of this method is the potential to explore what people say and what they think. According to Patton (Patton, 2002), this method enables the observer to see and discover which things people pay more attention and less attention to in a given setting (which helps to understand interactions) and to obtain information about critical issues that people prefer not to talk about.

Documents that are produced for purposes other than research, including newspapers, internal regulations, minutes of meetings, diaries, and websites, can also be used for research purposes. Corbetta identified some advantages of documents as research sources in that they make it possible to understand all stages of processes, they are often easy to access, and documentary information is not subject to subsequent distortion (Corbetta, 2003).

The observation and documentation process here involved reviewing minutes of meetings, unofficial talk, newspaper articles, press releases, meeting agendas, grant proposals, videotapes of presentations, and annual reports. During this research, over 70 documents related to external public sector activities and to internal management of networks, including regulations, ministerial rules, statutes, minutes of meetings, and other recordings were reviewed, along with observation of 20 major events.

Observation and document analysis made it possible to interact effectively with network members and to obtain in-depth views from different perspectives regarding collaboration in the network. It was also possible to interpret these views to identify common trends from which conclusions and a best practice model could be constructed in relation to program implementation in Azerbaijan, identifying key participants, their activities, and key issues in the networks.

5.2. Validity and Reliability

In general, when conducting a qualitative research, validity and reliability are an important factor to take into consideration since they help to identify the objectivity of the research. According to Bryman and Bell (Bryman&Bell, 2012), reliability and validity are separated into internal and external concepts. Internal reliability is typically assesses whether there is enough researcher in the study group thus the observer can agree as regards to what they see and hear. External reliability refers to "what extent a research can be completed again with results comparable to the original study" (Grimsholm&Poblete, 2010). Willis argues that main purpose of internal and external validity is to evaluate a research study's quality In other words, internal validity checks if the research can be duplicated with the same outcomes for another researcher. External validity, on the other hand, means to what extent findings can be applicable on other researches (Willis, 2007).

Validity of data in this research was enhanced through triangulation. Triangulation is a method to check and establish validity by analyzing research question from multiply perceptive and also usually used in qualitative research to strengthen reliability. In this study triangulation was done through across information sources-interviews in this case and document analysis. At the same time, triangulation also allow to understand of state programs implementation.

On the other hand, all interviews has been recorded and transcribed and sent back to the interviewees for additional control. This also decrease the possibilities of manipulating interview data.
Moreover, in order to enhance the reliability of the research much time was spent to explain questions to interviewees, which gave opportunity for deep and *clear* understanding. A conscious effort was made to interview

both higher level and lower level officials, urban and rural participants and with people from variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds. This diverse and large number of interviewing gave me an ability to not to rely on a single informant whose information might be unreliable.

6. Findings

Firstly, this research argued that unity and diversity of the network are important with respect to the success of network. High level of diversity in a network may create tensions as opposing ideas arise from differences in organizational values, cultures and goals. Therefore, unmanaged diversity may cause conflict and disunity among network member organizations. Successful networks need both unity and diversity simultaneously. Network in this study managed unity/diversity contradiction by uniting member organizations around metagoal, common identity and shared experience. Network sustained diversity along certain dimensions and generated unity along others and in this way they could deal with unity/diversity contradiction. By investigating "State Program on education of Azerbaijan youth abroad in the years 2007-2015" network, this research finds that unification around metagoal, experience and identity and sustaining diversity around several dimensions- organizational size, geographical difference, type of clients and so on. - is key to manage unity/diversity contradiction effectively and increase network effectiveness.

Second, leadership concept in this research addresses the role of coordinating unit of the network to resolve unity/diversity contradiction. This research launches a new role for Network Administration Organization (coordinating unit in this case) playing a leadership role to facilitate program implementation and intervene into the tensions. New leadership concept constituting features of network leadership study, is not meant to exclude network leaders existing roles, rather supplementing them.

