ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul466

Epistemic Methodological Decontextualization of Health Security

Albert Moritis Oti Agyemang[1]; Gloria Assuah[2]; Nana Owusu Boampong[3]

[1;2;3]Seton Hall University

Publication Date: 2026/07/20

Abstract: This paper examines how the executive positions of stakeholders and intellectual pride strip science of its intellectual framework and independence, thereby politicizing health systems for personal and localized interests. Executive privilege is deployed politically to undermine scientific integrity, prioritizing either the specific interests of key stakeholders or poorly integrated interdisciplinary programs. Intellectual pride frequently extends beyond specialty and epistemic domains, misleading global responses, as demonstrated during the initial stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. While interdisciplinary collaboration is accepted within contemporary intellectual fields, it must never serve as a rhetorical cloak for speaking authoritatively outside one's scope of competence. Furthermore, institutional restructuring should not target a methodological flattening—an epistemic strategy used to subordinate empirical evidence for political gains.

- ***Methodology:***

This study employs a conceptual-hermeneutic framework and structural analysis to evaluate the interface between public health governance, political influence, and epistemic validation. By analyzing systemic and historical case studies—specifically the global institutional responses to the COVID-19 pandemic and national-level policy implementations such as Ghana's National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS) and Free Education School-Feeding policy—the paper models how political and financial variables distort scientific outcomes.

To avoid ending up in epistemic luck, policy implementations must be considered within comprehensive contextual frameworks. Obscuring any part of stakeholder involvement worsens systemic outcomes; neglecting funding or key stakeholder dynamics increases the probability that implementations will be brushed off or undermined, particularly when empirical data contradicts political desires. To prevent the decontextualization of health system projects, political involvement must be integrated at the very beginning of programs alongside a constitutionally mandated institutional conscience keeper. Finally, epistemic humility must synthesize all operational narratives to prioritize common ground between genuine executive priorities and broader public considerations.

Keywords: *Epistemic Deconceptualization, Specialty and Executive Privilege, Stakeholder's Consideration, Political Methodology, Intellectual Pride, Conscience Keeper, Policy, Governance, Public Health, Global Health, Implementation, Health Administration, KATH.*

How to Cite: Albert Moritis Oti Agyemang; Gloria Assuah; Nana Owusu Boampong (2026) Epistemic Methodological Decontextualization of Health Security. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(7), 330-334. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul466

I. INTRODUCTION

To eliminate health mediocrity and reduce adverse health conditions, professionals propose practical indivisibility and semantic-hermeneutics as vehicles to achieve universal quality in healthcare delivery. This ambition captures the imaginations of United Nations health systems globally and localized institutions such as the Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital (KATH). However, the domestic and international health policies of various administrations provide a stark empirical demonstration of epistemic methodological deconceptualization, systematically stripping epidemiological realities of their scientific and social contexts to serve localized political interests and enacting an epistemic assault on data integrity. Epistemic methodological deconceptualization operates as a two-sided coin consisting of executive privilege and intellectual pride. Security systems politically utilize their financial and political muscles to gain control and compromise the data integrity of various administrations, including healthcare. To counteract this distortion, science must be separated from political manipulation so that interdisciplinary research remains grounded in structural accountability and intellectual humility.

This paper argues that executive privilege and intellectual pride politicize health systems, undermining scientific integrity and prioritizing stakeholder interests over

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul466

empirical evidence. It emphasizes the critical importance of considering all stakeholders' involvement, including their financial and political influence, from the very beginning of a program to ensure its success and avoid epistemic luck.

➢ *Accordingly, this Paper is Structured into Two Main Analytical Sections:*

- Specialty and Executive Interest: Exploring how scientific independence is stripped to politicize the research process, gaining political control to prioritize executive interests and privileges.
- Intellectual Pride and Epistemic Luck: Investigating how professionals transgress their fields of competence to make claims and judgments in external intellectual domains without verified knowledge or credentials, leading to ineffective policy implementation.

Finally, the paper concludes with brief analytical remarks and institutional recommendations.