In order to improve capacity of youth in Azerbaijan network type program implementation is important. Managers of network need to co-operate with member organizations. Moreover, they need to perceive tensions or contradiction in network and activate, facilitate, frame and mobilize members and to arrange relation-building to influence contradiction. Before activating right and diverse members, managers should take into account that this diversity will become disunity if it is not managed well. Facilitating in network constitutes relationship-building among members and these relationships contribute to opening the door between NAO and participant organizations, which can constitute the foundation of cooperation. Setting up network's values, norms and procedures are important in managing unity/diversity contradiction as it forms base for interaction. In network (or State Program on education of Azerbaijan youth abroad in the years 2007-2015), general norms and procedures are created by coordinating unit. Framing build interaction among members and therefore, it is important in managing the unity/diversity contradiction. Furthermore, effective mobilizing is fostering trust among network members and to coordinate diversity. Mobilizing helps to move the network forward toward achieving its targets and builds support.

The findings point to how contradiction emerges in network. Although contradiction is not only problem in network management, the main focus remains on it. Furthermore, cultural and political factors are not investigated directly. Because political and cultural factors in network management is scarce and in most of previous studies there were little evidence for the existence of unity/diversity contradiction in network. The findings show, moreover, that the development of education program changed constituents and organizations' opinion about program implementation. Organizations participated either directly or dispatched their managers to the education program. When participant organizations start to design program, they did not trust that each actor solely dedicated to the desired goal. In some instances, actors were criticized each other in network meeting and smaller organizations accused bigger ones not to meet schedule of decision-making. Network coordinating unit worked out human resource selection and attached personnel with appropriate knowledge.

Thirds, one of the most significant findings is how openness of the decision-making process and organizational autonomy increase interaction among members. Under open decision-making process, each member of the network accepts the final decision because it has been negotiated and agreed between sides. In both networks, each participating organization remains autonomous, and it is important for each organization to keep its identity. Without an open decision-making process and organizational autonomy, it would be hard to keep all of members together.

This research also finds that in the context of education program, unity/diversity contradiction was managed in networks by generating unity along network's metagoal, shared identity and shared experiences and by sustaining diversity among organizational size, culture, clients served.
Finally, research findings suggest that unity/diversity contradiction is important to improve network's capacity. Unity with diversity improves capacity of network because this structure creates an opportunity to network members to exchange information, generate trust, to get access to financial resource and learn others' expertise.
Response to social problems such as lack of skillful human resource depends highly on information. When government initiate to tackle social problems, organizations deal with information that is multidimensional, multi-sector. Management of unity/diversity contradiction allows the network to benefit from both of them. Contradiction is crucial to exchange information in network as diverse members bring their diverse subject-related information and put them in common.

In network, for a coordinated and effective action, organizations require accessing information about problem in order to respond it properly. In order to timely respond to the problem, information exchange among organizations needs to be encouraged and supported by coordinating unit. For increased performance to occur, information exchange needs to be flow continually among members within network. Therefore, member organizations must encourage to information exchange within network not only for their success but also network existence. Continuous flow of new information among members is lead to improve performance since timely flowing information help organizations in decision making. Management of unity/diversity contradiction supports effective information exchange in network. Building unity among diverse members encourage them to join a decision, which made based on diverse information.

In addition to information exchange, effective management of unity/diversity contradiction also gives an opportunity to organizations to access financial resources. Participating in a network benefits members by providing opportunities to access financial resources.

Prevailing wisdom holds that effectively managing network group can increase effectiveness by reducing costs without requiring formal structural changes. With control over resources, members have much influence in setting the ground rules and there is more check and balance in network than a single organization. A big concern of funders is that how funding organization spend money, because there are many wrongdoing scandal cases about spending of funded financial resources in organizational history. However, network system is more immune to such scandals due to its effective control system.

Since single organization does not have opportunity to attract enough financial resources to their projects, this shifts their interests to participate in network and unite with other members. For members of network then, the basic premise is that participation in network activities will increase access to resources and by uniting with other network members, costs can be reduces. Therefore, if network members do foster principled engagement to network and increase the capacity for joint action, it could be expect that it will increase access to resources.
Seeking and establishing unity among diverse members of network has been embraced by organizations for both proactive reasons such as information exchange and access to financial resources. Taking advantage of expertise also include among key opportunity given as a result of effective management of unity/diversity contradiction in network. During program implementation, each member of a network concentrate on their own area of expertise

and this helps to create whole network level expertise. In other words, diverse organizational expertise in a given field support to form a network level expertise in a given field.