II. METHODOLOGY

To investigate the systemic distortions within health governance, this paper utilizes a conceptual-hermeneutic and structural policy framework. Rather than relying on isolated empirical data, the methodology focuses on evaluating the interface where political power intersects with scientific validation. The analytical design follows a three-tiered approach:

- Conceptual Definition: Establishing strict boundaries for operational terms, primarily defining *Executive Privilege*, *Intellectual Pride*, and *Epistemic Luck* within public health administration.
- Structural Power Mapping: Analyzing how funding mechanisms and executive oversight act as political variables that either support or suppress empirical research findings.
- Case Study Synthesis: Evaluating historical and contemporary global events—specifically the structural dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic response and institutional policy frameworks in developing health ecosystems (e.g., Ghana's NHIS)—to isolate the systemic causes of administrative and policy failure.

By integrating these structural assessments, the framework models how shifting from an empirical paradigm to a rhetorical framework alters policy outcomes, ensuring the analysis remains grounded in institutional critique.

➢ *Specialty and Executive Interest*

- Executive Privilege and Political Considerations: Defined within this scope as the act of undermining scientific independence and politicizing the research process, utilizing political control to prioritize epistemic luck over scientific integrity and the common good, specifically to bypass administrative accountability and advance executive advantages regardless of alignment with project interests.

➢ *Shifting Paradigms and Epistemic Trespassing*

Many intellectuals find the notions of rhetoric implementation unintelligible yet fail to use their acquired knowledge to advance systems. The common thread in deconceptualizing projects is a shifting paradigm of health security away from a holistic, empirical framework toward rhetoric and short-term political expedience. This politically propositional divisiveness creates unnecessary external funding dependencies and fragmented protocols across various specialties, often aimed at removing critical demographic and epidemiological data points from public view to achieve specific political objectives. Because our administrative environment is shaped by scientific culture and linguistic schemes, epistemic trespassers—such as politically appointed CEOs judging matters outside their fields of competence—must be educated in intellectual humility to prevent artificial consolidation and false solidarity. It is well established that different actors, including policymakers, researchers, and advocates, frequently transgress each other's organizational responsibilities. Accepting a degree of trespassing in this age of interdisciplinary research is recognized within contemporary intellectual domains (Ballantyne, 2018). However, a methodological episteme must never serve as a rhetorical cloak for speaking authoritatively beyond one's empirical purview; it must function as an exercise of epistemic humility. Creating knowledge gaps between researchers and policymakers leads directly to the misunderstanding and misinterpretation of research findings, which in turn fuels misinformation and disinformation.

➢ *Institutional Distortions and Executive Overreach*

A syndrome familiar among stakeholders driven by executive considerations is that of inconsiderably pontificating beyond privilege (Soji, 2023). During the COVID-19 pandemic, global outcomes could have been optimized if not for the misinformation and disinformation propagating from political actors who used executive privileges to override scientific truth. Substitution of political expedience for empirical validation fundamentally compromises the integrity of public health institutions (Pai, 2023a).

Within this intellectual climate, the proceedings of the Canadian Conference on Global Health demonstrate that the epistemic methodological decontextualization of health is an ongoing institutional habit rather than a mere theoretical abstraction. This is evident whether through the reduction of pandemics to viral metrics (Canadian Association for Global Health [CAGH], 2022), or the technocratic pivot toward artificial intelligence solutions over upstream social determinants (CAGH, 2022). Global stakeholders consistently strip and undermine scientific independence and systemic socio-health integrity, substituting genuine equity with sterile, top-down metrics and institutional self-preservation.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul466

To ensure intellectual accountability, the historical space of interdisciplinarity must not serve as a rhetorical cloak for speaking authoritatively outside one's scope of competence. Otherwise, deliberate institutional restructuring operates merely as a methodological flattening—an epistemic strategy to subordinate empirical evidence to political preference. Weaponizing executive power as a definitive blueprint to strip local authorities of institutional representation and isolate health governance from vital socio-economic and public health realities prevents security systems from responding to ground-level epidemiological truths (House of Commons Library, 2026). Shifting control to political stakeholders to establish absolute executive authority without robust systems of checks and balances undermines scientific independence and politicizes the research process. Utilizing political control to prioritize epistemic luck and single-minded lenses over scientific integrity and the common good serves only to bully administrative accountability to advance executive privileges that diverge from institutional priorities and national narratives (UK COVID-19 Inquiry, 2024).

➢ *Funding Influence and Stakeholder Dynamics*

Because the availability of funding resources directly influences the uptake of policy and research findings, constitutional checks and balances must be established to protect research findings that do not align with the dominant political agenda. This prevents conflicts and competing priorities among stakeholders during decision-making processes. In contemporary institutional cultures, administrations frequently use political voice and executive power to bully or scrap programs they deem non-urgent, making it difficult for policy and research to separate from rhetoric. Most funding authorities tend to brush off intended policies or undermine implementation when empirical data reveals realities they do not wish to acknowledge or that conflict with their funding interests. Stakeholders consistently advocate for initiatives that match their direct interests, while actively working contrary to the success of projects that do not.

The attitudes, beliefs, methodologies, and interests of stakeholders exert practical influence on all implementations. They remain deeply skeptical of accepting recommendations that conflict with their agendas. During the initial stages of the COVID-19 vaccine rollout, a significant disruption occurred regarding scientific uptake and vaccine hesitancy, driven primarily by an institutional failure to establish clarity regarding effectiveness and quality. The genuine interests of key stakeholders were fractured, and recommendations appeared politically driven. Systematically, stakeholder dispositional claims departed from scientific justifications (Kelly, 2023). Science was treated as an entity separate from politics, leaving global systems poorly coordinated. This misalignment persisted until primary global stakeholders recognized the necessity of strengthening the interface between scientific evidence and political involvement.

While professionals often struggle to secure the attention of higher-level leadership for systemic improvements, the financial and political muscles of these stakeholders cannot be obscured if implementation success is to be achieved. In practice, when frontline staff are integrated directly into the research process, they are significantly more likely to understand and support subsequent implementation due to an established sense of ownership and institutional belonging. Therefore, to safeguard health systems from the deconceptualization of vital projects, political involvement must be structurally welcomed and integrated at the very inception of any program. Epistemic humility must be utilized to synthesize all operational narratives, prioritizing genuine executive stakeholder priorities alongside broader public considerations.

III. INTELLECTUAL PRIDE AND EPISTEMIC LUCK

➢ *Epistemic Warrant and Specialty Transgression*

When professionals go beyond their fields of competence to make claims in specialties where they lack verified knowledge or accredited experience, policy initiatives fail irrespective of their conceptual design. Health and scientific fields rely on strict procedural rules and justification systems. When preconditional requirements are ignored or initiated in error within a project, the resulting decisions cease to be scientific or aligned with empirical criteria.

Intellectual pride prevents professionals and practitioners from acknowledging the necessity of intellectual humility, converting scientific processes into games of epistemic luck. Due to incentive sensitization attached to certain high-status specialties, professionals frequently step beyond their epistemic domains—physicians assume the roles of specialized surgeons, and lawyers make clinical judgments. During the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, scientific interventions could have achieved higher efficacy in preserving life, but widespread epistemic transgression misled public understanding. While established scientists and institutional leaders worked to suppress the pandemic structurally, pseudoscientists and unauthorized executive stakeholders actively misinformed the public (Suzman, 2020).

Executive stakeholders frequently assumed the roles of impromptu scientists and policy analysts, working behind the scenes to undermine programmatic operations through their intellectual influence, financial backing, and political leverage. This dynamic compromised foundational national initiatives, such as the National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS) policy and the Free Education School-Feeding policy of Ghana:

- The NHIS Framework: Although currently operational, the policy has been structurally modified to fit the localized interests of implementers and powerful stakeholders. Driven by incompetent influences rooted in intellectual pride, the program was stripped of its correct evaluative framework and expert advice, leaving it unguided. While the policy mandates that patients should not face point-of-care charges during hospital visits, fees are routinely levied despite valid insurance coverage.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul466

- Systemic Consequences: Ethically grounded scientific decisions are transformed into institutional failures simply to parade the intellectual status of administrative figures (Mayernik, 2019).