Solution to nationwide problems requires different approaches and participation of organizations from a number of professional disciplines. It is also important to recognize that while educationists may have well-developed skills within their own area of expertise, it should not be assumed that they have all of the skills needed to implement program effectively. Therefore, all network members need the opportunity to learn the appropriate problem solution skills that will enable them to function as part of a network and therefore the network to function effectively as a unit.

If contradiction managed effectively in network, it leads to improve capacity of networks in three ways. First, it involves organizations to exchange information and continuous flow of new information among members is lead to improve performance and build a network's capacity to make decisions timely. Second, management of unity/diversity contradiction strengthen network capacity by giving individual organizations access to resources. Finally, contradiction management help organizations increase expertise, which enables them to be more efficient by combining their knowledge and ultimately form a network level expertise in special field.

7. Conclusion

The findings in this research have practical implications for institutions. Network management need constantly analyze because environment which they work are changing and organizational differences cause problems to interact. It is important for network leaders to realize that member organizations are diverse in terms of organizational size, culture, values and etc. and in each stage of program implementation NAO should be able to unite diverse members.

Before to start program implementation NAO is recommended to comprehensively analyze potential network members and realize differences among them. Unity and diversity produce similarly powerful yet contradictory requests with the possibility to undermine network objectives. Contradiction emerges in that neither pole can be favored over the other in the long-term and both must be amplified. Unity without diversity would produce inefficiency, because diversity is the reason unity exist in network. Building unity distinguishes organization-level and network level goals that jointly create an exchange system that determines the attainment of both. At the beginning, network member organizations may not have a common goal, but NAO need to unite member organizations around common goal that keeps network together over the longer term. NAO is advised to create common identity, which helps members to relate to each other's contexts and understand the underlying mechanisms and assumptions of network. Similarly, when members have share experience they may share exchange knowledge relate to the context and they are learning by doing so.

Moreover, this research identifies four leadership activities –activating, facilitation, framing and mobilizing- to manage contradiction in network. In networks that targeted to tackle social problems, member organizations are brought together by NAO – in our case this is coordinating unit. One of the significant implication of this study is that if NAO conduct leadership activities in a proper way network will be able to improve its capacity. NAO managers are recommended that activation of participants with an array of specialist expertise and diverse resources is needed to generate the necessary capacity to address target problems. In the activation process, one of the important factors is the relevance of members' working scope to the program, and this is an important criterion for selection of members. During network formation, NAO manager needs skills of persuasion and strategic problem-solving to activate collaboration among participants. An important factor for persuasion of members is trust, which is closely related to the successful management of unity/diversity contradiction in the network and enhances the coordinating unit's capacity to activate key members.

There are many internal problems and disputes in networks that can be solved by effective mediating skills on the part of NAO managers. Keeping communication flowing effectively is a vital function of facilitation, opening channels to solve confrontation in timely fashion. Network leaders may have good skills of integration, negotiation, or dispute resolution, but without sufficient information about values, organizational culture and geographical differences, it is almost impossible to reach targeted goals in the network. Similarly, style of language, open decision making, balanced dialogue and confrontation, and benchmarking are practices that recommended to NAO managers to use in order to strategically manage unity/diversity contradiction.

Every member of a network is autonomous, and for that reason, it is not easy to win the commitment of each member to the network. To achieve high commitment to the network's goal among members, NAO managers should ensure common norms and values in the network. By creating rules, norms, and culture of the network, NAO managers can generate a network-specific identity, shared identity, and enhance diversity within the network.

In order to manage unity/diversity contradiction effectively, managers must not only concentrate on potential members but must try to mobilize small communities and external members as well. By mobilizing all members, managers can use the broad knowledge of all participants to increase the network's external legitimacy.

If contradiction managed effectively in network, it improves capacity of networks in three ways. First, it involves organizations to exchange information and continuous flow of new information among members is lead to improve performance. Second, management of unity/diversity contradiction strengthen network capacity by giving individual organizations access to resources. Finally, contradiction management help organizations increase expertise, which enables them to be more efficient by combining their knowledge and ultimately form a network level expertise in special field.