➢ *The Limits of Epistemic Luck*

When policymakers and shareholders lacking epistemic warrant neglect scientific truth and communicate only what matches public desires to secure trust, they construct policies on shallow foundations, creating an unstable antithesis that prevents effective implementation. In any administrative system where authority dismisses scientific evidence because it contradicts institutional preferences, the system fails to achieve its project goals despite its financial muscles and executive influence. While science is subject to error, replacing a scientific claim that steps out of justified belief with non-scientific dogmas jeopardizes institutional systems, particularly within healthcare environments where stakeholders continue to operate via epistemic luck (Pritchard, 2007).

Over the past eight years, global systems have witnessed pandemics evolving with limited control because rigorous science and distinct specialties have been relegated to epistemic luck, deconceptualizing scientific norms to favor executive considerations. Science has been compelled to conform to public relations, and ethics has been subordinated to politics, pitting stakeholders against stakeholders and interest against interest. Comparative records indicate that excess mortality during the COVID-19 pandemic was higher in Western jurisdictions where political narratives and pseudoscience overrode empirical advice than in nations that prioritized systematic scientific procedures with fewer political interventions (The Economist, 2023; World Health Organization, 2020).

When institutional interest lapses into intellectual blindness to promote specific propositions, it obscures scientific methodology and reduces complex realities to political narratives or hyper-standardized administrative metrics. This dynamic strips structural governance of proper institutional requirements to chase immediate, localized returns on investment.

To prevent institutional restructuring dominated by mediocrity and intellectual pride over scientific intelligence, any commitment to elevate epistemic luck and prioritize executive interests over specialty frameworks must be monitored. This requires creating an independent institutional **c**onscience keeper tasked with reporting microscopic realities directly, thereby removing the pretense of accountability. Competing priorities and uncoordinated agendas among stakeholders result only in fragmented, conflicting policies and the neglect of practical research. A dedicated scientific committee must be established to formally inform political committees whenever executive privilege is invoked.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The structural analysis yielded the following results regarding the mechanics of health system decontextualization:

Table 1 Mechanism of Institutional Policy Failure in Administrative Governance

Evaluated System Variable	Observed Administrative Behavior	Systemic Outcome / Penalty
Executive Privilege	Prioritizes short-term political expedience and top-down metrics over local realities.	Compromises data integrity and creates needless external funding dependency.
Intellectual Pride	Decision-makers transgress fields of competence to issue authoritative edicts.	Policy failures; conversion of empirical processes into games of epistemic luck.
Funding & Leadership Asymmetry	Brush off or actively suppress research findings that contradict localized agendas.	Fragmented policy formulation; frontline implementation resistance.

Furthermore, the study confirms that during global health challenges, substituting political expedience for empirical validation leads to measurable real-world consequences. For example, the synthesis of pandemic records shows that jurisdictions where politics overrode scientific advice suffered higher excess mortality rates compared to those that maintained strict adherence to established scientific protocols.

On a national level, the evaluation of Ghana's NHIS demonstrates that when intellectual pride steers a program away from its guiding advisory framework, an operational disconnect arises. Despite clear statutory designs prohibiting point-of-care billing, patients are continually subjected to arbitrary fees due to an uncoordinated administrative structure that serves the immediate localized interests of implementers rather than the common good.

V. CONCLUSION

Executive privilege and intellectual pride function as methodological strategies to politicize health systems and broader administrations, undermining scientific integrity and prioritizing stakeholder interests over empirical evidence. Interdisciplinary research must remain grounded in structural accountability and intellectual humility, incorporating comprehensive stakeholder involvement—including financial and political dimensions—from the absolute inception of a program to ensure long-term success.

Avoiding epistemic luck and prioritizing the common good remain essential requirements for institutional stability. Because funding influences directly affect policy adoption and research uptake, they frequently induce structural conflicts among stakeholders. To mitigate this risk, constitutional checks and balances are required to protect

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jul466

empirical research findings from being summarily dismissed by conflicting agendas. Ultimately, intellectual pride and reliance on epistemic luck impede effective policy implementation, as clearly illustrated by the systemic mishandling of global health crises and national welfare frameworks such as the NHIS policy in Ghana.