References

Agranoff, R.; McGuire, M. 2001. Big questions in public network management. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(3): 295-327. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a003504

Borisov, A.; Narozhnaia, D.; Tarando, E.; Vorontsov, A.; Pruel, N.; Nikiforova, O. 2018. Destructive motivation of personnel: a case study of Russian commercial companies. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues,* 6(1): 253-267. https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2018.6.1(16)

Bartunek, J. M.; Walsh, K.,; Lacey, C. A. 2000. Dynamics and dilemmas of women leading women. *Organization Science,* 11(6): 589-610. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.6.589.12531

Bass, B. M. 2008. *Bass' handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.

Bennis, W.; Nanus, B. 1997. *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Boltanski, L.; Chiapello, E. 2005. *The new spirit of capitalism*. London: Verso.

Bono, J. E.; Anderson, M. H. 2005. The advice and influence networks of transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90(6): 1306-1314. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1306

Brass, D. J., Galaskiewicz, J., Greve, H. R., and Tsai, W. 2004. Taking stock of networks and organizations: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Journal,* 47(6): 795-817. https://doi.org/10.5465/20159624

Bryman, A.; Bell, E. 2012. *Social research methods*. 4th ed; U.S, NY: Oxford University Press: NY, U.S.

Bryson, J.M.; Barbara C.C.; Melissa M.S. 2006. The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Special issue, Public Administration Review* 66(s1): 44–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.x

Burns, T.; Stalker, G. M. 1961. *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock.

Corbetta, P. 2003. *Social research theory, methods and techniques*. 1st ed; London: Sage Publications.

Cyert, R.; James M. 1963. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dubini, P.; Aldrich, H. 1991. Personal and extended networks are central to the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Business Venturing,* 6(5): 305--313. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(91)90021-5

Ebers, M; Grandori, A. 1997. *The forms, costs and development of inter-organisational networking. The formation of inter-organisational networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emerson, R.M. 1976. Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *2,* 335-362. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003

Frey, J. H.; Fontana, A. 1991. The group interview in social research." *Social Science Journal*, 28(2):175-187. https://doi.org/10.1016/0362-3319(91)90003-m

Grandori, A.; Soda, G. 1995. Inter-firm networks: Antecedents, mechanisms and forms. *Organization Studies*, 16(2): 183-214. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069501600201

Gray, B.; Wood D.J. 1991. Collaborative alliances: Moving from practice to theory. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(1): 3-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886391271001

Grimsholm, E.; Poblete, L. *Internal and external factors hampering SME growth: A qualitative case study of SMEs in Thailand.* Unpublished; manuscript in preparation.

Hall, T.E.; O'Toole L.J. 2000. Structures for policy implementation: An analysis of national legislation, 1965-1966 and 1993-1994. *Administration & Society*, 31 (6), 667-686. https://doi.org/10.1177/00953990022019281

Herman E.; Bentley M. 1993. *Rapid assessment procedures (RAP): To improve the household management of diarrhea*. Boston, MA.

Hjern, B.; Porter, D.1981. Implementation structures: A new unit of administrative analysis. *Organization Studies*. 2(3): 211-227. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068100200301

Houghton, J.; Neck, C.P.; Manz, C.C. 2003. *Self-leadership and super-leadership: The heart and the art of creating shared ladership in teams. Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Pearce, C.L.; Conger, J.A. (Eds); CA, U.S: Sage Publications.

Hunter, M.S.; Agranoff, R. 2008. *Metro high school: An emerging STEM school community*. Columbus, OH: The PAST Foundation.

Huxham, C. 2003. Theorising collaboration practice. *Public Management Review*. 5 (3): 401-423. https://doi.org/10.1080/1471903032000146964

Huxham, C.; Beech, N. 2003. Contrary prescriptions: Recognizing good practice tensions in management. *Organization Studies*. 24(1): 69-93. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603024001678

Huxham, C.; Vangen, S. 2005. *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*, 1st ed; London: Routledge,

Kettl, D. F. 2002. *The Transformation of governance: Public administration for Twenty-First century America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kickert, W. J. M.; Klijn, E. H.; Koppenjan, J. F. M. 1997. *Managing complex networks*. London: Sage

Kreiner, K.; Schultz, M. 1993. Informal collaboration in R & D. The formation of networks across organizations. Organization Studies. 14(2): 189 - 209. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069301400202

Richard H.; Lawrence, P.R; Lorsch, J.W. 1968. Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 13(1): 180-186. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391270

LeRoux, K.; Paul W.B.; Sanjay, K. P. 2010. Interlocal service cooperation in U.S. cities: A social network explanation. *Public Administration Review.* 70(2): 268-278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02133.x

Liebeskind, J.P.; Oliver, A.L.; Zucker, L.; Brewer, M. 1996. Social networks, learning and flexibility: Sourcing scientific knowledge in new biotechnology firms. *Organization Science*. 7(4): 428-443. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.4.428

Lipman, B.J. 2000. *Connective leadership: Managing in a changing world*. 1st ed; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marwell, G.; Oliver, P. 1993. *The Critical Mass in Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGuire, M. 2006. Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. *Public Administration Review.* 66(s1): 33-43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00664.x

McGuire, M.; Silvia, C. 2009. Does leadership in networks matter? *Public Performance and Management Review*. 33(1): 34-62. https://doi.org/10.2753/pmr1530-9576330102

McGuire, M.; Agranoff, R. 2010. *Networking in the Shadow of Bureaucracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mintzberg, H. 1983. *Power in and around organisations (The theory of management policy series).* London, U.K: Pearson College.

Mizrahi, T.; Rosenthal, B.B. 1993. *Community organization and social administration: Advances, trends and emerging principles*. London, U.K: Routledge.

Monni, S.; Palumbo, F.; Tvaronavičienė, M. 2017. Cluster performance: an attempt to evaluate the Lithuanian case. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 5(1): 43-57. http://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2017.5.1(4)

Mura, L.; Ključnikov, A.; Tvaronavičienė, T.; Androniceanu, A. 2017. Development Trends in Human Resource Management in Small and Medium Enterprises in the Visegrad Group. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 14(7): 105-122 http://www.uni-obuda.hu/journal/Issue78.htm

Northouse, P. G. 2012. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 6th ed.; NY, U.S: Sage Publications.

Novak, J.M. 2008. Inviting passionate educational leadership. *Passionate leadership in education*. B.Davies., T. Brighthouse., (Eds.); London: Sage.

O'Toole, L.J.; Montjoy, R.S. 1984. Interorganizational policy implementation: A theoretical perspective. *Public Administration Review*. 44(6): 491–503. https://doi.org/10.2307/3110411

Patton, M.Q. 2002. *Qualitative Research and Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods Evaluation Methods*. 3rd ed; US, CA: Sage Publications.

Pearce, C.L.; Conger, J.A. 2003. *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*, 1st ed.; US, CA: Sage Publications.

Poole, M. S.; Van de Ven, A.H. 1989. Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *Academy of Management Review*. 14(4): 562-578. https://doi.org/10.2307/258559

Provan, K. G.; Fish, A.; Sydow, J. 2007.Interorganizational networks at the network level: A review of the empirical literature onwhole net works. *Journal of Management*. 33(3): 479-516. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307302554

Provan, K.G.; Kenis, P.N. 2007. Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.* 18(2): 229-252. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015

Rittel, H.; Webber, M. 1973. Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Science.* 4(2):155-169. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01405730

Sampson, R. C. 2007. R&D alliances and firm performance: The impact of technological diversity and alliance organization on innovation. *Academy of Management Journal.* 50(2): 364 –386. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.24634443

van Knippenberg, D.; Schippers, M.C. 2007. Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology.* 58:515-541. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085546

Williams, K.; O'Reilly, C. A. 1998. *Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. Research in Organizational Behavior* 1st ed; Barry M. S.; Robert M. S. (eds.); New York: Elsevier.

Willis, J.W. 2007. *Foundations of qualitative research.* 1st ed; U.S, CA: Sage Publications.

Neman MURADLi is the visiting lecturer of International Graduate and Doctorate Center, Azerbaijan State University of Economics. **ORCID ID**: orcid.org/0000-0001-6584-6013

Fariz AHMADOV is the Head of International Graduate and Doctorate Center, Azerbaijan State University of Economics. **ORCID ID**: orcid.org/0000-0003-2042-9018

Register for an ORCID ID:
https://orcid.org/register