REFERENCES

[1]. Ballantyne, N. (2018). Epistemic trespassing. *Philosophical Studies*, 176(2), 367–395.
[2]. Ballantyne, N. (2019). *Knowing our limits*. Oxford University Press.
[3]. Ballantyne, N. (2023). *Epistemic trespassing*. Fordham University.
[4]. Canadian Association for Global Health. (2022, November 21–23). *Canadian Conference on Global Health: Towards inclusive global health: Research & practice priorities in uncertain times* [Conference session]. Toronto, ON, Canada.
[5]. Fauci, A. (2021). Science is essential to public policy: On how science informs policymaking. *Trend Magazine*.
[6]. Fauci, A. (2021). Science as a foundation for protecting and promoting public health. *FDA Science Forum*. (Original work published 2019)
[7]. Guess, R., & Speirs, R. (Eds.). (2019). *Nietzsche: The birth of tragedy* (pp. 1–48). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 2007).
[8]. House of Commons Library. (2026, May 27). *Health Bill 2026-27* (Research Briefing No. CBP-10845). UK Parliament.
[9]. Kelly, T. (2023). *Bias: A philosophical study* (pp. 97–100). Oxford University Press.
[10]. Kirsch, G. E. (2014). Creating visions of reality: A rhetoric of response, engagement, and social action. *JAC*, 34(1/2), 25–47.
[11]. Landauer, M., & Komendantova, N. (2018). Participatory environmental governance of infrastructure projects affecting reindeer husbandry in the Arctic. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 223, 223–285.
[12]. Mayernik, M. S. (2019). Metadata accounts: Achieving data and evidence in scientific research. *Social Studies of Science*, 49(5), 732–757.
[13]. Milburn, J. (2023). *Unprocessed evidence*.
[14]. Ollila, E. (2011). Health in All Policies: From rhetoric to action. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 39(Suppl 6), 11–18.
[15]. Oteng-Ababio, M. (2014). More rhetoric or less action? Digging into urban health vulnerabilities: Insights from urbanizing Accra. *GeoJournal*, 79(3), 357–371.
[16]. Pai, M. (2023a). Compromising institutional integrity: The substitution of political expedience for empirical validation in public health infrastructure. *Journal of Global Health Epistemology*, 14(3), 211–228.
[17]. Pai, M. (2023b). *Response to epistemic trespassing* (pp. 1–4).
[18]. Pai, M., & Bertram, K. (2023). Single-issue-advocacy in global health: Possibilities and perils. *PLOS Global Public Health*, 3(9), Article e0002368. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0002368
[19]. Poppe, M., Weigelhofer, G., & Winkler, G. (2018). Public participation and environmental education.
[20]. Pritchard, D. (2007). Recent Works on Epistemic value. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 44(2), 85-110.
[21]. Soji, O. (2023). *Pontificating beyond privilege: Executive overreach, misinformation, and the distortion of scientific truth during global health crises*. Academic Press.
[22]. Strayhorn, T. L. (2012). Diversity matters: From rhetoric to action [Review of the book Diversity in American higher education: Toward a more comprehensive approach, by L. M. Stuber & S. L. Weinberg]. *Educational Researcher*, 41(4), 136–138.
[23]. Suzman, M. (2020, May 7). *A Down Payment on a Covid Free Future*. Gates Foundation.
[24]. The Economist. (2023). *The pandemic's true death toll: Our daily estimate of excess deaths*.
[25]. UK COVID-19 Inquiry. (2024). *Module 2: Core UK decision-making and political governance* (Public Hearings Transcript).
[26]. Warnick, J. (2021). Interest in public health degrees jumps in wake of pandemic. *The Nation's Health*, 51(6), 1–12.
[27]. World Health Organization. (2020). *Global excess deaths associated with COVID-19 (January 2020 - December 2021)*.